

**Examples from “Ecclesial Intelligence” of  
The Independent fellowship Practices,  
Including Independent Divisions,  
Independent Reunions and Reunion Efforts,  
Independent Ecclesial Resolutions,  
Independent Withdrawals and Fellowship  
*Proving*  
the Non-Unionized and  
Completely Autonomous Nature of  
Christadelphian Ecclesias  
From Volumes 1 to 30 of  
*The Ambassador and The Christadelphian*  
Magazine**

**With Additional Material from the Days of bro. John  
Thomas, bro. Robert Roberts and bro. C. C. Walker**

Compiled by: Bro. Jay Genger







## Contents

PREFACE.....	1
COMPLETE AUTONOMY OF <i>THE CHRISTADELPHIAN</i> MAGAZINE; “NO AUTOCRATS”, ALL FREE, EQUAL AND EQUALLY DUTY BOUND.....	4
GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE STATE OF THE BROTHERHOOD .....	10
THE “ABSOLUTE INDEPENDENCE” OF CHRISTADELPHIAN ECCLESIAS.....	12
ECCLESIAS USING PRACTICES OF/AGREEING OF/WITH ANOTHER ECCLESIA .....	27
ECCLESIAS AND LETTERS OF COMMENDATION .....	30
ECCLESIAS AND THEIR BASES OF FELLOWSHIP.....	33
ECCLESIAS THAT ACCEPTED “THE FOUNDATION STATEMENT” OR SIMILAR (THE WHOLLY INSPIRED BIBLE).....	33
ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED “THE DECLARATION” AS THEIR BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP....	54
ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED “ <i>THE ECCLESIAL GUIDE</i> ”.....	56
ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED THE “BIRMINGHAM STATEMENT OF FAITH” .....	59
ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED THE “EDINBURGH BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP” .....	71
ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED THE “LONDON SYNOPSIS OF THE FAITH” .....	71
ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED THE “ISLINGTON BASIS OF FAITH” .....	72
ECCLESIAS THAT ACCEPTED THE CHICAGO BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP .....	74
THE ROYAL ASSOCIATION OF BELIEVERS IN NEW YORK (1854).....	74
THE JERSEY CITY (NJ,US) BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP (1881).....	79
ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED THE “NEW JERSEY STATEMENT OF FAITH” (1882).....	81
THE NOTTINGHAM ANTIPAS ASSOCIATION OF BELIEVERS (1866) .....	82
JERSEY (U.K.) BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP (1896) .....	86
THE TOTTENVILLE (N.Y.) BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP (1896).....	86
INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL ACTIONS .....	87
INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS.....	87
PROPOSALS BY INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS.....	161
RESOLUTIONS BY INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS .....	166
INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS WITHDRAWING FROM MEMBERS .....	204
GENERAL CASES.....	204
INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL WITHDRAWALS DUE TO DOCTRINAL ERROR.....	212
INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL WITHDRAWALS DUE TO SPECIFIC DOCTRINAL ERRORS ...	222
PARTIAL-INSPIRATIONISM.....	222
CLEAN-FLESH, RENUNCIATIONISM, TURNEYISM, J. BELL, G. CORNISH .....	236
THE SPIRITUALISTS.....	241
TURNEYISM A.K.A. CLEAN-FLESH .....	241
INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL WITHDRAWALS DUE TO DISORDERY CONDUCT .....	242
INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL WITHDRAWAL DUE TO ABSENCE FROM THE TABLE .....	254

ECCLESIAL MEMBERS WITHDRAWING FROM AN ECCLESIA.....	265
GENERAL CASES.....	265
WITHDRAWAL DUE TO SPECIFIC DOCTRINAL ERRORS.....	278
CAMPBELLISM.....	278
CHRISTIAN ISRAELITISM.....	278
CLEAN-FLESH, RENUNCIATIONISM, TURNEYISM, J. BELL, G. CORNISH.....	279
DOWIEISM.....	282
IMMORTAL EMMERGENCE.....	283
THE FUTURIST THEORY.....	283
THE ANGLO-ISRAELITISH THEORY.....	283
THE NO ETERNAL LIFE HERESY.....	283
PARTIAL-INSPIRATIONISM.....	284
PRESENT POSSESSION OF ETERNAL LIFE WITHOUT IMMORTALITY.....	298
UNITARIANISM.....	298
INDIVIDUALS RETURNING TO FELLOWSHIP WITH THE SAME ECCLESIA.....	300
INDIVIDUALS RECEIVED INTO FELLOWSHIP BY ANOTHER ECCLESIA.....	333
INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL DIVISIONS.....	354
INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL REUNIONS AND REUNION EFFORTS.....	381
INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS EXTENDING FELLOWSHIP TO OTHER INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS.....	401
THE WORLD IN DISTRESS. RELIEF AT HAND.....	405
EXAMPLES OF THE LIKES OF THE APOSTASY – EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL.....	406
EXTERNAL.....	406
INTERNAL.....	451
LEAVING THE APOSTASY AND EMBRACING THE TRUTH.....	474
FURTHER PROOFS.....	477
VOLUMES 1 TO 30.....	477
INTELLIGENCE (Ecclesial Notes).....	507
COMPILER’S NOTE.....	533







## PREFACE

A couple of brothers encouraged me to read the ecclesial Intelligence reports out of the *The Christadelphian* magazine, which I did from volumes 1 to 34. I didn't know what to expect when I started reading through the material. When I first started to read every single Intelligence report of all 34 volumes, the project seemed somewhat excessive, but as I got further and further into the reports, I realized something very profound. It was clear how early Christadelphian ecclesias operated. I didn't want to stop reading because I was seeing the extent and variety of issues that faced the ecclesias, and how they individually did or did not work out their differences. As well as, and maybe more importantly, how they conducted themselves as independent ecclesias both in division and in attempts to heal their divisions; and how they had structured themselves as independent ecclesias of Christ.

I would like to return the favor; and encourage others to do what I did and go through the Intelligence reports so that they would get out of it the same thing as myself. I have therefore compiled ecclesial Intelligence reports that correspond with the headings listed in the [Table of Contents](#).

The evidence, now made readily available through this compilation, proves beyond any doubt that Christadelphian ecclesias were, originally, *completely independent* of one another, though typically as you would expect cooperative, and that *The Christadelphian* magazine was not the mouth of a Fellowship, that is to say *any* union of Christadelphian ecclesias.

Things worthy of special notice include:

1. While there were undoubtedly more, *ten different bases of fellowship* have been identified as in use during the time period this compilation covers. There was *never* a single Christadelphian statement of faith and yet ecclesias *readily* recognized other Christadelphian ecclesias as “in fellowship” or “out of fellowship”. The freedom which ecclesias had in this regard is readily expressed in the Jersey (U.K.) notice found on page 86
2. So far as fraternal fellowship was concerned, the editor of *The Christadelphian* attempted to support those ecclesias and individuals who were faithful to “the belief and obedience of the truth” (Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1872, p. 225). *As a rule, so long as the the first principles of the truth and commandments of Christ were upheld, bro. Roberts would print an ecclesia's intelligence.*
3. *Bro. Roberts did not require a particular statement of faith be adopted (he rejected the adoption of a common statement of faith in 1884 as seen on page 33); nor did bro. Roberts use, require of others or even entertain the idea of using a Fellowship name for there was no Union of Christadelphian ecclesias extant in his days. No Christadelphian Fellowships would come into existence until near the end of C. C. Walker's editorship.*
4. You will find no reference to a worldwide Christadelphian Fellowship (Union of ecclesias) in the ecclesial Intelligence reports.
5. Consistent with the idea that Christadelphian ecclesias viewed themselves as independent you will not find them referring to those who fall into error and leave their ecclesia as having joined another Fellowship. *They refer to them as the “partial inspirationist camp” (p. 379), “the other meeting” (p. 49), “the Other Side” (p. 350) and similar terms consistent with the doctrine and practice of independent ecclesias.*
6. *You will see, bro. Roberts, on a number of occasions, published counter (contradicting)-Intelligence, out of fairness to divided ecclesias. Bro. Roberts states repeatedly, in various ways, “Divisions in detail it is impossible for us to master at a distance,” which is quite unlike modern Christadelphian Fellowships who conduct fellowship 10,000 miles away as equally and as easily as they conduct it with their local ecclesia.*

7. *Those who believe that Christadelphians, from the 1860's to the late 1890's operated as a union of ecclesias, or a Fellowship, should take special notice of the section "Independent Ecclesial Divisions" starting on page 354 and Independent Ecclesial Reunions and Reunion Efforts starting on page 381. "Independent Ecclesial Resolutions", starting on page 166, is also very interesting.*

I have added a few non-Intelligence items to give context and added detail to events that influenced fellowship amongst Christadelphian ecclesias or that describes what the pioneer brethren called "the mixed state" of the ecclesias that existed in those days.

I also need to make a few clarifications about how the ecclesial Intelligence reports have been organized in this compilation:

1. The ecclesial reports are organized into categories as shown by the sub-headings listed in the Table of Contents. However, some events fit into *more than one sub-heading*. Some of those items have been duplicated under multiple sub-headings. Once completed, there will be approximately 3,000 items. The effort to classify these properly has been a very laborious and intense effort. We apologize for any items which are not placed in their proper categories. *If readers will kindly point out corrections, they will be made, God willing, in a future update.*
2. The ecclesial reports are listed, as closely as possible in a year/month order as they appear in the Ecclesial Intelligence columns.
3. In ALL ecclesial reports if fellowship is mentioned it is either *within* an ecclesia or involving inter-ecclesial fellowship, unless otherwise stated. You will find that in some cases both were involved and these events are largely duplicated in their proper sub-headings.
4. In *most* of the ecclesial Intelligence reports, as you are about to see, what an ecclesia often did, was recommended by Bro. Roberts in the "*Ecclesial Guide*". In some cases brother Roberts disagrees with the way cases are handled, and adds his editorial comments to the case.
5. Bro. Dennis at [denddavis @roadrunner "dot" com](mailto:denddavis@roadrunner.com) is going to elaborate upon some of these cases in "[An Ocean of Proof, One Drop at a Time](#)" on [antipas.org](http://antipas.org)

There is a time for debate, and a time for abstaining from debate. The time for debate is when stagnation is setting in, or when the holding of debate is likely to arrest a healthy public attention to the truth. The time to abstain is when a question has been thoroughly debated, and people have everywhere made up their minds, and when the continuance of debate is likely to be but a continuance of wrangle, affording no further elucidation of the question in dispute, and tending only to gratify those who love contention. There seem to be some who cannot understand the times.

**There are those who love strife and contention, and there are those who love peace at any price. Both are dangerous parties in the work of the truth. The first degrade the truth by their dog-like propensity for mere fighting, and take all usefulness out of it by their want of heart for its comforts, its nobleness, its holiness, its peace and love. The second destroy it another way. Their mere creature sociality leads them to love peace more than duty, man more than God, pleasure more than truth; and in their hands, the truth degenerates into a mass of invertebrate sentimentality in which there is no place for the wisdom of God, as embodied in the plan of salvation.**  
– Roberts Roberts – *Ecclesial Notes The Christadelphian* 1886, pg. 328

## COMPLETE AUTONOMY OF *THE CHRISTADELPHIAN* MAGAZINE; “NO AUTOCRATS”, ALL FREE, EQUAL AND EQUALLY DUTY BOUND

(Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1872, p. 619) – A. S. (United States.)—We mean to adhere to the rule of excluding from the *Christadelphian* all matter leading to the discussion of quarrels or personal misunderstandings. The only strife known to its pages shall continue to be the striving together for the faith of the gospel. Any other discussion would be hurtful in general and no benefit to the parties affected. If brethren cannot manage their own affairs in peace, it is not likely that a publication of their unhappy situation would improve it. It would only spread the mischief. Patience will the Lord come must be the mo to with all who feel the evil of the times in a special form. Good men will be justified at last, and offenders put to shame, though we may have to see the Lord before witnessing this result.

(Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1873, p. 148) – “But all the disciples have no right to discontinue the worship of God; or without some insurmountable impediment almost, to absent themselves therefrom. If, then, all have no right to do this, individual disciples have no right; for, in the kingdom of Christ there are no divinely-constituted privileged orders, no exempted ones, no autocrats, nor aristocrats, but all its citizens are free and equal—and equally bound in all things to obey.”

(Excerpt from January 1883) We are in a somewhat helpless position with regard to communications from the other side of the Atlantic. The “platform” of the *Christadelphian* (as the Americans phrase it) is well known: and when a man of education addresses himself to us fraternally, and encloses printed productions of his own apparently in entire harmony with the truth, we naturally assume his advances are on the basis of a mutual endorsement of the said “platform.” It sometimes turns out that in this we are mistaken. The only remedy is for brethren on the American side (as everywhere else) to use their discrimination when any one approaches them in the name of the truth, and act on John’s recommendation to “Try the spirits whether they are of God.”—EDITOR.

(June 1883) VALLEY SPRING (TEX.), S. H. O.—We make it a rule not to publish withdrawals where they are thrown in doubt by demur on the other side

(May 1883) PIETERMARITZBURGH (NATAL).—Letters from this place from several contending parties reveal a state of things in which it becomes necessary to shut the pages of the *Christadelphian* until the spirit of the truth returns to the ascendancy. Friends of the truth elsewhere can only feel sorrow and shame while the present state of things lasts. We cannot make the *Christadelphian* a ring for the fighting out of quarrels. Wherein intelligence may be made subservient to the interests of the truth, we are glad to use it—entire or abridged, unaltered or modified, as the case may call for. But it is the time to be silent when nothing but harm can come of publication. We are not a newspaper; we confess to a total partisanship on the side of the truth and all its interests. If this policy is sometimes irksome to those concerned, we must endure their dissatisfaction, in the conviction that even they, in the end, will justify a policy which is inspired by a regard to the highest ends and objects—not always visible to those who are warmly enlisted in some local or personal issue.

(July 1884) PIETERMARITZBURGH.—It is natural that men in this place who may have “remained faithful to the divine commands” should be pained by the paragraph which appeared in the *Christadelphian* for May, 1883: but that they should call it “defamatory,” and threaten the editor with withdrawal if it is not cancelled, is not reasonable. We had letters before us on that occasion from three conflicting parties, all bitterly accusing each other of wrongdoing. These had been preceded by letters of a similar character for a considerable time. It was impossible to judge between them: and we could not consent to let them fight each other in the *Christadelphian*. What could we do but close the door and wait

a better state of things. If such a state of things has arisen, we shall truly rejoice, and shall gladly announce it: but the letter now to hand is not an evidence of it. Brethren of Christ are reasonable men: and no reasonable man, even if wronged, would take the attitude of those who write this letter. We are sorry we cannot comply with their request.—ED.

(Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1885, p. 466-467) – “Twenty-one years ago, on the recommendation of Dr. Thomas, I commenced the publication of a periodical devoted to the interests of the truth, at a time when the truth had scarcely any friends. Amongst other features, I gave prominence to that of systematic ecclesial intelligence from a conviction that the regular publication of such intelligence would tend to keep alive and give Scriptural form to the activities developed by the truth, promulgated by lectures, and otherwise. The thing worked as I expected, and it worked without any detriment so long as the professed friends of the truth were at peace one with another. But by and bye, here and there, dissensions occurred—sometimes on personal issues—sometimes on doctrinal differences. Out of these dissensions, withdrawals, and divisions arose. Here is the difficulty which has clouded and embittered the editorial conduct of the *Christadelphian* for years. One side would send a report of their action, apparently official and unchallengeable. The report would appear, and then next month, the other side would protest against it, and demand that their version of the matter should be accepted and published as the right one. Sometimes this would happen even before publication—both sides simultaneously claiming publicity as the party in the right. It was inevitable in such cases that some degree of investigation should take place. Had I been indifferent to the peace of the ecclesias, or insensible to the question of right or wrong, I would simply have given place equally to both sides, and allowed the *Christadelphian* to become an arena of public wrangle. Had I been merely bent on creating a reading constituency, I would have done this. But I had very indifferent views, whatever incensed friends may think to the contrary. I have tried to find out the right, determining to identify myself with the right only, in which, surely, I was within the province of each man’s individual prerogative. What earnest man would have acted in the same way? Having come to a conclusion as to where the right lay, I directed my principal aim to restoring peace—always. Failing this, I have closed the intelligence columns of the *Christadelphian* to those I considered in the wrong. This has gone on for years; and now matters have grown larger, and sundry brethren here and there have represented to me that I ought not in the enlarged form of things to decide such matters by myself, but take into my confidence tried brethren with whom to share the determination of such issues when they arise, as affecting the *Christadelphian*. To this, I say I have never objected; but the way has never till now seemed open. The force of circumstances has forced the way open, as it were. I have even been willing to go further than requested—I have been willing to delegate the matter wholly to others, and leave myself out of it. My name has been inserted by other hands than mine.”

(Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1885, p. 166) – It is very proper for an ecclesia to “resist interference with its ecclesial affairs.” The determination on this head, which the resolution expresses, is, however, somewhat ambiguous in its bearing. It is aimed at the Editor of the *Christadelphian*, of course; but it is hard to see how it applies, unless it refer to the conducting of the *Christadelphian*. The Editor of the *Christadelphian* has never interfered in the affairs of the Birkenhead ecclesia, or any other ecclesia. He has several times attended ecclesial meetings in various parts of the country, by request, to take part with them in the disentanglement of ecclesial difficulties: but this could not justly be characterised as “interference.” It was co-operation in a perfectly brotherly spirit, with brotherly results, and with the reverse of gratification to us in every case, except in so far as good was achieved. If it refer to the conducting of the *Christadelphian*, the complaint is still more destitute of reasonable ground. The Editor in all cases has only exercised the lawful prerogative of an editor. He has “edited” the contents of the magazine from the point of view of the objects at which it aims. This cannot be held to be an interference in any ecclesia’s affairs. Each ecclesia does its own untrammelled part; and the Editor of the *Christadelphian* does his. It will be an unspeakable relief when the need for either part has ceased in the manifestation of the personal superintendence of the appointed judge; but while the need continues, what reasonable man would object to its faithful exercise in the spirit of mutual respectful independence and

consideration? A paper cannot be conducted by many hands. Under any arrangement, the ultimate management falls into a single pair. Editing by committee is a performance which must end in abortion where it is not a pretence.

(Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian 1886*, pg.37) — “The past year has been a year of ferment and transition. Henceforward, the *Christadelphian*, in its intelligence department, will speak for those only who are prepared to avow their belief in the totally inspired character of the Bible, and to maintain this belief as a first principle in their fellowship.”

(Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian 1887*, pg.572) — W.H.R.— **We cannot follow the fermentations you describe.** The world is a weltering chaos—some parts worse than others. In the absence of authority and power, there is nothing effective to be done. Each man must do his best without expectations. God has not made a mistake in placing His word in such an unfavourable situation. What His object is we may not always read, but His means are always commensurate with His aims. We must therefore conclude that the Bible, and the associations of love and commonsense growing out of it, are sufficient to accomplish what God requires in the present age in the way of preparation for finished results afterwards. There is nothing to be done in the way of successful ecclesial organisation under present circumstances. It would save much disappointment if men would not look for it, but simply look round for opportunities of doing all the good they can individually. Making thus the best of the materials and the circumstances (carefully refraining the tongue concerning the evil doings of others), we may at least save ourselves from this untoward generation.

(Excerpt, March 1892) SYDNEY.— We recently had interviews with the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, on the subject of excluding aliens from the building in which the church meets, but I am sorry to say with no good results. They maintain that the mere presence of a stranger in the room while the Ecclesia are partaking of the Bread and Wine amounts to defilement. They consider themselves impregably entrenched by quoting Ezek. 44:9, which to our minds is in no way applicable at present. We are not in fellowship with them, as we think that God has placed quite sufficient burden in all respects without any additions being made by man. This state of things is to be lamented. **We should like to know clearly the stand you take in the “Exclusion of Aliens” and “The 21 years age” questions, as we are constantly being informed by the members of the Temperance Hall and other Ecclesias that inasmuch as you receive and publish their correspondence, and also from some rather ambiguous statements in the *Christadelphian*, they conclude that you are in fellowship with them, and consequently they use this as a handle against ourselves.**—W. P.

(Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1892, p. 118)— “Nothing is so discouraging as division among those who profess the truth. Sometimes great issues arise that leave no alternative; but frequently division comes from non-conformity to the precepts that are binding on the house of God; and often both sides are wrong. It is wrong for a brother to make the sin of another a reason for refusing to break bread until he have privately seen the brother first alone, then with others, and the assembly have endorsed his iniquity. It is worse to do so ostentatiously to the interference with the comfort and edification of a whole body. On the other hand, it is wrong for the body to make that brother’s offence the subject of a public condemnation until steps have privately been taken to bring him to reason. Divisions like these paralyse friends at a distance, and kill the work on the spot. There is nothing but evil in them. What is the use of presenting the truth to the public if you have only a hot bed of strife to invite them into after they may have received the truth? The truth is of no advantage to any one when the fruits of the Spirit do not prevail. As to the attitude of the *Christadelphian*, it is not possible to follow the details where a body splits up into four parts. The names of persons and places and crotchets fuse into an irrerecognizable mass like the stuff thrown out of a volcano. We have no sympathy with the word-destroying crotchets that come up from time to time—some of which are specified in the foregoing communication: but we find it

always impossible to judge of ecclesial disturbances arising out of them unless we have the opportunity of personal investigation, which is impossible in the case in question. Our foundation is well known to those who have access to our literature. **Friends approaching us through the post we assume to approach us on this basis. We publish their communications on this assumption. We are sick and helpless in the presence of endless strife. We repudiate all constructions of our action that may involve us in unscriptural conclusions. Divisions in detail it is impossible for us to master at a distance. We desire to know no man after the flesh or after crotchets. Enlightened submission to the oracles of God is our basis of co-operation. Good men and true must do the best they can in an evil situation.**”

(Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1897, p. 376)—“Editors of our magazine have no authority to speak representatively or take action for the body on questions of dissent. This was the ground we took here when the ‘meeting’ was proposed, on your return voyage from Australia, ‘to settle this thing.’ ‘Authority,’ and guidance in action may be found only in the Scriptures; and this is prescribed to individuals and collective bodies. Responsibility for such action is to God alone, who requires it. Neither can personal, or ecclesial bodies alone, scripturally dictate such a course through our periodicals; or much less expect to escape the responsibility by attempting to throw the representative duty upon the shoulders of their editors. Communications upon such subjects should rather be considered as a matter of favour through editorial columns, to which, with all due propriety, the editor might add his own personal opinion: at the same time reserving his right, however, to make choice of such contributions as in his own judgment might best serve the purpose and good of the cause.”

(June 1892) SYDNEY.—*Temperance Hall*.—Brother Rubottom forwards a letter from brother Burton, in reply to the communication of brother Pickup, appearing in the *Christadelphian* for March last. On behalf of the brethren, he requests the publication of “part, if not the whole, of the reply, so as to remove wrong impressions from the minds of brethren in the neighbouring colonies or elsewhere.” [It would be gratifying to us to comply with the request of the letter, were it of a character likely to remove wrong impressions, or likely to do good to one side or the other. Its effect would, necessarily, be much otherwise. The main allegations of brother Pickup’s letter are not denied. That is, it is admitted that brother Burton holds, and perhaps some others, that no one ought to be immersed unless at least 20 years old; and that it is contended for that no stranger should be allowed to be present as spectator at the breaking of bread. The exceptions taken to brother Pickup’s communication are on phrases and matters of detail. Justice calls only for the notice of these. Brother Burton says he does not maintain that the presence of strangers in the same room where bread was broken “would amount to a defilement;” and he does not consider the case for exclusion impregnably established by Ezek. 44:9 alone. These are the only corrections of fact contained in the reply. The rest of it consists of arguments in defence of the things objected to, and of damaging allegations on other matters, which it is impossible we can publish. We exceedingly grieve at these contentions, which are nothing but destructive to all concerned. **We cannot escape them; but we must refuse to make the *Christadelphian* a vehicle for their ventilation.**—EDITOR.]

(September 1892) SYDNEY.—After about two years’ tossing about on roaring waves of trial and temptation, fourteen of us have (by the hand of providence) been rescued from our perilous position, and are now anchored, as it were, under shelter, where everything is calm and quiet. “A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.” Our meeting place at present is Town Hall, Norton Street, Leichhardt. We meet on Sunday morning to break bread and drink wine in loving remembrance of our absent Lord, who said, “This do in remembrance of me,” and in the evening to proclaim the glorious things of the Gospel and refresh our own minds. We have also established a Sunday School, which we hold in the afternoon. We are also pleased to be able to report having placed ourselves in fellowship with the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, from whom we had been separated, owing to

some of their members contending for an age qualification. We have come to the conclusion that the Scriptures did not warrant our action. As we were not compelled to endorse the views held on the twenty years' question, and there being no other reason as to why a barrier should exist, we invited the Temperance Hall brethren to our fellowship and co-operation, which invitation they readily accepted, showing that they had no wish that a barrier should be kept up; and they have since rendered us assistance by way of lecturing, etc.—H. HOWELL.

**[We insert the foregoing “without prejudice,” as the lawyers say; that is, without committing ourselves to anything that may hereafter appear to be unsound in the action referred to. We are too far away and in the midst of too many engrossments to be able to keep track of the personal evolutions of an unharmonious community. We must necessarily appear very obtuse to those on the spot. We can only do the best we can, like all other mortals. We aim on the one hand to keep clear of compromising associations, and, on the other, to do no injustice to those who “love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth.” Wherein we fail, we ask forgiveness.—EDITOR.]**

(Except, May 1893) SYDNEY.—*Leichhardt ecclesia*.—Brother H. Howell writes to contradict the allegations of brother Dalvey appearing in the *Christadelphian* for January last under the heading of “Sydney”; another brother writes that the Albert Hall brethren are alone entitled to the fellowship of brethren elsewhere, and that the Truth will never prosper in Sydney until the *Christadelphian* is closed against all but Albert Hall. We are weary of these dissensions, and feel helpless in dealing with them. We cannot know the exact state of matters without personal investigation on the spot; and as this is out of the question, we have to consider what to do. **Are we to publish intelligence from all, or to publish intelligence from none of the bodies professing the truth in Sydney? There seems no middle course. If some denied and some professed the truth as understood among us, we should know what to do exactly, and should do it without hesitation or fear. But when all profess the same truth and all object to each other’s communications appearing, we are simply paralysed. To publish communications from none would be a simple method, but there is a feeling that such a course must necessarily involve injustice to the Lord’s faithful servants, of whom there must surely be some among so many professors in Sydney. To publish from all, if they could each bear it, might be the lesser evil. But even here there is a difficulty. It would be an apparent countenance of a Scriptural wrong, for it is a Scriptural wrong that the friends of Christ should meet in separate and hostile bodies; and what are visitors to Sydney to do when they find themselves in the midst of warring camps? There’s something terribly wrong somewhere. It is questionable if Christ will have any word of commendation for a community so given up to mutual devouring. One thing is certain, there ought to be no compromise with this presumptuous exclusion from fellowship of obedient lovers of God who happen to be under 20 years of age. If this is the leaven that is working the confusion, cast it out. It ought to be easy to make a clearly drawn line here. Let as many rationally-minded and Godly men and women come together as can agree on a basis of fellowship that excludes this absurdity; and friends elsewhere would know what to do. At present, the Sydney brethren are not only afflicting themselves, but are discouraging brethren everywhere, and bringing reproach on the Truth to the ends of the earth by their chronic strifes, and diversions, and hatred, and evil speakings. Let the true men and women among them arise and deliver themselves from this carnal quagmire in which they are in danger of sinking to perdition. One thing we are on the point of resolving on, and that is to close the pages of the *Christadelphian* against all further**



communications until an **Apostolic basis of union and peace**<sup>1</sup> has been arrived at. We have not reached a final decision. We shall wait a little longer. We fear to interpose obstacles in the way of any man sincerely endeavouring to do the will of God in his day and generation. At the same time the fruits of the Spirit (love, joy, union and peace) are of as paramount importance as the elementary things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. Where these are absent, the spirit of Christ is absent: and we all know what is written, “If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.”—EDITOR.

(Excerpt, September 1893) *Albert Hall, Elizabeth Street.*—brother Pickup reports the withdrawal of the Albert Hall brethren from about 14 brethren and sisters whose names are given, and the said 14 brethren and sisters write simultaneously to refuse fellowship to the Albert Hall brethren on grounds specified in seven propositions, in addition to which there are separate letters from brother Ryall, brother Porritt, brother Stephens and brother Hodges—all of them acknowledging the uncorrupted way of truth, and advocating that which is excellent in all practical ways. There is no question of doctrine in doubt as between Albert Hall and Elpis Hall, so far as we can make out, nor any disagreement as to the obligations arising out of the commandments of Christ. It is a want of harmony in matters of order and discipline. **Of this it is impossible for persons at a distance to judge, however exactly they may be defined, without an amount of correspondence which is impossible. There is no advantage in debating what cannot be decided. The quarrel, if quarrel there must be, must be kept to Sydney. There could be no advantage in transferring it to the pages of the *Christadelphian*.**

(November 1893) AUCKLAND.—A communication from this place is too suggestive of ambiguity and compromise in the basis of fellowship to find place in the *Christadelphian*. When the fact of inspiration is referred to as “theory,” and other elements of Divine truth. are spoken of as “abstruse doctrines,” it is evident that a trumpet of uncertain sound is blowing which is of no use in battle.

(Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1898) – The only practicable rule of operation at present is fellowship on the basis of oneness of mind. It is a rule fraught with embarrassment and pain, but it is not of human appointment and cannot be set aside where faithfulness to the word of God is not extinct. To confound this rule with the Corinthian schisms that gloried in particular men after the flesh, is a serious mistake. The “plea” shows some heat against those who are described as “every assumed leader amongst us.” I suppose I am intended as one of those, and as such, I am to be “repudiated once and for ever.” There is either misunderstanding or malice here. I am no “leader” except as a man’s individual actions may influence others. I have always repudiated the imputation of leadership. I but do my own part on the basis of individual right. I claim no authority. I dictate to no man. I only act out my individual convictions, and advocate my individual views. Which of the demurring brethren do not do the same thing? Why should they find fault with me for doing what they do? If others are influenced by what I do or say, is this wrong? Is it not what the critics are aiming to do? An enlightened man would refuse to be responsible for such an unreasonable criticism.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: What was called for was “an Apostolic basis of union and peace”, not “the BSF” or some other prescribed basis of fellowship. This Intelligence item alone proves that no manmade worldwide Fellowship existed but independent ecclesias and there was such division amongst those in the Sydney area and, for such a period of years, that bro. Roberts is nearly ready to exlude their Intelligence until they adopt and follow “an Apostolic basis of union and peace”.

(Excerpt from September 1894) LONDON (SOUTH) *Gresham Hall, Gresham Road, (near Brixton Station)*. [We have a communication from the few who are separated from Gresham Hall, and who are assembling at the old meeting place in Camberwell. They cannot expect its insertion in the *Christadelphian*. It will be more in place in brother Andrew's magazine, where no doubt it will be welcome, like the omitted parts of their last circular which were duly emphasised by italics. (By the way, is it fair to make us appear blameworthy in having omitted parts? If we had professed to publish the whole, and given only parts, no doubt it would be very proper to hold up our obliquity in the emphasis of italicised lines; but when we openly declared that we omitted parts, where is the offence? Is an editor obliged to publish the whole of everything sent him? Has he no power of omission? Where then would be editorship? Or must the contributors be the editors and the editor merely a letter box to receive their MS.? No doubt such an arrangement would suit some very well; but this editor would not consent to edit on those terms. And he is quite sure that none of the critics would do so either. Let reason prevail.—EDITOR].

## GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE STATE OF THE BROTHERHOOD

(Excerpt of letter from bro. John Thomas to bro. Robert Roberts; *The Christadelphian*, 1866, p. 204)  
Dated July 30<sup>th</sup> 1866

I entirely agree with you in your graphic description of the barrenness of Christadelphia. Yet dry and withering as things appear within its limits, all exterior to it is scorched and destitute of any vitality at all. The Christadelphian Body in the days of the apostles abounded with professors whose hearts were but little attuned to the faith and hope they professed. Peter styles them *washed hogs*; and Paul, as little complimentary of them as he, terms them, "*liars, evil beasts, and slow bellies.*" These were creatures who had "crept in unawares," and "spoke evil of those things which they understood not;" clouds they were without water, carried about of winds of doctrine, and sporting themselves with their own deceivings, by which they beguiled unstable souls, and brought "the way of truth" into disrepute. The influence of these, who passed themselves off for Christadelphians, was more disheartening to the apostles, and the rest of the real brethren of Christ, than all the opposition that Satan could bring to bear upon them from without. Their influence was great, yea, strong enough to turn multitudes from the truth to fables, even to old wives' fables; and, as a consequence, to alienate them from the apostles, who had before turned them from pagan darkness, and the power of Satan. They were an element of the One Body, answering to sin in the flesh, which cannot be eradicated till this corruptible shall put on incorruptibility, and this mortal shall put on immortality. They were the occasion of great vexation and mortification to the apostles, whose work of faith and labour of love they neutralized, and rendered, to a great extent, ineffectual. They were zealous. They "zealously affected" the brethren, "but not well." Their zeal was not for the honour and promotion of the truth as taught by the apostles; but for the development of a theology that should be more acceptable to flesh and blood, and profitable to themselves. "The truth as it is in Jesus" was too exclusive and uncharitable for their piety and liberality of soul. *It was too "sectarian;"* and they were terribly afraid of being made responsible for those characteristics deemed odious by the fashionable religionists of their day, which were inseparable from "the sect everywhere spoken against." The way of salvation taught by this sect was too narrow for them. They wanted a broader way, whereby some good, pious souls might be saved, who did not belong to the apostolic sect or party. The apostles were too sectarian for their benevolence and universal philanthropy. Their large hearts could not be bounded by so sectarian a dogma as, that only those could obtain eternal life who affectionately believed the gospel of the kingdom, were immersed, and continued in the teaching of the apostles. This made no provision for babes and sucklings, and pious Jews who assented to the truth, but did not approve of so sectarian an institution as baptism. Were all these to be damned because they didn't see things as Paul did; and

because they had not been dipped? He that believeth the gospel and is baptised shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be condemned. This is the oracle of the Founder of the Sect. It is eminently “sectarian;” and whoever is faithful to it must, and can only be sectarian; and so sectarian were the apostles, that they turned all over to cursing, when the Lord comes, who did not believe and do according to the principles of the sect. “They lost their lives in labouring to establish, in all its alleged exclusiveness, illiberality and sectarianism.”

Do you expect poor, decrepid, human nature to evolve holier influences now, than it was socially capable of under an apostolic ministration of spirit? I believe you do not. It would be very pleasant if there were none in Christadelphia but the called, the faithful, and the chosen; all of one mind, and “with one mind and one mouth glorifying God.” If all understood the truth, and were governed by it, who profess to believe it, there would be a very different state of things to what has obtained in any age or generation, past or present. But ecclesiastical perfection is not to be expected in the absence of Christ. Till he comes, the wheat will be mingled with the tares in such proportion as to keep the faithful in tribulation and the exercise of patience. The kingdom of the heavens preached is still, parabolically, a net cast into the sea, and gathering all sorts of fish, good, bad, and indifferent. When the net is full, it is landed on to shore, and its contents are sorted by the master. All the good fish are gathered into vessels for his use, but the bad are cast away. This arrangement cannot be altered. The good and bad fish will continue to swim in the same waters until the end comes, and that end, it is to be hoped, is very near; for it is by no means pleasant or comfortable to swim in waters full of sharks and serpents of the sea.

(February 1881) SPRINGFIELD (Ohio.) — Brother Reeve writes: “I know how to sympathise with you in the work that we see proper to do, regardless of consequences from friend or foe. I have suffered with you in the evil courses of some. My tour lasted six months, during which I visited nearly all the Ecclesias (worthy of visiting) in Western Canada, Ohio, Michigan, New York State, Jersey, New England, Baltimore, and Washington City. I found the brethren in all those places separated from the distracting associations and teachings that have sprung up in the last decade, and that have wrought such division here and in many places as may not be righted before the judicial Master’s coming; but those that have come through the conflict without the smell of fire on their garments, I found zealous, warm hearted for the truth, and willing co-operators in the work that seeks no aid from mere men. I shall never forget the kindness of those very dear brothers and sisters in Christ; no, their labour of love with me shall ever be remembered, and be my consolation in my future walk to the kingdom under difficulties and sadness only fully known to myself. The hearty love and co-labour of true brethren is, indeed a sweet and comforting offset to the machinations of the evilly disposed toward the truth and its friends.”

(Excerpt from February 1893) HAMILTON (Mo).—Brother A. L. Sweet writes: —“Christadelphianism in this country is slowly but surely loosing its hold on the truth, if indeed it held it at the start. Uncertainty in matters pertaining to the truth are so palatable and so much easier to swallow that certainty goes a-begging. How do you know you have the truth?” asked an elder of me a few Sundays ago. To have given a lengthy answer would have been to waste words — words do, sometimes, glance off, I suppose you know. So I asked, “How do you know when you have got the measles?” “I don’t know it,” said he, “until they break out.” “That,” said I, “is the way one can tell when one has the truth. Unless it ‘breaks out,’ uncertainty in matters pertaining to the faith will answer equally as well as certainty.” His answer was a big “Haw Haw,” which meant, I took it, “You *can’t* know.” Last Sunday I let drop a few words that caused him to “break out”—not with the measles, nor with the truth—but with the words, “You are always finding fault.” I had said, “If the truth is proclaimed in this country as Paul proclaimed it, and as Dr. Thomas after him proclaimed it I don’t know it.” This was a little too much for the old gentleman, and he “broke out” much as “Christians” break out, and in a “Christian spirit,” too.

# THE “ABSOLUTE INDEPENDENCE” OF CHRISTADELPHIAN ECCLESIAS

(*The Christadelphian*, 1872)

## The Success of the Gathering

This is not to be estimated by the number attending, or the interest taken, but by *spiritual results*; and this not only the immediate results, but such as may follow after a long time (if the Lord delay his coming). For this reason, it is essential to be very decided as to one thing; and that is the point mentioned in the preliminary announcement in the May No.—that the gathering shall not be allowed in the smallest degree to acquire the character of a debating or legislative conference. The gathering must be held incompetent to deal with any matter implying a jurisdiction over others in any sense or degree. Business of all kinds must be absolutely and entirely excluded; also the discussion of any matters involving a difference of view. **It will be useful to hear the experience of others, and perhaps to receive their counsel; but it must be left to the absolute liberty of each to adopt or leave the views and recommendations advanced, as may appear good.** The theory of the meeting is this: that the ecclesia of Birmingham invites brethren from any place to come and spend a few days with them for mutual encouragement. It is not a meeting of ‘delegates,’ or a conference for business. It is precisely as when a brother invites a company of brethren to tea. This form of the matter must be distinctly recognised, and strenuously upheld. By this, we shall get all the advantages without **the evils that usually grow out of ecclesiastical assemblies.**

It happens that in our researches among Dr. Thomas’s papers, we have come upon a copy of a letter by him, having a bearing on this very subject. Its publication at the present time is very opportune. It is as if we had the benefit of

## DR. THOMAS’S JUDGMENT ON THE STEP

About to be taken. We know nothing more of the letter to which it is an answer than our readers will learn from the letter itself, which is as follows:—

Mott Haven, Westchester, N.J.  
Nov. 21st, 1859.

Dear Brother —, —After trying your patience so long, I am able, at length, to write definitely to you concerning the mind of the brethren on the subject of the proposed conference. **They have come to the unanimous decision not to give their countenance or support to any other ecclesiastical body than that commonly known by the phrase “the ecclesia,” which is an association of heirs of the kingdom of God, who have become such by an *intelligent belief* of “the things of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ,” and *immersion into the name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;” and are the pillar and support of the truth in the several special localities in which they reside. Beside this “one body,” they recognize no other in the New Testament, and know of nothing to be done in connection with the truth which *it is not competent to accomplish.*** They are opposed to a floating or movable body, composed of “delegates,” who, from their knowledge of such, are more likely to represent the *numerical majorities* than the *intelligence and wisdom* of the churches to which they belong. If one church wish to *confer* with another, it is competent to do so by *letters or messengers*, the latter not being able to sit as a council or conference, but to deliver the message of the one to the other church, upon which the whole will confer as at Jerusalem in Acts 15.

**This, dear brother, will answer your “5th question,” and, in part, your first; for if no “conference” be needed, no “public declaration of its faith and principles” is called for. The church declares its own “faith and principles” by the “foolishness of its preaching.” We in New York City**

**do not feel in any need of a floating body or bird of passage, alighting in — or elsewhere, and whistling melodies for us.** We can play our own tunes upon the inspired harp without the aid of a choir of delegates, whom we may not know even by name—“delegates” who might think proper to waste their time in creating business, and in discussing “reports” prepared for them by “committees on” tobacco, slavery, means to be abstained from, unleavened bread, and the infusion of raisins, teetotalism, the Sabbath, and numerous other crotchets which suggest themselves to the carnal mind, ever prone to strain out gnats and swallow camels without end. **From such a body we might expect “a declaration of principles,” which would become the foundation of a new apostasy from the gospel of the kingdom of God.”**

As to your question No. 2 concerning the apostolic organization, mode, and order of worship, we believe that in New York City we practise it as scripturally as may be in the absence of the spiritual gifts of the first century. We shall be happy to shew you if you will pay us a visit here.

**As to query No. 3, we believe that brethren when travelling, whether they be private or teaching brethren, should carry with them letters of introduction and commendation from *the particular church to which they belong*; and that that church before its introduction and commendation be accepted, should be known to consist of constituents who have themselves believed and obeyed the gospel of the promised kingdom, the letters of no other *kind* being of any worth with the saints.**

Lastly, when all the means existing for the maintenance and spread of the gospel are expended, we think it will be time enough to consider the 4th query on your list about “additional means.” It is more than probable that we in New York City do not do all that might be done; but of this we are certain, that expending our funds in despatching one or two of our number as a delegation to — or elsewhere, might benefit the New York Central and other R.R. Co.’s, but could not possibly make us more efficient here.

**Our advice is: Begin in — at home, where charity begins; and if there be any there “who have an ear to hear what the Spirit says,” bring them to “the obedience of faith;” and with these, be they many or few, as the “One Body” there, announce yourself to your fellow-citizens as the — Conference, ready to *confer* with any of *them* upon the great question of salvation. When you have separated from them all the people the Lord may have in — and you find that you get “*out of work*,” extend your operations to remoter parts. If each and all of the saints do this, real good may be done. **But from conferences, councils, synods, conventions, and general assemblies, other than the church in its original constitution, may heaven and all its ministers of grace defend the saints. Amen! We never knew any good thing come out of such a Nazareth or region of the shadow of death.****

With kind regards to all our friends in R., I remain, yours affectionately,

JOHN THOMAS.

(John Thomas, *Eureka*, Volume 2, p. 306-307) “Scarcely any two things can be more dissimilar than this new order of things, and the order instituted by the Apostles nearly 300 years before. Mosheim speaking of the episcopal presbyters, or overseeing elders, of the apostolic ecclesias and those of the second century, says: ‘Let none confound the bishops of this primitive and golden period of the ecclesia with those of whom we read in the following ages. For though they were both designated by the same name, yet they differed extremely in many respects. A bishop during the first and second centuries was a person who had the care of one christian assembly, which at that time was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly he acted not so much with the authority of a master, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful servant. The ecclesias, also in those early times, were entirely independent; none of them subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each of them governed by its own rulers and its own laws. Nothing is more evident than the perfect equality that reigned among the primitive ecclesias; nor does there ever appear in the first century, the smallest trace of that association of provincial ecclesias from which councils and metropolitans derive their origin.’”

(John Thomas, *The Apostolic Advocate*, vol 2,121). "On Sept. 2d I returned to Richmond after an absence of five weeks. During this period I travelled about six hundred miles, and spoke twenty-six times on the Christian Institution to a total of some three thousand people. On July 30th I arrived at Flat Rock in company with Bros. Jeter and Walthal. Here we found many of the brethren from various parts of Lunenburg and the adjacent counties. They had met here as delegates to, and spectators of, the proceedings of an Association, now probably defunct, called the Meherrin Association. We were respectfully invited to a seat. We appreciated the motive of our friends, but the invitation was not accepted. As far as we could learn, we believe there was not a single delegate, that was not fully impressed with the unscriptural character of these assemblies. Indeed, a vote was unanimously passed, that the churches be advised to dissolve the body. It is probable, therefore, that we were spectators of its demise. No 'funeral was preached' over its corpse; may its ashes, however, rest in peace, and never rise again.

"Associations" are unscriptural. The congregations of Christ in early times, were entirely independent, none of them being subject to any foreign or extraneous jurisdiction, but each governed by its own Rulers, and the Apostolic laws. No peculiar set of men, associated under any exclusive title, had any juridical authority, or any sort of supremacy, or the least right to enact laws under any pretence whatever. Nothing, on the contrary, is more evident than the perfect equality that reigned among the primitive churches; nor does there even appear, in the first century, that association of provincial churches from which councils and metropolitans derive their origin. It was only in the second century, that the custom of holding councils commenced in Greece whence it soon spread through the other provinces of the Roman world.

"The meeting of the Church at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) is commonly considered as the first Christian council or association. But this notion arises from a manifest abuse of the word council. That meeting was only of one church, and, if such a meeting be called a council, it will follow that there were innumerable councils in the primitive times. But every one knows that a council is an assembly of delegates, deputies or commissioners, sent from several churches associated by certain bonds in a general body, and thus the said supposition falls to the ground.

"Although the Christian assemblies in the first century were unassociated in any other bonds than those of love, in process of time, as HUMAN POLICY gained the ascendant, all the churches of a province were formed into one large ecclesiastical body, which, like confederate States, assembled at certain times, in order to deliberate about the common interests of the whole. This institution had its origin among the Greeks, with whom nothing was more common than this confederacy of independent States, and the regular assemblies which met, in consequence thereof, at fixed times, and were composed of the deputies of each respective State. But these ecclesiastical associations were not long confined to the Greeks; their great utility in subserving the ambitious views of a rising priesthood was no sooner perceived by the clergy, than they became universal, and were formed in all places where the Christian religion had been planted. To these assemblies, in which the deputies or commissioners of several churches consulted together, the names of SYNOD was appropriated by the Greeks, and that of councils by the Latins; and the laws that were enacted in these general meetings, were called canons, i. e. rules.

"These councils," says Mosheim, "of which we find not the smallest trace before the middle of the second century, changed the whole face of the church and gave it a new form; for, by them the ancient privileges of the people were considerably diminished, and the power and authority of the bishops greatly augmented.' Prudence indeed prevented the clergy assuming all at once the power with which they were afterwards invested. At their first appearance in these general councils they acknowledged that they were no more than the delegates of their respective churches, and that they acted in the name, and by the appointment of the people. But they soon changed this humble tone, imperceptibly extended the limits of their authority, turned their influence into dominion, and their counsels into laws; and openly asserted, at

length, that Christ had empowered them to prescribe to his people authoritative rules of faith and manners. Another effect of these councils was, the gradual abolition of that perfect equality which reigned among all bishops in the primitive times. For the order and decency of these assemblies required, that some one of the provincial bishops, meeting in council, should be invested with a superior degree of power and authority, and hence the rights of metropolitan bishops derive their origin. In the mean time the bounds of the church were enlarged; the custom of holding councils was followed where ever the sound of a corrupted gospel had reached; and the universal church had now the appearance of one vast republic, formed by a combination of a great number of little States. This occasioned a new order of ecclesiastics, who were appointed in different parts of the world, as heads of the church, and whose office it was to preserve the consistence and union of that immense body, whose members were so widely dispersed throughout the nations. Such were the nature and office of the patriarchs, among whom at length, ambition, having reached its most insolent period, formed a new dignity, investing the Bishop of Rome, and his successors, with the title and authority of Prince of the Patriarchs. (Mosheim, vol. i. p. 60.)

“Such is the testimony afforded us by history of the origin and usurpation of associations. History is the experience of past ages, and is able to make us wise in the conduct of the future. The embryo assemblies out of which arose the councils of Nice, Nicomedia and Trent, claimed to be nothing more than ‘advisory,’ which is the main plea by which it is attempted to sustain them among the Baptists at this time! Advisory! yes, indeed, even to the excommunication of churches from Christian fellowship. The designs of ambition are generally masked under a show of moderation and humility. These have been well played off among the Baptists until the people are cajoled into the belief of their scriptural and apostolic character. We rejoice, however, that in Lunenburg the knell has been sounded and the requiem of these antichristian assemblies chaunted perhaps forever.

(John Thomas, *The Herald*, 1861; Quoted in *The Christadelphian*, 1885, p. 168)—“**Now, to all these things we, and, as far as we know the views of the brethren in this country, with a few exceptions, are utterly opposed. We have no ‘conferences.’ . . . Their influence is evil in the absence of divine authority and wisdom to enlighten and keep things straight. They are ecclesiastical schemes** for the promotion of the hireling system, and for the working out of lay and clerical speculations. We protest against them all as incipient tyrannies. **Let every church manage its own affairs; let its members exert themselves in their own spheres for the diffusion of the truth;** and if any can publicly ‘preach the word,’ let him go forth as we do without stipulation, and trust to the appreciation of his labours by his brethren, for his expenses and support. . . . If a man be really devoted to the truth he will not wait for money to be raised to send him out. When by his earnest and self-denying labours he makes his influence felt, means will come in with the labour to extend its field. An ‘Evangelist’ who waits to be sent out by subscription, is just the man who should stay at home and take care of his own household. Conferences and committees and subscription lists, cannot make ‘Evangelists;’ they can make public talkers for the lucre’s sake, but not Scriptural Evangelists. . . .

(C. C. Walker, *The Christadelphian*, 1904, p. 113) – “Brother R. W. asks us to countenance the movement at the antipodes to “give up the word ‘Birmingham’ and substitute ‘Christadelphian’” [in the Birmingham Statement of Faith]. **Our answer must be as before: We have no authority so to do. Neither has anyone else. The Birmingham ecclesia can only speak for itself; and it is so with every other ecclesia. We entirely sympathise with every godly effort for unity on a pure basis; but it would be a mistake to issue a document under the above title, because it would imply the right of the issuers to speak for the whole household of faith, which right does not exist. The principle of ecclesial independence must be jealously guarded, and it is the beginnings of things that have to be watched. There is no desire on the part of the Birmingham ecclesia to impose its form of words on any ecclesia; but there can be no valid objection to any ecclesia adopting it if it sees fit. But to adopt this statement and give it a universal title that the Birmingham ecclesia conscientiously refrains**

**from giving it, does not seem to be right at all.** If a group of Australian ecclesias desires a common statement, let them accurately define its **scope and limitations.** We are happily agreed as to the **'one faith,'** but let us be careful about our definitions. Ecclesiastical history is a warning to us in this respect."

(C. C. Walker, *The Christadelphian*, 1914, p. 129) — "Now we respectfully suggest that these brethren are going outside their province, and that it does not pertain to them to purify, say, the Birmingham, or any other ecclesia than their own. Also that the idea of "stepping out on the right side" without "division," is a contradiction in terms, and that their proposed action can only add division to division, without the establishment of the pure fellowship they very rightly desire.

**"Let each ecclesia consider its own way, as being responsible to the Lord after the example of the seven churches in Asia. And let no ecclesia begin to think that it can do what is really and truly his work, and establish 'a pure fellowship throughout the world.'"**

(C. C. Walker, *The Christadelphian*, 1919, p. 461) Is It to Be a Central Tribunal? We have received a few letters relative to a circular entitled 'The Right Way and the Wrong Way,' sent out by the London Standing Committee. A note at the head thereof, addressed 'To Ecclesial Secretaries,' says that 'a copy should be handed to every member.' It is right to explain that we were asked to print and publish this circular and declined, feeling that the anonymous case involved in the fragmentary correspondence quoted, which certainly does not lay bare all its facts, **was one that should by no means be obtruded upon all the ecclesias, but should be left for the ecclesia concerned to deal with on its own responsibility to the Lord. Upon our refusal to publish the correspondence the seven London brethren published it themselves.**

Now all these seven brethren are by us 'esteemed very highly in love for their work's sake.' Nevertheless we have grave misgivings as to the course they now appear to be taking. **Do they wish all ecclesias in the United Kingdom, and all 'members' thereof, to consider them a permanent ethical tribunal, to whose judgment as to 'right ways and wrong ways,' in such cases as that under consideration, all must bow under pain of excommunication? Surely the answer must be in the negative.** Where would our jealously guarded ecclesial independence vanish to if such an idea were tolerated? Some time ago brother F. G. Jannaway was alluded to in the press as 'the head of the Christadelphians.' Of course, he only smiled. Some time ago the editor of *The Christadelphian* had to answer the question of a Court of Law as to whether he was 'the recognised head of the Society of Christadelphians.' He said, 'I am not 'the recognised head of the Society of Christadelphians,' neither is there any such recognised head upon earth.' Then came the question: 'Have you been authorised by the Ruling Body of the Society?' (The matter in question did not concern the body generally.) **The answer was: 'I have not been 'authorised by the Ruling Body of the Society,' because no such Ruling Body exists.' Then, for the information and guidance of the Court, the following statement was made: 'Our Society in the United Kingdom consists of a number of churches (or 'ecclesias' as we call them), each of which is absolutely independent and self-governed. And this is the order of things in the U.S.A., Canada, the Australasian Overseas Dominions, and other countries.'**

These answers appeared to us to be right and true, and after the pattern of the 'seven churches in Asia,' alluded to in the book of Revelation. The Lord did not charge Ephesus, or 'the angel' therein, with the supervision of the spiritual affairs of all the rest of the Churches, though all the faithful would naturally love and respect that 'church' and its eldership. Sardis and Laodicea were responsible to the Lord and not to Ephesus. So let it be still in these 'remote islands of the Northern Seas.' One brother says he is distressed with this circular. On the data set forth he really cannot judge of the merits and demerits of the case in question, and does not see why he should have it



presented to him. Another says bluntly, but it seems to us not untruly: 'These brethren are not the keepers of my conscience.' As to the case in question, we do not presume to judge. It is perhaps due to readers to say that it is not in Birmingham, as might, perhaps, be supposed by some. Such is the disadvantage of anonymous communications. One brother thinks he knows three cases, to any one of which the correspondence might apply. Very likely he is wrong in all the three, who can say?

The craving for authority is very natural. We are all waiting for Authority in the return of the Lord to judge us all. But while thus waiting, let us be careful how we begin to set up authorities ourselves. All ecclesiastical history is a terrible warning in this direction. It seemed a far cry from 'the seven churches in Asia' to Rome; but it was not so very far after all! If we set up a Central Tribunal there will soon be more than enough for it to do, what with rising labour troubles, questions of trades-unionism, munitions making, and perhaps 'Drink' and 'smoke' thrown in. And we sadly fear that such discussions would make, not for unification and edification, but for division and strife.

(C. C. Walker, *The Christadelphian*, 1922, p. 549) – **Pioneer days are long past, and the tendency of ecclesiastical and all other history is to repeat itself. Consequently there are now movements quite opposed to the spirit of this sound advice, and even with regard to *The Christadelphian* itself some would like to see its editor put under the control of some “committee.” One brother quaintly objected to this: “You would only substitute seven devils for one!” The editor, while denying the soft impeachment involved, admits the cogency of the argument in the abstract. If he become a sufficiently objectionable *diabolos* he is quite easily disposed of by the simple expedient of all readers withdrawing their support, and leaving him to perish in his own devices. But who but the Lord himself could deal with those “seven”? In our judgment it will not be easy to improve materially upon the admittedly imperfect conditions and endeavours of the past half-century and more. In fact, it is far easier to spoil things than to improve. No one is more deeply impressed with present-day imperfections than is the editor of this magazine; but it would be affectation to deny (and in the presence of much generous encouragement from all parts of the world at such a time as this) that some measure of success has attended the work. We call readers to witness that we have never exploited “the praise of men.” But an apostle does say: “I praise you, brethren” (1 Cor. 11:2); and we are not insensible to the praise of good men, nor, we trust, to the blame of such, where necessary. Finally, it is for the Lord to praise or blame as he will. We hope for his favour in that day.**

(C. C. Walker, *The Christadelphian*, 1923, p. 122) – **As was explained in our issue for December last, *The Christadelphian* in present hands stands for the independence of the ecclesias and their individual responsibility to the Lord. We agree altogether with the late editor and what he said in Section 44 of the *Ecclesial Guide*:—**

*To form “unions” or “societies” of ecclesias, in which delegates should frame laws for the individual ecclesias, would be to lay the foundation of a collective despotism* which would interfere with the free growth and the true objects of ecclesial life. Such collective machineries create fictitious importances, which tend to suffocate the truth. All ecclesiastical history illustrates this.

**Present-day developments tend to emphasise the truth of these observations. The Birmingham ecclesia withdrew from a small minority of disorderly brethren and sisters. As a result of agitation by these, certain other individuals and ecclesias have sought and are seeking to disallow the judgment of the Birmingham ecclesia in the case. But the Birmingham ecclesia is not responsible to any outside authority in the matter, and will not be.**

There now comes from the north of England a proposal from a brother who is himself at variance with the

ecclesia in his town, to form just such a Council or Judicial Body as is objected to in the extract from the *Ecclesial Guide* reproduced above. Twenty-five ecclesias are mentioned, and many names suggested, but neither Birmingham nor London figure on the list. Probably we cannot do better than reproduce here the remarks of brother Sulley in reply to this circular.

DEAR BROTHER,—While sympathising with you in the distress which you feel in consequence of the cloud which impends over us, I must say that your proposal to select delegates to consider the dispute that has arisen between the two meetings there referred to, is quite out of harmony with those instructions that are found in the Word for our guidance. Such a proposal if carried into effect would divest those who are called according to God's purpose of their freedom of choice, which God the Father has bestowed and imposed upon them. **Those who selected delegates would be appointing a tribunal of judges to act for them, in place of exercising their own judgment as to whom they should or should not hold in fellowship. This heritage of full choice and responsibility to Him should not be renounced on any account whatever. Since, therefore, I am not willing to part with my loyalty to my Lord, I am not willing to ask anyone else to act in that way, and could not consent to ask anyone else to represent me, and to act for me in a matter upon which I must come to my own conclusions after having carefully sought and found the evidence which would enable me to form a decision.**

Further, I would not consent to be a representative in any ecclesia for such purpose, even if appointed.

The instructions contained in [Matt. 18.](#) and amplified in the apostolic writings, if carefully applied to any question in dispute should be sufficient to enable brethren to steer the ecclesial ship through the troubled waters. Although the terms of the instructions apply to individual differences they have an important bearing upon congregations, for what is a congregation but a number of individuals associated together for a common purpose? What is good for a single individual is equally estimable for a congregation, even though the method of application may require to be in a measure modified to fit the larger issue. Just as the rising sun dispels the morning mist, so the observance of the law of Christ will dispel the fog enveloping the body of Christ, and show the truth shining in radiant splendour.

Another matter; you suggest that brethren should be selected because of their ability and long experience to signify their decision by ballot after prayerful invocation for guidance; such decision to be accepted as final and binding upon others. Permit me to point out that nowhere in the Gospels or apostolic writings do we find any injunction or example to warrant such a course of procedure. On the contrary, when the Apostle Paul warned the believers against the wolfish leaders who would arise in the Church, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them, he did not advise the brethren to consult men "because of their ability or long experience," but commended them to God and to the Word of His grace, as able to build them up and to give them an inheritance amongst all that are sanctified (see [Acts 20:29–32](#)). Similarly, he referred Timothy to "the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. . . . That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works" ([2 Tim. 3:15–17](#)). He also instructed Titus to "hold fast the faithful word as he had been taught, that he might be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers, in opposition to unruly and vain talkers and deceivers" ([Titus 1:9, 10.](#))

In the case of the apostles who possessed the gift of the Holy Spirit, and whose commandments were to be observed by the disciples ([2 Pet. 3:2](#)), even their decisions were not promulgated without the concurrence of the brethren, who assembled when the question of circumcision or no circumcision for the Gentiles was considered (see [Acts 14](#)). But in these days we have no divinely inspired apostles to guide us, and must one and all come to our decisions after sifting any evidence put before us through the finely graded sieve provided in the Word of God.

Further, the suggestion that a vote secured “after prayerful invocation for guidance” should be binding upon the brethren, implies that divine guidance will be given to those who have been chosen to act as delegates. This would be a very presumptuous claim if acted upon, and would establish a self-constituted synod. The method of procedure suggested by the Apostle Paul is altogether different. He said, “If any man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness” (Gal. 6:1). **The selection of “brethren of ability and long experience” to sit in judgment upon their fellows as representatives of an ecclesia, is more calculated to develop the spirit of pride than humility, and the next step after selecting representatives would be the selection of a Pope, to the hurt of the brotherhood and to the destruction of that liberty with which Christ has made us free.**

(C. C. Walker, *The Christadelphian*, 1923, p. 266) – Zeal for Excommunication

**A number of Clapham brethren, in an 8-page circular bearing their signatures and dated April 13th, profess to have discovered that the arranging brethren of the Birmingham Temperance Hall ecclesia are guiding the ecclesia into the toleration of unscriptural doctrine and fellowship, and, upon the basis of this alleged discovery, they actually recommend to their ecclesia the excommunication of some 1,300 of their brethren and sisters in Christ.**

**The said circular, sent broadcast without the approval of the Clapham ecclesia, is a sad travesty of facts, and those who take it as true will be sadly misled.**

It quotes on page 2 the Special Constable’s Oath. Why? There are no special constables in the Birmingham Temperance Hall ecclesia. There is not now even a regular constable, though we believe there is one in the Clapham ecclesia. The general practice of the body heretofore has been the fellowship of constables who were such when obeying the Truth, provided they recognised Christ’s law concerning the doing of violence, and tried to obey it. In Birmingham we have recently gone to an extreme in withdrawing from a constable who was a cook, thus taking more drastic action in this matter than even our Clapham critics themselves.

Brethren Davis and Pearce did not, as alleged in this circular, “argue for the legitimacy of brethren joining the constabulary and using force.” Those who say they did simply “bear false witness against their neighbours.”

The argument of brother Davis was for deliberation and leniency in the treatment of the man who was in “fault.”

That of brother Pearce was *in essence* an allegation of inconsistency in our proposal to withdraw from the constable-cook while tolerating munition workers. His speech was modified at the time of utterance, and has been more so since. *The ecclesia* which heard these speeches, and knows the whole history of the case, is witness to the fact that these brethren “do not deny any of the commandments of Christ, loyally submit to the voice of the majority, and accept the position of the ecclesia.”

It is quite true, however, that some of brother Pearce’s words caused “consternation”; but when his mind was really known it was seen that his “views” were not such as some of his critics supposed.

The reasons why we withdrew from the minority were because of their persistent false accusations, railings, and sowings of discord among brethren. And because they themselves withdrew from our

fellowship, and established a separate and hostile meeting. The “taking up” of their “reproaches against their neighbours” is still producing wide-spread strife and division. The zeal of the minority for the law of Christ in one direction is quite marred by their utter disregard of the law of Christ in other directions. Even such excellent disciples as James and John had to be “rebuked” by the Lord, who said, “Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of” (Lu. 9:55). And we can scarcely doubt that he would say something similar to some of his lesser disciples to-day.

It has always been recognised hitherto that “he that is not against us is on our part,” and that “silence gives consent.” You cannot insist that every brother and sister must and shall vote in favour of every withdrawal recommended by arranging brethren to the ecclesia. Some “reservations” there must be, and always will be in this imperfect state. Any attempt to eliminate such by force or legal process will only result in further strife and division. In the words of brother Roberts (quoted from another page of this issue) “It is nothing but monstrous to contend for a fellowship responsibility of this sort. In fact it would make fellowship impossible. It would turn ecclesial life into an intolerable inquisition, instead of a source of comfort and edification, and help and joy, from the sharing of a common faith.”

As brother Islip Collyer has pointed out in a recent circular:—

Brother A. Davis does not believe, and never has meant to suggest or imply that it is right for brethren to join the Army or Constabulary.

In a “personal statement” of July 10th, 1919 (printed and published on February 15th, 1923), he said:—

“I would not join myself, and on the last occasion when I appealed for Military exemption I appealed also for exemption from Constabulary Duty, although I was not eligible for this work. I did it in order to fall in line with the other brethren.”

He recognises that Christ condemned the use of violence, and that therefore those who agree to use violence contravene the law of Christ.

The contention of brother Davis has been that in this, as in all other matters, there are degrees of culpability in offenders, and that therefore every case ought to be dealt with on its merits. He does not judge, nor condemn, nor even oppose those who feel that it is necessary to withdraw from one who has joined a State Service; but he claims liberty of conscience as to how he votes in such a case.

Brother Davis read this carefully, and then wrote underneath: “I agree absolutely.—A. Davis, April 19th, 1923.”

Under these circumstances is it not right to “receive” these brethren upon the principle that “he that is not against us is on our part”? If either had joined the Army or Constabulary, or had even justified others in so doing, we might have had scruples. Even if some of our over-zealous critics consider these brethren “weak in the faith,” does not an apostle say of such: “Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, *but not to doubtful disputations*?” Will any dare to say they are not “in the faith” at all? Can anyone deny that “*doubtful disputations*” is exactly what this whole matter has degenerated into among those outside Birmingham who are burdening themselves with it, and essaying to dictate to the Birmingham ecclesia and the whole brotherhood in relation thereto?

With reference to the two brethren who were in the Constabulary; one got released from being “Special Constable,” and the other, the old policeman who rejoined the force as cook, was withdrawn from; the

ecclesial action being in the end admitted unopposed by brethren Davis and Pearce. Under these circumstances the ecclesia “receives” these brethren who are certainly “not against us.”

**But if under these circumstances the ecclesia *is* mistaken, is that a sufficient ground for the action of these Clapham brethren in charging the Birmingham ecclesia with “corruption” and toleration of “views contrary to the commandments of Christ,” and recommending their ecclesia to “withhold fellowship from the Temperance Hall ecclesia”? The Birmingham ecclesia does not think so; but believes that nothing but chaos can result from so unjust an action. As was pointed out to brother V. Hall long ago, he had done his duty when he had made his protest. Even if he was one of only “a few names in Sardis” he would not lose his reward. It was not for him to root up the ecclesia. That, if necessary, was for the Lord. Brother Eastwood also points out the same thing with reference to some London enterprises. Let ecclesias and individuals look to themselves, and take care lest in their zeal to excommunicate others they begin to usurp the functions of the Lord and Judge himself.**

(C. C. Walker, *The Christadelphian*, 1923, p. 455) A 'LESSON OF THE PAST'

A BROTHER, writing on other matters, and not officially, adds:—

There is plenty of talk of Apostasy from —, and we are urged to learn from the lessons of the past. It cannot, then, be a matter of complaint if we read history a little for ourselves. Here are some words from Ramsay’s *Seven Churches*, to my mind not without interest and possibly application at the present time. He says:—

'It is apparent that the Syrian bishop (Ignatius) regarded Ephesus as occupying a position of loftier dignity than the other Churches of the Province; and this is an important fact in itself. It proves that already there was the beginning of a feeling, in some minds at least, that the Church of the leading city of a Province was of higher dignity than those of the other cities, a feeling which ultimately grew into the recognition of metropolitan bishoprics and exarchates, and a fully formed and graded hierarchy.'

History can repeat itself in more ways than one, and it is open to doubt whether any other ecclesia would have interfered as — has done. . . .

I hope that resistance to the — extreme (resistance which I feel more and more is necessary) will not cause a swing to the other extreme. That is always a danger. To preserve the balance of Purity and Unity is one thing that needs to be kept in mind.

About four years ago (October, 1919) we pointed to the 'lessons of the past' in reference to some answers that we had to make to a Court of Law concerning Christadelphian 'Church Government.' One of these answers ran as follows:—

'Our Society in the United Kingdom consists of a number of churches (or ‘ecclesias’ as we call them), each of which is absolutely independent and self-governed. And this is the order of things in the U.S.A., Canada, the Australasian Overseas Dominions, and other countries.'

These answers (we went on to explain to our readers) appeared to us to be right and true, and after the pattern of the 'seven churches in Asia,' alluded to in the book of Revelation. The Lord did not charge Ephesus, or 'the angel' therein, with the supervision of the spiritual affairs of all the rest of the Churches, though all the faithful would naturally love and respect that 'church' and its eldership. Sardis and Laodicea

were responsible to the Lord and not to Ephesus. So let it be still in these 'remote islands of the Northern Seas.' . . .

The craving for authority is very natural. We are all waiting for Authority in the return of the Lord to judge us all. But while thus waiting, let us be careful how we begin to set up authorities ourselves. All ecclesiastical history is a terrible warning in this direction. It seemed a far cry from 'the seven churches in Asia' to Rome; but it was not so very far after all!

If we set up a Central Tribunal there will soon be more than enough for it to do, what with rising labour troubles, questions of trades-unionism, munitions making, and perhaps 'Drink' and 'smoke' thrown in. And we sadly fear that such discussions would make, not for unification and edification, but for division and strife.

**Well, here is the 'division and strife' sure enough! We suppress the details concerning the well-meant but misguided essay that provoked the foregoing reflections; and join with our correspondent in the fervent hope that the struggle to maintain 'the balance of purity and unity' may not be altogether unsuccessful. ED.**

(C. C. Walker, *The Christadelphian*, 1925, p. 78) A North London Tribunal

In October, 1919, when the seven London brethren who constituted 'the London Standing Committee' sent out a circular entitled 'The Right Way and the Wrong Way,' in which circular they published their judgment in a particular and anonymous case and **sought to force a precedent upon the brotherhood, we asked the question, 'Is it to be a Central Tribunal?' We pointed to the example of the seven churches in Asia in the book of Revelation, and to the fact that the Lord did not charge Ephesus with the supervision of the other six churches. 'Sardis and Laodicea (we said) were responsible to the Lord and not to Ephesus. So let it be still in these 'remote islands of the Northern Seas.'** We are of the same opinion still—only more so. And that because of the stern logic of facts, and the answer of ecclesial history during the last six years. Our question was deemed presumptuous and impertinent. A South London Tribunal was set up which judged, condemned and excommunicated ourselves and most others in the Kingdom, and incidentally began by splitting up its own community and 'the London Standing Committee' as well. Is a similar essay north of the Thames going to produce a different result? We are thoroughly convinced it will not. It will work according to precedent. **It will first of all split up its own community, and afterwards sow nebulous strife and discord broadcast. Taught by the scriptures and by bitter experience, individuals and ecclesias will do well to let all such experiments alone, and to look to the Lord alone for judgment upon their individual and ecclesial activities.**

(John Carter, *The Christadelphian*, 1945, p. 31) — "The ecclesia is strong when there is faithful stewardship on the part of its 'elders'—men with a zeal for God and for the faith, 'such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness.' Their responsibility is defined—it is in the ecclesia in which they have the oversight. **The basis of apostolic organization is the ecclesia—not without co-operation with others, but with an organization independent of others, self-governing with a sense of responsibility to the Lord. And in keeping with this we find the Lord who walks in the midst of the lightstands knows the works of each, reproves and rebukes, encourages and exhorts as each one needs (Rev. 2: 3). It is noteworthy that the New Testament is completely silent about any development in interecclesial organization. Everything points the other way.**

**"History confirms this conclusion. As Hatch shows in his classic *Organization of Early Christian Churches*, it was not until the second century that 'the custom of meeting in representative**

assemblies began to prevail among Christian communities.' 'More or less informal' at first, they did not interfere with the liberties and responsibilities of separate communities. But later in the century the conferences grew in frequency, and in course of time the decisions of conferences of representatives became binding upon all the churches. But the progress in organization coincided with steady decline from the truth, and the organized church in the days of Constantine was a church the Lord reprobated.

"The lesson is plain. Ecclesial independence is something to be maintained, and ecclesial control must not be allowed to pass to organizations which are on other than an ecclesial basis. Sunday Schools, Youth Circles, and all other classes are all parts of ecclesial activity, and all must be subject to the direction or approval of the Arranging Brethren and through them to the ecclesia itself.

**"Ecclesial interrelationship consists of recognition of each other as pillars and stays of the truth, whose decisions and arrangements are to be respected. If, however, an ecclesia ceases to uphold the truth by condoning error, if there is frankness and an acknowledgment of a changed view, then all co-operation is thereby terminated; it no longer is 'a pillar and ground of the truth.'** There are some things, of course, where ecclesias can co-operate, as in special efforts in towns adjoining, and in joint arrangements for efforts when ecclesial independence and responsibility is in no way infringed. There are some very wise words in the Ecclesial Guide on Ecclesial Troubles, Ecclesias in Relation One to Another, and Gatherings, and the limits that should be imposed upon the activities of these, **with a warning against "unions" and "societies of ecclesias" (Sections 41–44), which are commended to all Arranging Brethren for study.**

(John Carter, *The Christadelphian*, 1945, p. 43)— "We pointed out last month that **ecclesial independence is something to be maintained jealously; and that such independence is the counterpart of ecclesial responsibility to the Lord. The price of that independence is constant vigilance and a recognition of their duties by Arranging Brethren and ecclesias. We also drew attention to the fact that there were no representative assemblies of ecclesias, and no unions or larger units than the ecclesia, provided for in the Scripture; nor in fact did any exist in the first century; and that the growth of conferences coincided with the decline from the Truth in the second century.** In the words of Mosheim:

"These Synods or Councils, of which no vestige appears before the middle of the second century, changed nearly the whole form of the church. For in the first place, the ancient rights and privileges of the people were, by them, very much abridged; and on the other hand, the authority and dignity of the bishops were not a little augmented. At first, they did not deny themselves to be the representatives of their churches, and guided by instructions from the people; but gradually they made higher pretensions, maintaining that power was given them by Christ himself, to decide upon rules of faith and conduct for the members of his church.'—Ecclesiastical History, III., 116."

#### 41. Involved in another Ecclesia's Trouble

An ecclesia may be at peace in itself, but may get involved in the troubles of other ecclesias through an incorrect mode of action. The simple law of Christ, to do to others as we would be done by, will greatly help us to take the right and wholesome course. Let us suppose, then, that some other ecclesia has withdrawn from a brother on grounds that have seemed just to the majority thereof; is it right that the brother so withdrawn from should be received by you? You can settle this by considering: How would you like the said ecclesia to act towards a brother or sister you have withdrawn from? Would you like them to receive such? There is only one answer—No. And this yields this general rule that no ecclesia ought to receive into fellowship a brother or sister who has been withdrawn from elsewhere. If you say, "Perhaps the brother or sister is unjustly withdrawn from", such a case is possible; and the door ought not to be shut against the consideration of such a possibility. But there is a right way of dealing with such a supposition. And the simple rule of Christ aforesaid will again be an all-sufficient help. Would you not like your decision in the case of a brother withdrawn from to be held good until it is proved a wrong one? There is only answer—Yes. We ought, therefore, to respect the withdrawals of other ecclesias until we have proved them unjustifiable.

**But here again we must be careful. There is a right way and a wrong way of trying such a case.** Would you like the case of a brother you have withdrawn from to be tried behind your back? There is only answer—You would not. Therefore you ought not to hear the case of a brother who has been withdrawn from, without the presence of those, either actually or by representation, who have withdrawn from him. If a withdrawn-from brother comes to your ecclesia and alleges the injustice of the withdrawal, if you are disposed to listen to the case, your duty is (meanwhile withholding fellowship) to apprise the ecclesia that has withdrawn from him, that he applies for your fellowship on the ground of the withdrawal being unjust, and that you wish to investigate the case concurrently with them. If the withdrawing ecclesias refuse to grant such an investigation, they place themselves in the wrong, and justify you in examining the case for yourselves in their absence. But an enlightened ecclesia would not refuse. They would act on Christ's rule. They would do as they would like to be done by. If they were the withdrawn-from but demurring brother, or the doubtful ecclesia applying for re-examination, they would like to have the opportunity of judging for themselves, and would, therefore, grant that opportunity thus respectfully applied for. The result would tend to peace. The concurrent re-examination would either manifest the righteousness of the withdrawal, or the uncertainty and perhaps unjustifiableness of it. In either case, the course to be taken by the applying ecclesia would be freed from doubt. - *The Ecclesial Guide* pg. 28-29



## 42. Ecclesias in Relation One to Another

If a careful attention is given to these reasonable rules of procedure between one ecclesia and another, there will be little danger of disagreement. The bond of union is the reception of the one faith, and submission to the commandments of the Lord. **It is nothing less than a calamity when rupture on secondary issues sets in, where these other conditions of union exist. It is not only calamitous, but sinful somewhere. There ought to be no interference of one ecclesia with another.** At the same time, they have reciprocal rights. Ecclesial independence is a principle essential to be maintained. But it is no part of that independence to say that no ecclesia shall consider a matter that another has decided upon, if that matter comes before the first ecclesia, and challenges their judgement, and, in fact, requires a decision. In the example already discussed, if a brother withdrawn from by one ecclesia applies for the fellowship of another, that other ecclesia is bound to consider the application, and it is no infringement of the independence of the first ecclesia that it should be so, subject to the rules and attitudes indicated. It would, in fact, be a renunciation of its own independence, were it to refuse to do so. Respect for the first ecclesia requires that it accept its decision until it sees grounds for a different view; and in the investigation of these grounds it ought to invite its cooperation, as already indicated. But the mere fact of the application imposes upon it the obligation to consider and investigate the matter, if there are *prima facie* grounds for doing so. The other ecclesia would make a mistake if it considered such a procedure an infringement of its independence. Such a view would, in reality, be a trammelling of the independence of every assembly; for it would then amount to this, that no assembly had the right to judge a case coming before them if that case happen to have already been adjudicated upon by another ecclesia. The judgement of one would thus be set up as a rule for all. An ecclesia has no right to judge except for itself.

This is the independence not to be interfered with; but a similar right to judge must be conceded to all, and the exercise of it, if tempered with a respectful and proper procedure, would never offend an enlightened body anywhere. **In the majority of cases the withdrawal of one ecclesia is practically the withdrawal of all, since all will respect it till set aside, and since, in most cases, a concurrent investigation would lead to its ratification.** But there may be cases where a reasonable doubt exists, and where a second ecclesia will come to a different conclusion from the rest.

What is to be done then? Are the two ecclesias that are agreed in the basis of fellowship to fall out because they are of a different judgement on a question of fact? This would be a lamentable result—a mistaken course every way. They have each exercised their prerogative of independent judgement; let each abide by its own decision, without interfering with each other. The one can fellowship a certain brother, the other cannot. Are they to aggravate the misery of a perhaps very trumpery and unworthy affair by refusing to recognise each other, because they differ in judgement about one person? **What sadder spectacle can there be than to see servants of the Lord Jesus frowning at each other, and denying each other the comfort of mutual friendship and help, because they cannot agree about a given action or speech of perhaps some unworthy person.** The course of wisdom in such a case is certainly to agree to differ. An ecclesia acting otherwise—**demanding of another ecclesia, as a condition of fellowship, that they shall endorse their decision** in a case that has become the business of both—is in reality infringing that principle of ecclesial independence which they desire to have recognised in their own case. It would be to impose what might be an intolerable tyranny upon the brethren; for suppose it were to happen, as it might happen, **that a deserving brother or sister were withdrawn from on insufficient grounds by an assembly that might happen to be composed of persons not remarkable for breadth of judgement, to what hopeless injustice such a brother or sister would be subjected if other ecclesias were to be debarred from forming their own judgement in the event of application for their fellowship.**—*The Ecclesial Guide* pg. 27-28

#### 43. The True Secret of Success

This lies in the rich indwelling of the word of Christ in each individual member of an ecclesia—a state to be attained in our day only by the daily and systematic reading of the Scriptures. When every mind is influenced by the Word, the worst rules work smoothly. When it is otherwise, the best will miscarry. The system of daily reading, laid out in *The Bible Companion*, has for years been followed by thousands with increasing benefit. The brethren ought, above all things, to help one another in its observance. It is with a view to this that in more than one ecclesia each new brother and sister is presented with a copy of *The Bible Companion* on their entrance.

In one ecclesia a copy of *The Commandments of Christ* is also given to each new member. When the commandments of Christ are remembered and acted on (and Jesus says none who fail to do so are his brethren), it will be easy to carry out any system of rules. In fact, a small company where Christ is in the heart ascendant can get on best without set rules. It is only because this is not universal, and when members increase, that rules become necessary.

#### 44. Fraternal Gatherings from Various Places

These are beneficial when restricted to purely spiritual objects (i.e., let the brethren assemble anywhere from anywhere, and exhort, or worship, or have social intercourse together); but they become sources of evil if allowed to acquire a legislative character in the least degree. Ecclesial independence should be guarded with great jealousy, with the qualifications indicated in the foregoing sections. To form '**unions**' or '**societies**' of ecclesias, in which delegates should frame laws for the individual ecclesias, would be to lay the foundation of a (**collective corporate despotism dictatorship compiler**) which would interfere with the free growth and the true objects of ecclesial life. Such collective machineries create fictitious importances, which tend to suffocate the truth. All ecclesiastical history illustrates this. -*The Ecclesial Guide* pg. 29-30

Compiler's Note:

The following section will show fellowship interaction between ecclesia to ecclesia, ecclesia(s) and member(s), and member(s) to member(s). In some cases the actions were scriptural and in other cases unscriptural. Brother Roberts comments upon some of these cases.

From around or about 1885 the Reader will see a slow degeneration of the ecclesias

## **ECCLESIAS USING PRACTICES OF/AGREEING OF/WITH ANOTHER ECCLESIA**

(October 1874) GLASGOW. — “Brother Nelson has requested us to intimate that an ecclesia has been formed at Airdrie, meeting on the same basis of fellowship as ourselves. It is composed of brother Nelson, Chapelhall, near Airdrie, brother Robert Russell, brother Robert Kerr, of Coatbridge, William Hunter and sister Forsyth, of Airdrie. I have also to mention the death of sister Nelson, wife of brother Nelson, of Chapelhall, who fell asleep on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of last month, strong in faith, and fully realized that though the body be consumed in the grave, yet in her flesh she shall see God.”

(April 1878) LEICESTER.—Brother Yardley reports:—“The brethren having determined to set apart an evening for the answering of questions, and brother Roberts being with us on the 17<sup>th</sup> inst., we embraced the opportunity of commencing this special work, knowing it had proved beneficial in other ecclesias. The result far exceeded our expectations, the central hall being filled with an interested audience.” Brother Collyer writes:—“After the morning meeting, two of us went to Hinckley—brother Yardley and myself. The attendance at our meeting was not large, but a good few of earnest looking people gave the utmost attention to our reasons for becoming Christadelphians, and for believing in the gospel preached by Jesus and the apostles. May it please our Father in heaven to give repentance unto life to some of these sons and daughters of Adam in Hinckley. Next Sunday (D.V.) brother Weston joins me in the work at Hinckley.”

(June 1879) HUDDERSFIELD.—There is trouble here through a mistaken conception of duty. It is to be hoped reflection will bring rectification before the matter becomes too old for cure and makes trouble elsewhere. The ecclesia has rightly decided to respect the withdrawal from a brother, resolved on by another ecclesia, and several in Huddersfield are standing aloof in consequence. This is a mistake. When an ecclesia withdraws from a brother, it is only right that no neighbouring or other ecclesia should receive him until at all events a properly conducted and concurrent examination of the matter have taken place by both ecclesias, if the second ecclesia sees reason to ask for it. If a concurrent investigation is asked for, it ought to be granted. If it is not asked for, the first decision ought to be respected. In any case, the first decision should be respected till it is set aside by a joint decision. The joint decision, whatever it is, should govern all. Those who disregard such evident rules of just government put themselves in the wrong with brethren everywhere else, and sow the seeds of endless difficulties for themselves and others.

(July 1879) SKEWEN.—John Morgan, Margaret Morgan, Joseph Eldridge, and Elizabeth Eddon have adopted and signed the declaration adopted by the Oxford Street brethren in Swansea, as appearing in the intelligence from that place last month.

(March 1882) NOTTINGHAM—We are now arranging to remove into what has been known as the Christadelphian Synagogue. (This was a building put up for the service of the truth by Mr. W. H. Farmer, about ten years ago. It had only been a few months occupied by the brethren when the late Edward Turney launched the questions that led to Renunciationism, compelling about 50 of the brethren to leave the Synagogue, to meet together on the basis of the uncorrupted truth—the bulk remaining behind in the Synagogue with Mr. Farmer and Edward Turney. Since that time, there have been various changes. It has always been felt an offence and obstacle to the truth, that a building occupied by those who had departed from the truth, should bear the name Christadelphian Synagogue.—EDITOR.) We have long waited and prayed that this difficulty might be removed. Not that we knew how it was to be done, still less did we expect the building would come into our hands. However it has come to this—the building was unexpectedly put into the market for sale, and one of our brethren seized the opportunity of acquiring it. The brethren have decided to rent it off him, and, if possible, to keep it entirely devoted to the work of the truth. We hope to meet there for the first time on Sunday, March 12<sup>th</sup> (if the Lord will), when Bro. Roberts will lecture in the evening. It is proposed to call the Synagogue a hall, and give it another name, be way of marking the change.

I have pleasure also in reporting the obedience of GEORGE ROLLS (45), who put on the sin covering name by immersion on Feb. 8<sup>th</sup>, and is now numbered with the brethren in the place. About two-and-a-half years ago, he was passing the People's Hall on the Sunday evening, and seeing the lecture advertised on the bill, was moved to go in and hear. Previous to that time, he could not remember when he had last read his Bible; but now he was impressed by what he heard, and began to search the scriptures. He has continued to do so, and to attend the lectures, until he is now rejoicing in the knowledge of the truth and in the hope of the gospel. We are having very good audiences at our Sunday evening lectures, and have hope of others becoming obedient to the truth. Our Sunday school is doing well, and never was in a better condition than at the present time. The teachers have adopted the Birmingham lessons. On Jan. 4<sup>th</sup>, the children (which number about 50) with their teachers and friends, had tea together in the Peoples' Hall. Aiter tea, the children were entertained with the magic lantern, &c., after which prizes were given to those who had gained the highest number of marks during the past year. Brother and Sister Mitchell have removed from Nottingham, and since their removal, Sister Mitchell, who for many months past had been suffering from consumption, has fallen asleep. Bro. Mitchell, in writing to me, says she remained steadfast unto the end.—J. KIRKLAND

(Excerpt from July 1882) MANCHESTER—A meeting of the brethren comprising the Manchester and Miles Platting ecclesias was held on the 28<sup>th</sup> of May, to consider the advisability of a union of the two meetings, when a proposition declaring “that, in the interests of the truth, and for the welfare of the brethren, an amalgamation of the Manchester and Miles Platting ecclesias was desirable,” was unanimously carried. We are, therefore, meeting at the Co-operation Hall, Oldham Road, until a room more centrally situated can be obtained.

(April 1883) BALMAIN.—Sister Wood writes as follows:—“We are desirous of acquainting you with the fact that we have formed an ecclesia in Balmain, composed of the following brethren and sisters:—Brethren W. H. Payne. Archer, O'Toole, F. R. Wood; Sisters S. A. Bower, L. S. Bower, A. Wood, and Brother and Sister Cook, of Rockhampon (when they are in the colony). We are at present giving lectures in the Temperance Hall, Montague Street, Balmain.

The following lectures have been delivered:—“The Future Government” (Brother Walter Cook); “Paul at Athens” (Brother A. O'Toole); “The Salvation of Cornelius” (Brother F. R. Wood); “The Nature and Destiny of Man” (Bro. Logan, from Sydney); “New Year's Prospects” (Bro. A. O'Toole); “Burning up of the Earth” (Brother F. R. Wood). Brother W. H. Payne will give his first lecture on Sunday evening next, upon “The Bible, and How to Interpret it.” Our lectures are fairly attended as yet, but will perhaps be

better so, as we get known. We will write you particulars from time to time, if “the Lord delay His coming.” The Sydney ecclesia have expressed their willingness to co-operate with us, as it is desirable to put the truth before the 16,000 who compose the Balmain public. We advertise in the public press weekly, and have had printed small handbills for distribution, and trust by these means that our feeble efforts will excite some interest in the minds of the people here, and cause them to search into the good things of the Kingdom of God.

(April 1883) SYDNEY.—Since writing last we have had the pleasure of immersing, on Dec. 18<sup>th</sup>, into the sincovering name, J. D. H. Cooke (21). Also with sorrow we have to report the death of our Sister Stone, who fell asleep on January 3<sup>rd</sup>. Our removal to the Temperance Hall has been a decided gain to the truth, affording us a better ground for its advocacy than we formerly had. The field of operations has widened, by the formation of another ecclesia at Balmain, with which we are now able to co-operate in the work of the truth. We have several interested in the truth, who are soon likely to obey its commands by immersion.—J. J. HAWKINS.

(July 1883) BATH- An effort is now being made to bring the truth before the public of Bath. The brethren from the ecclesias of Bristol, Bradford-on-Avon, Radstock, and others, have co-operated, and lectures on various features of the truth have been given, at the Temperance Hall, Widcombe. On Whit-Monday a social gathering took place, when some 60 brethren, sisters, and interested strangers sat down to tea. In the evening Brother Ashcroft lectured to a small audience. Those present appeared to be greatly interested. If any brother has friends in Bath, a post card will direct them to the above Hall; or if any be passing through the city, he will find a welcome at 24, High Street, where resides—BROTHER KEEPENCE.

(June 1884) JERSEY CITY, N.J.—Bro. J. C. Washburne reports the obedience of Master WALTER VREDENBURGH, son of bro. C. Vredenburgh, baptised February 19<sup>th</sup>. Mr. HARVEY BEDELL, brother in the flesh to sister Cecil Miller, baptised on March 30<sup>th</sup>, and Mrs. ELMIRA SHERWOOD, wife of bro. Sherwood, who was introduced into the saving name April 20. Sister Sherwood lives in Orient, L.I. On February 10<sup>th</sup>, the *Ecclesial Guide* was formally adopted by this ecclesia. After several careful readings, we came to the conclusion that it was the best thing in print for ecclesial government, embodying, as it does, rules for guidance in many of those trying and vexatious circumstances which are almost sure to arise. The *result* of “30 years’ experience” will be a great help to those who are just starting out, and we are sanguine of success. In this new departure. It is very difficult. To get out of the old ruts, but where a determined effort is made, *it can be done*. Let the commandments of Christ, then, be faithfully obeyed, not only individually, but also ecclesially. And we will have an abundance of peace, where now, too often, discord and dissatisfaction exist. On account of our numbers, &c., we were compelled to make a few changes in the “Guide,” but no very radical alterations were necessary.—The lectures here are *not* well attended. We cannot bring any power to bear, in this evil day, to get men to listen to the “good news.” Perhaps we shall be happily privileged in a time not far distant, to command, where now we are compelled to entreat. Oh, the dearth of divine things in this part of the earth! God is not present in all their thoughts.

(August 1886) Oldham.—On the morning of the 20<sup>th</sup> June, after a full and clear statement of his belief, JOSEPH KERRY (37), of Bolton (late of Newark) was united to Christ in the appointed way, and partook of the memorial supper with us shortly afterwards. He is the only brother living in Bolton, but will be able to break bread every Sunday with brother and sister Finch, of Moses Gate, which is but a few miles away. The nearest ecclesia is Pemberton (Wigan), and, no doubt, our brother will occasionally go over there. The brethren in Newark will be pleased to learn that they have not laboured in vain, nor spent their strength for nought. For some months past we have been considering the position of Christ’s brethren with relation to sick clubs, insurance societies, trades unions, oddfellows, foresters, rechabites, town

councils, &c., &c.; and at our quarterly meeting, held June 16, it was *unanimously* resolved to adopt and place on record the resolution and addendum appearing under Stockport intelligence in the *Christadelphian* for May, 1886, pages 238–9. This is, we feel, the only safe position for brethren to take. In withdrawing from the world, we are but obeying the Master, whilst in mixing up with the world in its various social, political, and other movements, we are doing great violence to the express commands of him who said, “Ye are my friends *if ye do whatsoever* I command you;” and again, “If ye love me, *keep* my commandments.” Although we passed no resolution, we had arrived at exactly the same conclusion, before we saw what the Stockport ecclesia had done. I have also to report the formation of a Sunday School on July 4<sup>th</sup>. The want of one has been felt for some time past, and now that it has been commenced we trust it will be a success, and that, as a result of the efforts put forth, many may be eventually added to the ecclesia.

(March 1871) CAMBRIDGE, (Ohio).—Brother J. Swan, Dec. 15<sup>th</sup>, says that since his previous letter, he has commenced the practice (though alone) of “observing the ordinances on the first day of the week, after the following order, 1 prayer; 2 praise; 3 reading the scriptures; 4 breaking of bread; 5 praise; 6 reading one of the ‘Sunday mornings at the Birmingham Christadelphian Synagogue,’ and, lastly, lay by him in store as God hath prospered him.”

(January 1894) AUCKLAND.—I have to advise you that a satisfactory arrangement has been made with the Auckland Masonic Hall Ecclesia, and the eleven brethren and sisters who separated from them January 12th, 1893, as per my advice to you, which appears in the *Christadelphian* for May. The basis (though not exactly all that was required by the Arch Hill Ecclesia) has been accepted, therefore, we are now one ecclesia. The basis, among other things, affirms the divinity of the Bible as a record, and its infallibility as a revelation of the way of salvation.—S. HARRISON.

(September 1882) MANCHESTER- Our ecclesia being situated in a flow part of the city, we find our publications slow of sale, so we have adopted the plan started by the Nottingham ecclesia, of taking the names and addresses of any stranger that would like to borrow any of our books to read. To do this, we want a larger stock than we are able to pay for, so we have to ask your help through the Fellow-Service League. I have enclosed you a P.O. for 10s., but we should like publications to the amount of about 20s., including the list following.—JNO. ROBINSON.

## ECCLESIAS AND LETTERS OF COMMENDATION

(John Thomas, *The Christadelphian*, 1872, p. 378) As to query No. 3, we believe that brethren when travelling, whether they be private or teaching brethren, should carry with them letters of introduction and commendation from the particular church to which they belong; and that that church before its introduction and commendation be accepted, should be known to consist of constituents who have themselves believed and obeyed the gospel of the promised kingdom, the letters of no other kind being of any worth with the saints.

(Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1872, p. 614) Brethren Removing from one place to another.—Such should always provide themselves with a letter of recommendation from the ecclesia with which they have been assembling. There have recently been several instances of awkwardness from want of the necessary introduction.

(*The Christadelphian*, 1873, p. 47) CHICAGO, Ill.—Brother W. A. Harris says “We have thought it necessary to adopt the rule adopted in England and elsewhere, that when a stranger visits us, he be

required to produce a letter of recommendation before we receive him into our fellowship; **failing which, we appoint a committee to confer with him as to the identity of his faith and practice with ours.** Please state this in the *Christadelphian* for the information of the brethren.” Brother Harris also mentions a visit from brethren Donaldson and Harper, who lectured on the subject of God-manifestation in relation to the human race. Wherein any may have (unwittingly) degraded the Son of God in time past, he thinks if they are true children, they will acknowledge their error and undo the past.

(*The Christadelphian*, 1874, p. 147) SWANSEA.—Brother Goldie writes, Jan. 21st:—“At the end of last month, we had a visit from a brother Joseph Cooke and his wife, who have just returned from Shenandoah, Penn., U.S.A., and who are at present located in the Rhondda Valley, Glamorganshire, but are anxious to get to Swansea. **They brought us a letter of commendation from brother Brittle of Shenandoah,** and we doubt not their presence will be of much benefit to us all.

(*The Christadelphian*, 1881, p. 187) CARDIFF.—Brother REES reports the obedience of C. E. REES and his wife SARAH ANN, who make eleven additions since the opening of the Mission Hall, two years ago. The brethren feel much comfort in the fact, and thank God, and take courage. **They would feel pleased to have the presence of any passing brother, with a proper letter of recommendation.**—Brother George A. Birkenhead, referring to the same matters, says: “Although it is wearisome at times, still it is a pleasant duty—that of labouring in Our Master’s vineyard. Having had two or three additions lately, I cannot help looking back at the time when I was the only brother within a radius of sixteen miles of this place. Five years ago I was alone. Since then, three or four brethren have removed to Cardiff, and we have immersed about twelve. Our present number is about fifteen.”

(*The Christadelphian*, 1882, p. 384) TORONTO.—Brother D. P. Ross writes: “A Bro. Plant joined with us last night in fellowship. He says he is from Birmingham. He has been here several months. **How is it that persons coming here from your locality do not bring with them a letter of recommendation?**” [Because they do not apply for it. In some cases they do. As a rule, where they do not apply for it, there is some special reason why they do not, as in the dead-branch case in question. Strangers unprovided with introductions should be regarded with caution. Of course, when genuineness is known otherwise there is no need.—Editor, *Christadelphian*]. “Brother John Ford, an old man, over 60, has left us and gone to Winnipeg. He is the only brother there, that I know of.”

(*The Christadelphian*, 1883, p. 94) WESTMINSTER. (*Victoria Hall, 327, Vauxhall Bridge-road. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.*)—I have to report a further increase of three to our ecclesia—one by the immersion of ALICE AMELIA ROWLAND (23), wife of our Bro. Rowland, whose immersion was reported last month, formerly Church of England; the other two by removal of Bro. James Thorneycroft from Brierley Hill, and Sister Femister from Glasgow, with both of whom we have received letters of recommendation (as essential now as they were in Paul’s day). Their callings necessitated removal to London, and we are pleased to welcome them among us.

(Excerpt from December 1883) WESTMINSTER ECCLESIA. — **The brethren have lost, by removal to Brisbane, Australia, sister Emily Oakes, who left a short time since, bearing a letter of commendation to other members of the one body, with whom she may come in contact.**

(*The Christadelphian*, 1888, p. 314) The usual quarterly business meeting was held on the last Thursday in March. The reports were all of the usual satisfactory character—shewing a balance in hand in all the funds after making liberal provision for the work of the Truth and the needs of the poor, whom, as Jesus said, “We have always with us,” and who are there, not by accident, but as God’s proof of our obedience during these the days of our probation. The only unsatisfactory feature of the proceedings was the necessitated withdrawal of the ecclesia from brother E. C. Watts, originally from Bedford, and now in the

South of England, for the denied and unrepented crime of bigamy, by which he inflicted a great wrong on a sister now in Birmingham, but originally from the South. The brethren are anxious that others should be on their guard against this man. He ought not to be received without a letter of recommendation.

(Excerpt, October 1892) ADELAIDE.— It is always best for brethren, when travelling, to carry a letter of introduction. Our ecclesia being based upon a wholly-inspired Bible, we desire to fellowship none but the true metal.

(From Notes 1984) LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.—The Leeds Brethren call attention to the necessity for the various ecclesias providing travelling or removing brethren or sisters with letters of recommendation, making clear their position with regard to fellowship. They suggest printed forms, with blanks for the filling in of the address of the ecclesia and recording brothers.

(*The Christadelphian*, 1894, p. 160) BIRMINGHAM MISCELLANIES – Sister Barclay, of Dunedin, who has been making a journey round the world for nine months past, looked in upon the Birmingham brethren in the middle of March. She had with her a letter of recommendation from brother Campbell. She pleased and was pleased by her visit, and passed on to London.

(*The Christadelphian*, March 1898) PORTH (GLAM.)—On January 19th, MARY FORD (35), wife of brother J. Ford, and daughter of brother Phillips, after witnessing the good confession, was immersed in the waters of baptism, and is now rejoicing in the hope of eternal life through Jesus the Anointed. We were very pleased to welcome brother and sister Yews, who have returned home from Scammon, Kans., U.S.A. They are a very welcome addition to our little ecclesia here, seeing that they have an excellent letter of recommendation to fellowship from the brethren in Scammon, U.S.A.—JOHN PHILLIPS.

(*The Christadelphian*, 1910, p. 376) —Brother F. G. Jannaway writes as follows:—We want you to state somewhere, prominently, in the next issue of *The Christadelphian*, that in future all brethren and sisters visiting us from the Colonies, especially from Australia and New Zealand, must bring letters of recommendation. We have been deceived twice recently. Upon each occasion the brother told us that he was in fellowship with us on the “Birmingham basis,” and not till afterwards did they tell us that they were in fellowship with brother Bell. We are not; and we decline to fellowship any brother or sister who is. He believes that at birth all have the same nature that Adam had before “the fall,” which is not a part of our basis, but contrary thereto; and we are not in fellowship with any ecclesia where such a doctrine is condoned or held. The brother or sister who holds such doctrine, and says he is “on the Birmingham basis,” does not tell the truth. We will not tolerate this playing fast and loose with ecclesias. Some time since a brother was interviewed by us on paying us a visit from Australia, and assured us, in view of what he had learnt, he could not possibly fellowship “brother Bell or his party,” and would not do so. Only on that assurance did we receive him. We now hear from several that he states that he was received into our fellowship, although one of brother Bell’s way of thinking, etc., and has rejoined his old companionship. We should certainly not allow him to impose upon us again. It is not honest; it is un-Christadelphianlike. If brother Bell has changed his mind, and now sees that all born of the human race have the same sinful nature that Adam was possessed of as the result of sin, let him boldly say so, and not try to “hunt with the hounds and run with the hare” at the same time.



## ECCLESIAS AND THEIR BASES OF FELLOWSHIP

“JUSTICE.”—Your proposal for the simultaneous adoption of a common statement of faith by all the ecclesias is made with the best of objects; but it could not accomplish the end you seek. It is not possible in the present state of things to bring all to harmony and stop the mouths of talkers. If the Apostles did not succeed in this, none else need hope to do so. We can but do our best and let things take their course. (Bro. Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1881, p. 572)

### ECCLESIAS THAT ACCEPTED “THE FOUNDATION STATEMENT” OR SIMILAR (THE WHOLLY INSPIRED BIBLE)

THE FOUNDATION. That the book currently known as the Bible, consisting of the Scriptures of Moses, the prophets, and the apostles, is the only source of knowledge concerning God and His purposes at present extant or available in the earth, and that the same were wholly given by inspiration of God in the writers, and are consequently without error in all parts of them, except such as may be due to errors of transcription or translation.

(June 1885) Lichfield.—Brother Sykes says the few brethren and sisters of Christ in this place will only fellowship those who hold the Bible as the inspired word of God. He adds remarks which, had space allowed, we should have been glad to quote.

(June 1885) Newcastle-on-Tyne.—Bro. Leadbitter reports an addition, through the removal of sister A. Young from Peterborough; also that “at a special meeting of the ecclesia, held on May 14<sup>th</sup>, we adopted the resolution on Inspiration appearing in the *Light-stand* for Feb. 28<sup>th</sup>.”

(Excerpt from June 1885) Normanton.—Writing again, bro. Dowkes says:—“At a meeting of the ecclesia, held here on April 23<sup>rd</sup>, the following proposition was adopted—‘That we believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were, in all parts of them, given by inspiration of God, and that we cannot offer fellowship to any who hold the doctrine of partial inspiration.’”

(July 1885) Aberdare.—Brother Thomas L. Davies says: “I have the pleasure of reporting an addition to our small ecclesia. ELIZA LLEWELYN (38), formerly neutral, was, after a good confession, immersed into the sincovering name. She states that she heard Dr. Thomas lecture at the Mumbles, and has now rendered obedience. I have also to report that this ecclesia believes in a wholly-inspired and infallible Bible.”

(July 1885) Newport (Mon.)—Brother Lander writes as one of those “who hug (yes hug, says he, excuse the term) the Bible to their hearts, and who are afraid to lose a bit of it, lest the enemy should shoot the breach, and wound us—it may be mortally.” He appends a declaration of the brethren at Newport concerning the Scriptures. “We, the undersigned do unanimously agree that the Scriptures, *the whole of them*, are God-inspired as Paul puts it, “*All Scripture is given by inspiration of God,*” that is, that the Scriptures were produced in all parts of them by God’s direction, as Peter declares that ‘Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit,’ and we do not believe, nor can we entertain the idea, that there is a human element in them liable to err. We refuse fellowship to all who maintain that inspiration

was limited to certain parts only, and that the other parts were the work of a merely human authorship liable to err.” He adds, “as yet we meet at one of the brethren’s house to break bread, but we are negotiating for a room; if we get it, we then shall begin active service for the Master if He tarries so long.”

(July 1885) Auburn (N. Y.),—Brother Thomas Turner writes:—“The ecclesia here in Auburn, N. Y., consisting of ten members, wish to express themselves upon the subject of the ‘Inspiration of the Scriptures.’ We unanimously approve of the course pursued by brethren Shuttleworth and Roberts, and unreservedly accept the resolution passed by the Birmingham ecclesia.”

(August 1885) Brierley Hill.—Bro. H. O. Warrender reports the obedience of GEORGE DUNN, DAVID MEESE, and JAMES BECKLEY, who were baptized into the sin-covering name of Christ, at Dudley. Also that the following resolution has been unanimously adopted by the ecclesia: “That this ecclesia believes that the Holy Scriptures, commencing with Genesis and ending with Revelation, were originally produced in all parts of them by inspiration of God, and in no part were the writers left to their unaided efforts; that the original writings were therefore, free from error, and rendered infallible by the superintending power of the Deity; and also that we refuse fellowship to any who do not accept this foundation of faith.”

(August 1885) Devonport.—Brother Sleep reports that at a special meeting of the brethren held June 21<sup>st</sup>, the following resolution was carried unanimously:—“That we believe the Scriptures in all parts are God-inspired, and that we shall refuse fellowship to anyone who believes in their partial inspiration.” He adds: “We also desire to express our sympathy with you and the Brethren and Sisters in Birmingham who have taken the stand you have for a wholly inspired Bible.”

(August 1885) Halifax. — (There is also intelligence from the brethren at Regent Street. If they will authorise us to state that they hold the wholly-inspired and infallible character of the Bible as a first principle in their basis of fellowship; and that they are prepared to refuse association with those who believe in an only partial and erring inspiration, they will relieve us from the great embarrassment in which we are placed by their communication, and will open the way for the return of the brethren meeting as above-described.—EDITOR).

(August 1885) Heckmondwike.—Bro. Barraclough reports the immersion of Mrs. ACKROYD (36), which took place on May 20<sup>th</sup>. He says, “We have been highly gratified by the assiduous manner in which our new sister has sought for the pearl of great price which, having found, she evidently estimates at its full value. Also on June 24<sup>th</sup>, ROBERT WALKER ATKINSON (61), postmaster, put on the saving name. He is brother in the flesh to bro. Benjamin Atkinson, and was formerly neutral. We have also unanimously adopted the resolution upon which you have acted at Birmingham, respecting inspiration.”

(August 1885) Neath.—Brother Tucker reports that the ecclesia having duly considered the inspiration of the Old and New Testament, resolved unanimously (June 28<sup>th</sup>, 1885) that the whole of the original were inspired, and are consequently true and reliable in all parts, and that they should refuse fellowship with any who hold the doctrine taught by brethren Ashcroft and Chamberlin. On June 14<sup>th</sup>, brother D. Clement lectured on “The Geography of Hell.” On July 5<sup>th</sup> brother W. Clement delivered a stirring address on “The only way, the Apostle’s way, God’s way to Glory, Honour, Immortality, and Eternal Life.

(August 1885) Oldham.—We have again been cheered and strengthened by an addition to our ecclesia, in the person of ELIZABETH HARGREAVES (55) formerly “Primitive Methodist.”—It is now exactly twelve months since we opened our meeting room, and it is gratifying to know that during that time we have doubled ourselves. Beginning with 13 we gradually increased until we reached our present

number—26. We have just commenced a week-night meeting (Wednesday, 7.30) for Bible study and mutual improvement, and we hope it will be a success. Having carefully considered the question of inspiration we have unanimously agreed to the following, which we trust you will have room for, viz.: Resolved “That we heartily believe the Holy Scriptures to be (in all parts of them) the inspired Word of God, and therefore free from a merely human authorship liable to err, and believing this to be the *first* principle of that system of truth which forms the basis of our union one with another in Christ, we shall refuse to fellowship any who believe or tolerate the belief in a partially-inspired Bible.”—J. E. BAMFORD.

(August 1885) Redfern.—Bro. R. G. Burton reports that about fifteen brethren and sisters are now meeting at the New Masonic Hall, Castlereagh-street. On May 6<sup>th</sup> they immersed into the sin-covering name HARRY WARADLE (22), after an intelligent statement by him of his belief. As a body and individually they endorse the “Statement of Faith” in use at Birmingham, but in amplification of that have added as follows: “We believe the Bible to be the inspired word of God, and the only safe guide in all matters of faith and practice; also, that Light or Knowledge brings responsibility; by which we mean that those who may come to an understanding of the Gospel preached by Jesus and his apostles and recorded in the Scriptures, will if disobedient to the divine commands, be raised and punished; and, further, a clause declaring that it is inconsistent for a “saint” to have any fellowship with the political, municipal, or religious systems of the day.

(August 1885) Oakalla.—Brother P. M. Wilson reports that an ecclesia, numbering nine, has been organised here. They meet on the first day of every week to break bread and exhort one another, and present the truth to the alien on every opportunity. Brother Wilson has been authorised to report the ecclesia’s belief in a wholly inspired Bible, and their non-fellowship of the doctrine of a partial or fallible inspiration, or the presence of a human element liable to err.

(September 1885) Bath.—Brother Keepence reports a visit from brother W. Taylor, of Gloucester, who delivered a very interesting lecture on “The Merchant of Tarshish” to an audience of about 150. “Our meetings,” he says, “continues to be well attended, and several are interested.” Brother W. A. Robinson, of Bradford-on-Avon, and sister Trigg were united in marriage on the first of August. Brother Keepence adds that at a special meeting, on July 2<sup>nd</sup>, the ecclesia unanimously passed a resolution declaring their conviction that the Scriptures are divinely inspired in all their parts, and their determination to refuse fellowship to all who believe or tolerate the doctrine of a partially-inspired Bible.

(September 1885) Birmingham. — During the month, while on a visit with his sister-wife from Australia, obedience has been rendered to truth by Mr. SAMUEL BARTON (54), formerly a Baptist. The way is not yet open for the publication of intelligence from the brethren who meet in the Exchange Assembly Rooms. We ardently desire the obstacle may be removed by their decision not only to recognise and affirm the wholly inspired character of the Scriptures, but to maintain that truth in their midst as a first principle by refusal to fellowship the doctrine of partial and erring inspiration. In this event, the two bodies would be in working co-operation one with another, and our separation might then prove to the furtherance of the truth and love. So long as they leave the door open to dangerous error, this result is impossible.

(September 1885) Dudley.—Brother and sister Parker, of Hyatt Farm, Netherton, of the Dudley ecclesia, have decided to emigrate to Texas. They hope to arrive there the third week in September, and would be glad to make the acquaintance of any of the brethren in that part of the world. Anyone wishing to communicate with them can do so by writing, or applying, to Mr. A. B. Close, agent to the Galveston, Harrisburg, and San Antonio Railroad Company, San Antonio, Texas.—Brother Hughes, inviting brother Powell, of Birmingham, to lecture at Dudley, reports that the ecclesia has adopted the following

resolution:—"That this ecclesia believes the doctrine of the divine inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures, in all parts of them, as originally written by the prophets and apostles, and that we repudiate the doctrine that the Bible is only partly inspired and contains an element of merely human authorship liable to err, and that we discontinue fellowship with those who hold the same."

(September 1885) Llanelly.—Brother Green reports that with the assistance of the brethren of Mumbles, and occasionally of Swansea and Neath, the truth has been kept before the public here now for three years past. The interest which the novelty of the thing naturally excited at first has subsided; and the audiences now have dropped to about two dozen, in addition to the brethren (except where there is a subject touching politics, when we have the old number, about 200). The two dozen mentioned have been constant hearers from the commencement, and are as firm advocates of the truth as the brethren themselves, but from some cause or other, fail to give themselves over as the Lord requires. The brethren pray that they may all yield to the heavenly calling before it is too late; also, that they who have yielded, may be faithful to the very end. At a meeting held on the 14<sup>th</sup> of June, the brethren unanimously declared their faith in the complete inspiration of the Scriptures, and their resolution not to fellowship anyone holding the view of a partially-inspired Bible.

(September 1885) Ripley.—Brother Wharton reports the loss of sister Louisa Mitchell by removal to Pittsburg, Pa., U.S.A. Her place has been filled by the removal to Ripley of sister Wood, from Derby, now sister Parkin.—On August 13, the ecclesia adopted the following resolution:—"That we believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were in all parts of them given by inspiration of God, and that we cannot offer fellowship to any who hold or tolerate the doctrine of partial inspiration."

(Excerpt from September 1885) Swansea. — Brother Randles forwarded last month, too late for insertion, a resolution adopted by the ecclesia, refusing fellowship to all who believe in the doctrine of a partly inspired Bible, propounded by the *Exegetist* and endorsed and advocated by the *Æon*.

(October 1885) Cannock.—Brother Beasley reports that the ecclesia here has resolved "that we do and shall henceforth make entire inspiration a first principle of fellowship in our ecclesia." Brother Roberts, of Birmingham, visited and lectured, on Sunday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, on "The Kingdom of God and the sign of its coming."

(October 1885) Leeds.—Brother W. H. Andrew reports: "Two more have been added to our number by baptism. On August 27<sup>th</sup>, ANN HUNTER (wife of brother Hunter), formerly Methodist Free Church, and on August 31<sup>st</sup>, SYER SHULVER (29), tanner, formerly Methodist Free Church. Sister Hunter was brought to a know edge of the truth by reading *Christendom Astray*. Brother Holdsworth reports that at a special general meeting of the ecclesia, the following resolution was adopted: "We believe that the writings collectively known as the Bible were originally produced free from error by inspiration of God." In answer to the inquiry whether the ecclesia were prepared to maintain as a first principle of their fellowship the truth so clearly confessed, brother Holdsworth says: "We have always recognised it as a first principle, as you will see from a perusal of the enclosed statement of first principles."

(October 1885) St. John's (N.B.)—Sister Jardine writes:—"We have very pleasing intelligence to communicate: the addition of four members to the body of Christ. On July 15<sup>th</sup>, brother CORAN, millwright, yielded obedience. Our brother had been previously immersed by the Baptists. For ten years he had been a teacher among the disciples of Christ, but he advanced beyond his associates and amid much opposition proclaimed the gospel of the kingdom and immortality only in Christ. Through the past year, reading our literature and attending our meetings, through the grace of the Deity, awakened his mind to the whole truth, and constrained him to tear himself from his companions, and join the true disciples of Christ, his brethren. Two others of the same sect have followed brother Coran's example, and realizing

that their former immersion when in ignorance, was no more to them than an ordinary bath, they submitted to baptism on confession of the one faith and Lord. For that purpose, our ecclesia engaged an omnibus, and early on Sunday, August 2<sup>nd</sup>, we drove to the Kennebecasis river. The quiet grandeur of the hills surrounding the water, together with the occasion of our gathering by the riverside, filled our minds with scenes and thoughts of Scripture.—Brother Fraser read appropriate passages, and, after singing together the baptismal hymn and uniting in prayer, he assisted first his wife, and then the two brethren, to submit to the typical burial and raising again. Brother ELSTON (41) is a grocer. Brother WILLIS (28) is a cabinet maker. Our number is now 14. Though it sounds small, we feel greatly cheered in view of the many difficulties and discouragements met with in trying to awaken any from the strong delusion, and we rejoice that those added are devout and earnest in purpose.—Brother Dowling has been under severe affliction since January, suffering from acute dyspepsia, so that he and his sister wife have been prevented assembling with us. We have missed his voice from our meetings. He worked hard in the Master's service, and, through his illness, the truth and the ecclesia have been uppermost in mind. He says the thought of the prayers of the brethren have sustained and encouraged him. Our ecclesia believe in a wholly inspired Bible, and we sympathise with you, dear brother, in all the trials and conflicts you are passing through, for your faithfulness to the cause. We thank our heavenly Father for the *Christadelphian* and its Editor, and pray that both may be sustained till the Master comes

(October 1885) Lampasas (Tex).—Bro. Solomon T. Blessing reports the holding of a fraternal gathering at Lampasas, commencing Saturday evening, Aug. 1<sup>st</sup>, and continuing until Monday morning, Aug. 10<sup>th</sup>.—Bro. Dr. W. H. Reeves, of Springfield, Ohio, was present by special invitation, and spoke many times to edification, as did also bros. A. R. Miller, W. A. Oatman, John Banta and others. The meeting was very harmonious. The following had been studying the truth for some time and came to the meeting for the purpose of putting on Christ in baptism. There were immersed on Saturday evening, August 8<sup>th</sup>, by bro. Wm. Greer, namely, ROBERT BUNTON, W. WATSON, W. H. FERRELL, G. W. MAYNARD, JOHN CAMERON, JAS. M. GATLIFF, SUSAN MAYNARD, SUSAN CORNUTT, ELIZA MCKEE. There were present at the gathering, including the nine that were immersed, 96 brothers and sisters, besides a number of the alien. It was decided that our next gathering should be held in the same place, August 14<sup>th</sup> and to continue eight days. The following resolution was adopted without a dissenting voice. “Whereas some among our body, through print and otherwise have called in question the complete inspiration of the Bible; and, whereas we believe such doctrine will undermine the very foundation of our faith; therefore, be it resolved that we, as a body assembled together in this Fraternal Gathering, declare our belief and firm confidence in the complete and unerring accuracy of the Old and New Testament, from Genesis to Revelations, in the original manuscripts; and whatever little inaccuracies there may be, arising from transcribing or translations, does not militate against their being wholly inspired. That the several writers were inspired to record what they wrote, even though they quoted from uninspired sources. For instance, Moses was inspired to record the declaration of the serpent:—“Ye shall not surely die,” though that declaration was a lie, we believe that all Scripture was given by the inspiration of God. Early on Monday morning we assembled at the tent for prayer, thanks giving, and bidding each other good-bye if the Lord defer his coming. A special invitation is given to all brothers and sisters and interested alien to meet in next year's fraternal gathering.

(October 1885) New Edinburg (Arks).—Sister Anna B. McDaniel says:—“There are four of us here—my mother (Mrs. M. A. McDaniel), my two sisters (Mrs. L. Woods, Mrs. L. Washburn) and myself, believe in the inspiration of all the Bible. I rejoice in your noble defence of the same. There are other believers here, but I have not seen them for sometime, and report only for four. May the Father strengthen your heart and hands to uphold the truth, and to feed His lambs and His sheep, for there would be spiritual death without the true Bread of Life. We would be glad if some brother could deliver a course of lectures here. I request the prayers of the faithful everywhere in our behalf. I feel it was difficult to learn the truth, and still more so to obey it; but some of us have been trying to walk therein for more than sixteen years, and desire to be faithful to the end. My love to the faithful everywhere.”

(December 1885) Easington.—Brother John Mallett on behalf of the brethren and sisters here, says:—“Though the inspiration controversy has caused them much grief of mind, yet they feel called upon to let the brethren everywhere know their attitude.” He says:—“We now see it our duty to let our decision be known. We have reasoned the matter over and have come to the conclusion that if we believe (or fellowship those who believe) the doctrine of partial inspiration, we shall be building on a foundation of sand. Our conviction is that the Scriptures in all parts of them, as originally written by prophets and apostles, were written by the guidance of the Spirit of God, and consequently free from error. We continue our meetings every first day for the breaking of bread, and exhort each other to continue in well-doing until the end, hoping that we may be able to stand fast and having done all to stand in His presence with joy.”

(December 1885) Glasgow.—Brother and sister Hall report that a meeting is to be held here on the position to be taken as to inspiration. They say:—“We have not met with the ecclesia here since June 28<sup>th</sup>, but we have got relief and comfort for the present by meeting with the ecclesia in Greenock—the brethren there being all agreed that the Scriptures were originally free from error, being all inspired of God

(December 1885) Grantham.—Brother Peatman says:—“In the state of things existing for some time past, seven brethren and sisters have resolved to stand aside and to break bread together at the house of brother Buckler, 10, Grantley Street, on Sundays at 11 a.m. In forming ourselves into a separate ecclesia, we have resolved unanimously—That we hold as a first principle in our basis of fellowship the divine inspiration and consequent infallibility of the Scriptures in all parts of them, as originally written by prophets and apostles and now known as the Holy Bible. Our number is made up as follows:—Brother and sister Johnson, brother and sister Peatman, brother and sister Bucker, and sister Fevegreen. We pray for our heavenly Father’s guidance and blessing in the future, and with gratitude His care of the past

(December 1885) Halifax.—Brother Hanson reports that the following four persons were immersed into the saving name of Christ on Sunday morning, October 18<sup>th</sup>, at the public baths, viz., ELLEN MIDGLEY (51), formerly neutral; JANE PARISH (24), MARTHA ANN HOLMES (19), both of Stone Chair, near Halifax, and both formerly Primitive Methodists (brought to a knowledge of the truth by the instrumentality of sister Beaumont, of that place); and JANE ELIZABETH SMITH (17) eldest daughter of brother and sister Robert Smith, who, though so young in years, has a good knowledge of the scriptures, having from a child been brought up in the knowledge of them. “With these additions, we now number 23, and I am glad to say, all of one mind, believing in a *wholly inspired* and therefore *infallible Bible*.”— (Sister Beaumont’s correspondence next month.)

(December 1885) Leamington.—Brother Peters reports the obedience of WILLIAM GILL (52), basket maker, and his wife, ELIZABETH GILL (45), also, on October 10<sup>th</sup>, THOMAS HOVLEY (65), gas stoker, all formerly neutral. Two have removed, namely, sister Woodward to Clifton, Bristol, and sister Harriet Woodward to Bewdley, where she has been united in marriage with brother G. C Potter. Brother Peters also announces, with pleasure, the return of brother Mercott to fellowship. The brethren have been cheered and encouraged by visits from various brethren from Birmingham. “And I am very happy to inform you,” adds brother Peters, “that strife and difference have ended in this ecclesia, believing the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures in all parts of them, as originally written by the prophets and apostles, and agreeing to refuse association with those who either believe or tolerate the doctrine that the Bible is only partly inspired.”

(January 1886) Alderley Edge.—Brother Finch reports that the brethren here have made a special effort to introduce the truth at Wilmslow. They secured a room for a month and arranged for the delivery of four lectures as follows:—Oct. 18<sup>th</sup>, “The kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ,” Oct. 25<sup>th</sup>, “How to become and continue a Christian,” brother J. E. Bamford, of Oldham; Nov. 1<sup>st</sup>, “The kingdoms of God

and the kingdoms of men,” brother G. Waite, of Stockport; Nov. 8<sup>th</sup>, “The Signs of the times,” brother E. Bellamy, of Stockport. From thirty to fifty strangers were present at each lecture. The meetings are being continued at Wilmslow, and the brethren trust their efforts will be the means of rousing enquiry into the grand teaching of the Bible. A good number of *Finger Posts* have been distributed at each meeting. Bro. Finch concludes by saying: “We are glad to report that the brethren of this ecclesia have considered the question of Inspiration, and all believe in a wholly-inspired Bible, and refuse to fellowship those who believe in a partly inspired Bible.”

(January 1886) Blantyre.—Brother H. Brown reports: “We have given up the hall which we have had for a meeting place for the last nine months, and have decided upon having two separate meeting places during the winter months, for the benefit of those who have a long road to travel. The addresses of our meeting places are: No. 13, Portland Square, Hamilton, and Biggsland, High Blantyre.” He also says: “We have not been moved away from the foundation on which we were placed some six or seven years ago, viz.: a belief in a wholly inspired and infallible Bible—a Bible in which there are no real discrepancies—in its original form, a perfect revelation from God to man. We will admit of imperfections in translations, and of interpolation where that can be proved beyond a doubt; but we will not tolerate in our midst, or fellowship those persons who take up certain portions of the Bible and say this is not inspired, or that is not inspired,—having no authority for so doing.”

(January 1886) Great Bridge.—Brother W. H. Mosley writes as follows:—“The brethren and sisters meeting at Brother Hollier’s house in Farley Street, Great Bridge, have separated themselves from Great Bridge ecclesia meeting in the Odd Fellows’ Hall, Great Bridge, and are now meeting on exactly the same basis as the Temperance Hall ecclesia, respecting inspiration and fellowship. Our action has been taken with great reluctance and after a careful and serious consideration, holding forth every possible consistent means to prevent the same. Signed on behalf of the aforesaid brethren and sisters, W. H. MOSLEY.” At the same time, Brother Hardy reports that the following resolution was passed by the Great Bridge ecclesia, at its annual business meeting, on December 14<sup>th</sup>:—“That we believe the Scriptures (viz, all the books of the Old and New Testaments) were in all parts of them given by inspiration of God; and that we cannot offer fellowship to any who hold the doctrine of partial inspiration.” He adds a P.S., which probably indicates, though it does not state the explanation of this (to those at a distance) puzzling state of things. The P.S. is this: “Our intention in carrying out the above is not to cut off whole ecclesias, but to test for ourselves all who present themselves for fellowship with us.”

(January 1886) London. — ISLINGTON. — A special meeting of the Ecclesia was held on Oct. 19 to consider the inspiration question, notice having been previously given that the following propositions would be moved:—1. “We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the divine authorship, and consequent infallibility, of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship.” 2. “We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it.” Brother J. J. Andrew moved the first of these, which, however, was not voted upon, as at the close of the meeting a proposition by brother H. H. Horsman to adjourn the question for 12 months was carried by 43 to 36, many not voting. As this amounted to a refusal, either to reject the “fallible authorship” theory or to repudiate the fellowship of those holding it, the supporters of the proposition at once withdrew from fellowship, and to the number of nearly 100 have since been meeting at 69, Upper Street, for the breaking of bread. The brethren at Wellington Hall then met (Oct. 25) and passed the following resolution:—“That this meeting, whilst refusing to countenance an unnecessary agitation, maintains its old position of confidence in the divine authorship, inspiration, and consequent infallibility of the Bible; and will continue to deal with cases of departure from the Truth in accordance with the rules.” This we refused to accept, as it did not define the “fallible authorship” theory to be a “departure from the truth,” nor did it repudiate those who might hold

such a belief outside the ecclesia. A meeting was then held between seven brethren on either side, at which it was agreed the first proposition should be accepted by those at Wellington Hall, and that a meeting should be held to discuss the *second*—i.e. upon the question of fellowship. This meeting was held on Nov. 9<sup>th</sup> (the adjournment motion having been previously rescinded), but was without result, and at a subsequent meeting of the Wellington Hall ecclesia, our second proposition was put to the vote and rejected by a large majority. Until after that meeting, we had taken no definite action towards forming a new ecclesia, having no desire to make the separation complete, if it could, without compromising any principle, be avoided, but in view of the absolute rejection of the second proposition we at once formed ourselves into an ecclesia on the same basis of fellowship as hitherto with the addition of the two propositions given above. The Wellington Hall brethren have since amended their proposition of Oct. 25 as follows:—“That this ecclesia whilst refusing to countenance an unnecessary agitation maintains its old position of confidence in the divine authorship and consequent infallibility of the Bible; and deeming a belief in the fallible authorship of any part of the Bible to be a departure from the truth, declines the fellowship of those who so believe, and will deal with such in accordance with the rules.” This it will be seen concedes the principle that we are contending for, and we hope (subject to some necessary preliminary arrangements) will shortly lead to a re-union.—WM. OWLER, Secretary.

(January 1886) WESTMINSTER.—Brother F. W. Porter writes:—“The controversy on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, has at length terminated amongst the South London brethren and sisters, so far as the Westminster ecclesia is concerned. The matter has been under discussion for a considerable time, four ecclesial meetings having been held for the purpose. The ecclesia was asked to re-affirm their old position, and their belief in a wholly inspired and infallible Bible, and their determination to fellowship those only who so believed in the following propositions:—Prop. I.—“We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the Divine Authorship, and consequent infallibility of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship.” Prop. II.—“We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it.” To these, however, the following amendment was moved:—“That the Bible, as we now have it, is a reliable record of God’s dealings with men in the past, and an infallible revelation of the way of salvation and of His future purpose; a belief of which, in conjunction with obedience to the precepts of Christ and the apostles, we hold to be necessary to salvation. We shall therefore continue (as heretofore) to fellowship only those who so believe and teach.” On the first proposition and amendment being put to the vote of the meeting, the former was rejected and the latter carried by a large majority. Under these circumstances, about 60 brethren and sisters (including the writer of this report) have felt it their duty to withdraw from the ecclesia, it being impossible to endorse the amendment, which not only evades the point at issue, namely, the character of the autographs, but directly affirms that while certain parts of ‘the Bible as we now have it are infallible,’ other portions are merely ‘reliable.’ Moreover, it is manifest that it will admit into fellowship those believing in a partially inspired Bible. The brethren and sisters who have withdrawn from membership have constituted themselves a separate ecclesia meeting at the Hanover Assembly Rooms, 334, Kennington Park Road, S. E., having adopted the two resolutions first mentioned as a basis of fellowship.”

(January 1886) Newcastle-on-Tyne.—Brother Little reports:—“On May 14<sup>th</sup>, 1885, we adopted the amended resolution on inspiration. There were only two dissentients, viz.:—Brother and sister Forbes, who objected to it being made a basis of fellowship, and therefore withdrew themselves. We have, since then, endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation on the ground of wholly-inspired and infallible Bible, but, I regret to say, it has been unsuccessful. This was not mentioned at the time, as we expected it would be unnecessary.”



(January 1886) Sheffield.—Brother Shemeld reports that a meeting of the ecclesia, held November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1885, the following resolution was adopted:—“We, the brethren and sisters of the Sheffield Christadelphian ecclesia, do believe that the autographs of the Scriptures were produced in all parts of them, by divine revelation and supervision, and were free from any error whatever. And we refuse fellowship to anyone who believes them to be partially inspired. Also, we extend our fellowship to those brethren and sisters and ecclesias *only*, who believe in the full inspiration of the Scriptures, and who refuse fellowship to those who believe in partial inspiration, as above set forth. Also, that a scriptural course must be taken before anyone be withdrawn from.”

(January 1886) Jersey City (N.J.).—Brother Geo. T. Washburne writes:—“We are quietly and firmly continuing the good work initiated by Dr. Thomas in this city; and from time to time we are encouraged in our labour of love by the acceptance—on the part of some—of Yahweh’s offer in Christ by the Gospel. This was the case on Sunday, October 11<sup>th</sup>, when Miss MARY MILLER (formerly Baptist) and Miss ANNIE SMITH (neutral), both of Brooklyn, N.Y., were immersed into Christ. Then, too, we have the company of brother Harry and sister Amy Vredenburgh, who recently removed from Carbondale, Pa., which helps us on in our humble service for Christ. We have declared our position in regard to ‘inspiration.’ In view of our geographical location (being, as it were, the dumping ground for European refuse of every sort) it seems incumbent upon us to cry without ceasing. ‘That the Holy Scriptures, originally, in all parts of them, were the result of the inspirational power of God, however exercised; and that this ecclesia holds no fellowship with any who believe otherwise.’ This stand is taken, not from personal likes or dislikes towards any of the brethren who have been engaged in the controversy, but because it is the very keystone which binds the work of God together. We fear to tamper with that Word which God has magnified above His name (Psalm 138:2) and thus we flee from the very appearance of evil, lest at last we be found ‘partakers of other men’s sins.’—In the (American) *Christadelphian Advocate* for October there was a letter to the Editor, in which a Charles W. Searight reported the existence of a few in his neighbourhood ‘sound in the doctrines of the one faith,’ but unprepared to enter to the Lamb’s supper, ‘having not yet received the sign by immersion.’ The writer expressed a strong desire to have some brother come and assist him into Christ. Under date of the 3<sup>rd</sup> inst., Brother J. M. Washburne of this ecclesia, writes:—That he “made it his business to go from Cincinnati, O. to Lawrenceburgh, Ind. To examine Mr. Chas. W. Searight, and after a most satisfactory confession of faith by him, immersed him into Christ’s name, a union with which *only* can give a man, the true hope of life. Brother Searight is a railroad operator and train agent, and is possessed of no little zeal for the truth, and will be a bright light-stand in the community where he resides. He already has a number interested. I had a very pleasant interview with one man who has learned the truth unaided by Christadelphian literature or person. He is nearly ready for immersion. They beg me to pay them another visit, which if the Lord permit, I will only be too pleased to do.” And so we see the power of the “Word which endureth forever.” Therefore, dear Brother Roberts, in time of sorest trial, fail not to remember the words of Him, who alone can give consolation of an abiding sort, “So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it *shall not* return unto me void, but it *shall* accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.”

(January 1886) Lowell (MASS.).—On October 19<sup>th</sup> our ecclesia made increase by the baptism into Christ of Mr. WARREN H. CLOUGH (25), formerly Methodist. Brother Clough, after a careful study of the Scripture, firmly holds the doctrines defined in the ecclesial guide, and on the assurance of an infallible Bible will strengthen us in our public efforts to enlighten others. May God give us increase and preserve us unblamable until the day of Christ is our prayer.—SAMUEL EVISON.

(January 1886) Pomona (CAL.).—Sister White writes:—“We need books very much, as we are all alone here, myself and husband. Several are interested, and some of the very best material. One man almost ready will be useful; another, a lady, a school teacher, I have great hope of. She is in dead earnest about

her salvation. She is reading *Twelve Lectures*, and says she is coming to talk Bible with me all day. We will try to sow. May God give the increase. I must tell you, dear brother, how we sympathise with you in your trials. May God be with you and keep you. We are among believers in a wholly inspired Bible. We also believe Dr. Thomas taught the whole truth. Will you please publish our address, so that any of the brethren coming to California may find us. We would be very much delighted to have them call on us. It has been over a year since we have seen a brother or sister, and we have heard but three lectures for six years. I tell you it often brings the tears to think we must live alone, but we have often spent money trying to go where we could have some brethren to associate with, but something always turns out that we are sadly disappointed. If it is God's will for us to live alone, we must submit."

(January 1886) Queenstown.—Brother Bushell says: "Our ecclesia is very small, only five—three sisters and two brothers. We have done all we can to spread the truth by distributing *Finger-posts* and books. We have no one that can lecture. We are very much isolated. We are all very glad of the stand you and brother Shuttleworth have made for the inspiration of the Bible."

(January 1886) *Tarkastad*.—Brother J. Shrosbree writes: "It gives me great pleasure to report what ought to have been reported long ago, namely, the obedience to the truth in Christ, of AGNES SHROSBEE (20), wife of brother Charles Shrosbree. Our dear sister was a member of the United Presbyterian Church, and her prejudice against the truth was strong; but she is now altogether weaned from the apostacy, and is humbly striving like the rest of us to become fit for Christ and his kingdom. Her immersion was in March. We now number ten. We are unwavering believers in the entire inspiration of the Holy Scriptures."

(February 1886) Bath.—Brother Keepence reports the separation of four on the question of fellowshipping the Exchange brethren. The matter was under discussion at five meetings. The ecclesia was asked to re-affirm their belief in a wholly inspired and infallible Bible. This was done; but a second proposition declaring determination to fellowship those only who so believed, was rejected by half of the ecclesia. On this a separation ensued—all ecclesial effects being sold, and all accounts paid, and the balance divided. On the question of who was to have the hall, it was decided that brother Keepence should carry it on on behalf of those in favour of a pure fellowship. Several have since accepted the propositions, leaving the loss at the number stated. The ecclesia, as now established, will refuse fellowship to all who do not agree on the question of inspiration and fellowship.

(February 1886) Bexley (Kent).—Brother M. Lewin reports the obedience of two who put on the sin-covering name on Sunday, January 3<sup>rd</sup>, namely, ISAAC SMITH (38), gardener, and his wife, AMELIA SMITH (37). Brother Lewin and brother Guest are much encouraged by this event. Brother Guest, also writing on the subject, says, "This addition to our number is due to the persistent efforts of brother Lewin and myself at the Bible Class held every Sunday evening at my house. We advertise the subject of our address every week in our local paper, and although we do not obtain overflowing audiences, yet we get some few to listen to the glad tidings concerning the kingdom of God. Sometimes our audience has consisted of *one person only*, and sometimes nine, but whether one or many we have gone on just the same, and the result is that after less than four months, two persons are rejoicing in the glorious liberty in the Son of God. Our new brother and sister had for some time been seeking the truth, being alike dissatisfied with every system they came in contact with, and convinced that there was something else which they had not met with. That something else they now realise and enjoy. They seemed to grasp the truth on hearing the first *address*, and what surprised them most was that we had not a crowded room. We meet for the "Breaking of Bread" every first day morning at 11 a.m. at my house, on the basis of an wholly inspired Bible, and we shall refuse fellowship to all who believe otherwise, or who would tolerate those that do. We number *six* now, and our names are as follows:—Brethren Moses Lewin, Isaac Smith, Geo. Fred. Guest; sisters Amelia Smith, Mary Ethel Guest, Mary Tremaine Guest.

(February 1886) Blackpool.—Brother Allen reports the return to fellowship of brother John Booth and sister Mary Booth, of South Shore, Blackpool; also sister Bell, late of Birmingham, who has recently come to reside here. There have also been two other additions—sisters Camotta (mother and daughter), of Queen’s Square, Blackpool. They formerly belonged to the Church of England, and have been in the truth some time; but their immersion did not appear in the *Christadelphian* at the time. Meetings are held, as usual, on Sunday and Wednesday evenings. Several have been attending regularly for some time, and the brethren hope, with God’s blessing, to grow both in strength and numbers. They are all united in affirming that “all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,” and they will not fellowship with those who believe in “partial inspiration of the Scriptures.”

(February 1886) Crewe.—Brother Atkinson reports that during the past twelve months, the brethren have distributed *Finger Posts*, and continued a house to house lending of works on the truth. They have also conducted a Bible Class, which is regularly attended by those who are anxiously looking into the truth. We have reason to be thankful. They hope before long to be able to report additions. One has already obeyed the truth, viz., WILLIAM GEE (38), formerly Congregationalist. A separation, which has existed for a year past, is now at an end.—Brother Heath also reports that the ecclesia has adopted a resolution declaring their belief that the entire inspiration of the Scripture, as originally given, and will not fellowship any who do not hold the same.

(February 1886) Spalding.—The brethren and sisters of the Spalding ecclesia have passed the following resolution:—“We affirm our unabated confidence in the divine authorship and consequent infallibility of the Bible, subject to errors of translation which principles we have hitherto held, consequently we decline to fellowship any who countenance the partial inspiration theory.”—J. GODLEY.

(February 1886) Auckland.—Since our last letter, we are pleased to record the obedience of CLARA M. FLAVELL (17), formerly Church of England; and DENNES R. FLAVELL (19), son and daughter of sister Flavell, of our last intelligence. I have not been commissioned by the ecclesia to say anything on the subject which has caused such trouble, but I think I know the mind of the brethren enough to say that we could not accept a partial theory, unless accompanied by an inspired person commissioned to point out the inspired parts.—ALBERT TAYLOR.

(February 1886) South Riverton.—Sister Rebecca Wood, at the request of the ecclesia here, in a well-written communication, which crowded space compels us reluctantly to abridge, conveys a strong expression of sympathy with the right side of the inspiration controversy, and reports the adoption of a stringent resolution in harmony with the position occupied by the Temperance Hall ecclesia, Birmingham.

(February 1886) Corliss, Perham (Minn.).—Brother Samuel G. Wallace writes:—“You have probably heard of my name through brother Wilson, of Strathaven, Scotland. About five years ago he and I used to discuss the matters of religion—he for the *Christadelphian*, and I for the Evangelical Union Church. But for prejudice, I should have seen the light sooner. But thank God my eyes are opened. Christadelphianism harmonises the whole Bible. I did not know who would baptise me, seeing there were no brethren here; but an ex-Free Baptist minister, named Pettigrew, (now a brother in the hope of Israel), baptised me. I have a brother in the flesh about 35 miles from here. I paid him a visit, and found a young unmarried man at work for him, named John Grantham, who held the very same views as the Christadelphians. It made me feel glad. He was formerly a Roman Catholic in the State of New York, but got disgusted with their form of worship when he was but fifteen years old. He came out west to Minnesota and studied the Bible for himself, and a year past in June, he was baptised for the remission of sins. He joined himself to no church, and I was the first person of like faith with himself he had met. So he is going to settle beside me as soon as possible. That would form an ecclesia of three. Brother Petticrew is a good speaker. So I think it would be good to have him our presiding brother. We can hold meetings in farm houses around the

township. We are all starting to clear up a farm, so that we are not over wealthy; but we are rich in the love of the Lord, and the hope of Israel. I received “the Ecclesia Guide” from brother W. H. Wilson, Strathaven, which will be our standard. We believe the Bible to be wholly inspired.”

(February 1886) Worcester (MASS.)—Brother Bemis reports the adoption, by the ecclesia, of a resolution (which was carried unanimously, November 15<sup>th</sup>, 1885) claiming complete and unerring inspiration for the whole of the original Scriptures, and refusing fellowship with all who have sympathy with the doctrine of partial inspiration.

(Excerpt from March 1886) Brother Bruce says:—“It is a sore trial, but we must not be discouraged. Christ has only one body, and it is the Father’s love towards the members of that one body, that leads Him to purge and purify them, so as to work in harmony. We must be of one mind, holding fast the one faith, having peace one with another, not tarnished with strange doctrines which the human mind sees fit to invent. We, who have come away, believe that the autographs of the Bible now in our possession were God inspired writings and free from error, whatever errors of transmission may belong to the copies now in our possession. We therefore cannot accept fellowship with those who attribute certain parts of the Bible to a human authorship, or who while believing the Bible to be wholly inspired, fellowship those that believe in a partly inspired Bible.” Brother Bruce further reports the removal of brother Norman to London. The brethren are sorry to lose him, as he has been a great help to them in our trial.

(March 1886 Upholland (near Wigan)—Brother Longbottom communicates intelligence accompanied with the intimation that part are in favour of accepting a resolution in favour of inspiration and part are against it. This means that as things stand at present, the ecclesia is prepared to fellowship the doctrine of partial and erring inspiration. While this continues to be the case, we are sorrowfully obliged to act on the intimation published in the January number—that intelligence appearing in the *Christadelphian* is henceforth limited to communications from those who are prepared to stand by the complete inspiration of the Bible, both in doctrine and fellowship.

(March 1886) Paddington.—Brother D. Logan reports the adoption of the following resolution:—“That we, the members of the Christadelphian ecclesia meeting at the Temperance Hall, Pitt Street, desire to convey our hearty sympathy and approval of brother Roberts’ action, and all brothers and sisters who have stood with him in his contention for a wholly-inspired Bible, and that we fully endorse the step he has taken in withdrawing from all who deny this important Bible doctrine, believing, as we do, that the logical outcome of such denial would be the entire destruction of our faith and practice in the whole of the book.”

(March 1886) Washington (D.C.).—Brother W. T. Hadley expressing sorrow at the condition of things ecclesially here says:—“There are seven meeting at my house who are not ashamed of the name Christadelphian and who believe in a wholly inspired Bible. We pray you may be long spared to the brethren in the good fight of faith and the pulling down of imagination and everything which exalts itself against the knowledge of God.”

(April 1886) Bath.—Brother Keepence reports the return of brother and sister Strange, who, after an absence of six weeks, have seen their way clear to meet with the ecclesia as now established on the question of inspiration and fellowship. He also reports visits from brethren G. F. Guest, of Bexley; J. Thomas, of Newport, Mon.; and T. Boshier and R. Elliott, of London; and brother Stainforth, of Bristol, who lectured to large audiences.

(April 1886) Bexley (Kent).—Brother M. Lewin reports further additions to the “little flock” here. On March 5<sup>th</sup>, three put on the sin-covering name, viz., ISAAC PITTUCK, gardener; and his wife, MARY

ANN PITTUCK; and CLARISSA LEWIN, wife of brother Lewin. The little ecclesia would now have numbered twelve but for the removal of brother Guest and his wife and daughter to Lewisham. As it is, they are nine, but hope to have the company of brother Guest occasionally. They should be glad of the visit of any brother who could give a word of exhortation. They firmly hold the Scriptures to be inspired in their entirety, and free from error; and on this basis will welcome brethren to the table of the Lord.

(April 1886) Leeds.—At a special meeting of this ecclesia held on March 7<sup>th</sup>, the following resolution was unanimously passed:—“We believe that the writings collectively known as the Bible were originally produced free from error by inspiration of God; and recognising this conviction as a first principle in the basis of apostolic faith. This ecclesia will fellowship only those who believe likewise.”—W. H. ANDREW.

(April 1886) Leicester.—Brother Gamble reports that at a special meeting of the ecclesia, held on Sunday afternoon, February 28<sup>th</sup>, a resolution was adopted of which he encloses a printed circular copy. The resolution declares the belief of the ecclesia in the entire inspiration and consequent infallibility of the original Scriptures, and their refusal to fellowship those who believe and teach the doctrine of a partial or fallible inspiration as pertaining to the word of God, or who knowingly fellowship such doctrines. Brother Gamble also reports that on March 2<sup>nd</sup>, three put on the name of Christ by immersion, viz., MARY BAILEY, JOSEPH COOK LEATH, and FANNY LEATH, his wife; also that the number of the ecclesia has been increased by the removal of sister Wright from Derby, which was omitted to be mentioned at the time.

(April 1886) Maldon.—Brother C. M. Handley reports the obedience of ANNIE BLANKS (22), formerly Church of England, who fell in love with the truth while living with our late sister Burgan, dressmaker. He gives it to be understood that, with one exception, all in Maldon recognise the wholly-inspired and infallible character of the Scriptures, and are in harmony with those who insist upon this truth as a first principle in the basis of fellowship. Time may help the extrication of a local position somewhat complicated and difficult. Brother C. M. Handley prays the Lord to overrule the whole matter to His own glory. What earnest fellow-believer will withhold the hearty “Amen!”

(April 1886) Northampton.md;Bro. Mellows writes:—“We have forwarded ten shillings for Jewish Contribution. Also we wish to say we are all of one mind here as to the Bible being of divine authorship and consequently *free from error*, and we decline to fellowship those who attribute to some parts an authorship of error. Will you please make our position known. We very much regret the present state of feeling in the brotherhood.”

(April 1886) Warrington.—Brother Smith reports that at a general meeting of the ecclesia held on Sunday, Feb. 28<sup>th</sup>, the following resolution was proposed and unanimously adopted: “We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the divine authorship and consequent infallibility of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship; and we reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it.”

(April 1886) Beechworth.—Brother Ladson (regretting the lateness of renewal of subscriptions to the *Christadelphian*) expresses sorrow at the division which has occurred on the question of inspiration, and says, “We are wholly with you in the stand you have taken on this question. Admit this principle of partial inspiration, and the truth would soon coalesce with and become indistinguishable from the polluted flood of popular beliefs, which will, thank God, soon be utterly and finally swept from the earth, although so

tightly hugged and loved by the credulous sheep who delight to part with their wool in return for the chaff supplied to them so liberally by their shepherds.”

(April 1886) Halifax, (N.S.)—Brother Mitchell writes:—“For some few years, on each first day, we have met privately in our own houses to break bread and to exhort one another. At first there were only two of us; now, our number is eight and feeling that something should be done to bring the truth before the public we decided to rent a Hall, so as to have our ecclesial duties performed in a more public manner that the alien might be invited, and feel at liberty to come and hear the Truth, as it is in Jesus, read and expounded in a very humble manner perhaps, but in harmony with the oracles of God. We rejoice in the knowledge of the glorious truth, and we feel it our duty to bear testimony to it and to be witnesses for it, in our day and generation knowing that the time is very short to labour now. “The times of the Gentiles” are fast drawing to a close. The number God is taking out of them for His name will soon be complete, and then comes our gathering to the judgment seat for our Lord’s approval. May our heavenly Father grant us grace and wisdom, that we may patiently endure all trials, and not faint, but “labour for His name’s sake, knowing that our labour is not in vain in the Lord.” Our ecclesia is composed of the following persons: — Brother David Brown, brother Charles Rusted, sister Rusted, Sister Coleman, sister Mitchell, brother F. R. Moreash, brother F. F. Stevens, brother Edward F. Mitchell. Sister Coleman, on account of her advanced age (88 years), is unable to meet with us, but she remembers the Lord Jesus in the appointed way, each first day at her own home. Our basis of fellowship is the “Birmingham Statement of the Faith,” and believing the Scriptures in every part of them are given by inspiration of God. “That the man of God may be perfect—thoroughly furnished,” etc., etc. The address of our hall is “Mumford’s (late Oddfellow’s) Hall, Argyle Street. Faithful brethren holding to the *Statement of the Faith* above given will be most gladly welcomed.”

(April 1886) Invercargill.—Bro. Mackay, referring to the ordeal through which the brotherhood have passed, on inspiration, writes thus: “Good will come out of it, otherwise it would not have been permitted.

“The Lord makes even the wrath of man to praise Him. Let us take, for example, the case of Domitian, the Roman Emperor, the degenerate son of Vespasian. He succeeded to the purple at the death of his brother Titus, and surpassed, if possible, Nero himself in blood and cruelty. By his orders, a war of extermination was waged against the Christians, and the beloved apostle John, after a series of other sufferings, was banished into the Isle which was then called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. This island is one of the most barren spots that can be well imagined even at the present day, notwithstanding the industry of the monks, who attempted its cultivation, and have consecrated its rocks to superstition. It was then a desert. Here the persecutor hoped the exile would die of starvation. He was, however, sadly disappointed. The same God of Israel who supported Moses and Elijah for many weeks together without food, revealed himself to the beloved disciple, and by his power supported his body, while by the revelation made to him, his solitude was sweetened and his seclusion from the society of his fellowmen (caused instrumentally by Domitian) made a distinguished blessing for all ages, for the believers in the “things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus the Christ—God will make the wrath of men to praise him again.” (This inspiration controversy is only making more clear the divine character of the Bible.) The books of the Old Testament are the same now as they were in the time of Christ and his disciples. Who could have altered them since? Christians could not alter books which were in the hands of Jews. Jews could not alter books which were in the hands of Christians. Christians would not write new books for Jews. Jews would not write new books for Christians; yet both Jews and Christians alike look upon the Old Testament as sacred and divine, and thus they serve not only as a check upon all fraud, but as a double watch set over truth. The main divisions of the Old Testament are precisely the same now as they were in the time of Christ, thus proving that not only have there been no additions, but no transpositions, that all stand now in the order it did then. Christ himself establishes this when he says: “All things must be fulfilled which are written in the *law of Moses*,

and in *the prophets*, and in *the Psalms* concerning me.” And the apostle Paul expounded, “both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets, from morning till evening.” This threefold division of the Old Testament and the arrangement is now precisely the same. Suffice it to say that there is scarcely one book of the Old Testament which is not directly or indirectly referred to and recognised by Christ or his apostles, as being included in the Scriptures and so possessed of divine authority. No less than one hundred and forty times do they speak of these ancient records with full emphasis as “Scriptures,” “Holy Scriptures,” “Scriptures of the Prophets,” or with the expressive phrase, “Thus it is written.” The Holy Bible, written by divine inspiration at the first, it has passed through the ordeal of ages, and though the text, has not been uninjured through various translations, it is yet as “able to make men wise unto salvation” as when the ink was yet undried upon its sacred pages.

(April 1886) Alma (Wis.) — Brother Latschaw writes:—“I have held the view that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God ever since I became converted by its infallible truth some twelve years or more, and how can anyone contend otherwise, who is enlightened by the truth? Let every brother and sister come out plainly for or against. In the latter day, teachers will come teaching false doctrines, not sparing the flock. It stands us in hand to plant our feet on the solid rock. Yes; stand firm on thus saith the inspired word of Ail.”

(April 1886) Cambridge (Maine)—Brother H. T. Hamilton writes: As regards the question of inspiration, we have grieved over it, and prayed over it. Although not a subscriber to the *Christadelphian*, I received and read some copies from brother E. V. Carr of Mount Vernon this State; also some copies of the *Fraternal Visitor* and the *Aeon* from brother R. C. Bingley of Portland Oregon. I think I am able to come to a conclusion. I will not say “I am for Roberts” or “I am for, &c,” as some have. But this I do say I believe in an inspired Bible in its entirety. I have a sister who was immersed into the truth last October. She takes the same stand as myself. It is nothing strange that heresies should get into the ecclesias, for it has been so in all ages, and as we are not favoured with any open vision or inspired apostle to determine the truth, all we can do is to study the word, that we may be able to try the spirit. Looking upon the state of things as they presently exist both in the ecclesia and in the world; who would not desire the coming of the kingdom of God? According to the prophetic word the great and dreadful day of Deity is at hand, and seeing we are looking for such things, what manner of persons ought ye to be in holy conversation and godliness. I am trying to arrest the attention of others to look into these blessed things as I have opportunity. While it is called to day May God’s blessing be upon his faithful children who are jealous for his word with a Godly jealousy.”

(April 1886) Spotsville (Ky.).—Brother Green forwards a resolution passed by the ecclesia here on the subject of inspiration. He says, “We wish all to know that we have no place in our minds for fallible inspiration. We are in sympathy with the warfare you have so successfully waged in defiance of God’s Word. We sincerely thank God for your work, and greatly appreciate your personal efforts in the matter. We neither impugn your motives, nor your judgment, but are quite satisfied with your work.” The resolution is as follows:—“We, the members of the Christadelphian ecclesia of Henderson County, in special meeting convened, do declare our allegiance to the Holy Scriptures, believing the same to be in all parts thereof in the original writings the result of the inspirational power of God, however exercised, such inspiration securing absolute infallibility. We do also refuse fellowship to all, who in theory or practice, believe otherwise.”

(May 1886) Cumnock.—During the present month we have been cheered by the addition to our meeting of Bro. JAMES CRAIG, of Ballochmyle. Bro. Craig originally belonged to the Irvine ecclesia, but his employment has brought him, together with his sister wife, to our locality, and we now expect their presence with us on the first day of the week. Belief in a wholly inspired Bible being a necessity for our fellowship, we were glad to find him a believer in a completely inspired Bible. It has been the privilege of

some of the brethren to be present at Kilmarnock during Bro. Roberts' stay there, and to enjoy a short season of that comfort which arises from association in the truth. ALLAN MACDOUGALL.

(May 1886) Huddersfield.—Brother Heywood reports a visit from brother R. Roberts of Birmingham, who delivered three lectures in the meeting room, Devonshire Chambers. On Sunday afternoon, March 21<sup>st</sup>, brother James Briggs, of Sowerby Bridge, subject: “Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord;” evening, by brother Roberts, “The Christadelphians. Who they are. What they are aiming at.” Monday evening, “Trouble abroad; the Bible only the way of peace and hope for man.” Wednesday evening, “The Eastern Question—(irrepressible and insoluble)—considered from a Bible point of view.” The lectures were fairly attended. On Thursday evening the brethren met to consider the position of certain brothers and sisters who were not in fellowship on account of the ecclesia's withdrawal from brother R. Sanderson; after inquiry into matters, with brother Roberts' assistance, it was resolved that there was no further cause for division. The position of those on the inspiration of the Word was then investigated, resulting in their affirming the wholly inspired character of the Bible, and refusing to fellowship any who believe or tolerate the partial inspiration theory. All the brethren have since met in fellowship with us. May the Lord keep us faithful.—Brother Heywood adds that MARY ANN HIRST was immersed into the saving name in January last, intimation of which was omitted to be made at the time.

(May 1886) Wigan (PEMBERTON).—Brother Rylance writes:—“Will you kindly announce in the *Christadelphian*, that our ecclesia has adopted the following resolution on inspiration:—‘That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, were originally produced in all parts of them by the inspiration of God (the Holy Spirit moving and guiding the writers), and that the writers were in no case left to themselves, the result being that their writings were free from error; also, that we refuse the fellowship of all those who cannot accept these resolutions.’ Two did not vote for the resolution, but we have reason to believe they will yet see their way to accept it. We are still keeping on with the lectures, and doing our best for the spread of the truth; but the audience are very poor. We had brother Thos. Holland April 4<sup>th</sup>, subject: ‘Where are the dead ones?’ We are thinking of starting a Sunday school very soon.”

(May 1886) Great Grimsby.—Brother Sayers reports that the few brethren here have taken the Hall of Science for Sunday Afternoon at 3 p.m., for Breaking of Bread; and Evening at 7 p.m. for Lectures:—Brother Dracup has removed to Lincoln. The whole of the ecclesia accept the Bible as a wholly inspired work. They consider partial inspiration one of the most dangerous errors to have arisen amongst us. “If we admit this” say they, “We should soon have no Kingdom; and the keys of the House of David would be lost and the truth fall to the ground.”

(Excerpt from June 1886) Melbourne.—Brother Whalley, on behalf of the ecclesia at St. Kilda, reports that they continue to struggle together in the maintenance of all things tending to strengthen them in their most holy faith, but between the darkness of the age and the wrestlings from within, their course toward faithfulness and purity seems at times nigh blocked up. Yet they fight on, and by the help of that sustaining power which “the Truth” affords, and which supplication unto God supplies, they live in hope that in the day of the Lord Jesus, “Victory” and the “Crown of Life” will be theirs.—Brother Whalley says:—“Sister Strand, of Tasmania (some four or five years ago of Birmingham), has come over to Victoria to recruit her health, and while here has met and will continue to meet with us in Windsor. We as an ecclesia have unanimously agreed upon a resolution, ‘affirming our belief that the whole Bible is the Word of God; that all parts of it was originally produced by His inspiration; that therefore the autographs were infallible to the minutest detail. That the Bible, as we now have it, is a thoroughly reliable reproduction of those originals, being in no way impaired by the few discrepancies and mistranslations that are to be found in it. And that from this time forward we cannot fellowship any who believe otherwise, nor those who can tolerate such belief.’”



(July 1886) Derby.—(*Athenæum*, *Victoria Street*, *Sundays*, 10.30 and 6.30).—Sister A. Smith has removed from Nottingham to Derby, and bro. E. Marshall from Derby to Bridgenorth. We shall hold our usual tea-meeting on July 5<sup>th</sup>, in the Drill Hall (entrance from Beckett Street) and shall be very pleased to have the company of those brethren and sisters who are at one with us as regards the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible. Tea at 4 p.m. There will be special trains from all parts of the country.

(August 1886) Elland.—Brother Zachariah Drake writes:—“On February 3<sup>rd</sup> of this year, an ecclesia was formed at Elland, on the basis that the whole Bible in its first form was the inspired work of God, and in all parts free from error of any kind. Since May 30<sup>th</sup>, we have on Sundays met in the Liberal Club Room, James street, Elland. We deferred engaging a public room for the truth for four months because some thought that the other meeting would see the error that they fell into in inviting those who fellowshipped partial and fallible inspiration, but others of us perceived that to invite and fellowship the invited leaven, was to become leavened with the corruption, and those at the first allowing themselves to fellowship those who held and tolerated partial and fallible inspiration, by so doing became weakened in their defence of the truth, and their conscience so far becoming seared. We are thankful that God opened our eyes to see that to be obedient to the truth we should separate from the leaven. Two have come to a knowledge of God’s truth, and by confession and immersion, on the 3<sup>rd</sup> inst., put on the name of Christ, viz., SARAH ANN HIRST (53), and ELIZABETH THORNTON HIRST (20), mother and daughter. We meet at 2–30 p.m. to break bread, and at 6–0 p.m. for lectures.”

(August 1886) Radstock.—Brother Young says:—After a long silence I am much pleased to report the addition of two to our little ecclesia, viz., CHARLES FORD (32), formerly Baptist, and WALTER FORD (30), his brother in the flesh, who both put on the sincovering name of Christ at Bath in the appointed way June 6<sup>th</sup>. Our hope and prayer is that they, together with us, will be found worthy to put on immortality at the appearing of Christ. I may also add that a resolution has been passed, and signed by each one of us, as follows:—1. “We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the Divine Authorship, and consequent infallibility of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship. 2. We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it.”

(August 1886) Carpenteria (Cal).—Brother Greene announces one more candidate for “Eternal Life” in the person of Mrs. AGNES RUTHERFORD of Goleta, who was inducted into the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, by baptism on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of May. Sister Rutherford is daughter-in-law to Mrs. Jesse Rutherford, formerly of Scotland. She had long been seeking for the truth, and only felt her doubts dispelled through the influence and matter of fact statements of the “Holy Oracles of God,” shown to her by our dear sister Ellen Shiels, who is up from her Scenega home on a visit. After baptism, our little band of eight broke bread in memory of our absent Lord. We miss sister Shiells very much, as she is one of our “bright and shining lights,” and has been instrumental in bringing several of us to see the *light*! Our little flock is widely scattered in this country, and it is a rare treat for so many of us to get together, as on the above occasion, but we live in hopes of meetings in that “great congregation” around the “Lord’s table,” to partake of that “feast of fat things, of wines on the lees well refined,” where parting will be no more. We are sound on the Inspiration Question, and believe in a wholly inspired Bible as it came from the hand of its author—God—and we thank his Holy Name that He has raised up such advocates as you, brothers Andrew and Shuttleworth to stamp this heresy under foot. These hydra heads of the “Old Serpent” are ever cropping out from under his cloak in the name of the *Truth* to choke down and strangle it from the face of the earth. May God bless and keep you in the field of his vineyard to fight this good fight of Faith until ‘He come whose right it is’—if it be His will, is the prayer of your brother in the Truth.”

(December 1886) Newton (Ayr).—Brother Howatson, jun., reports (for himself and sister Howatson) having arrived at the decision that the whole Bible is the word of God: that all parts of it were originally produced by His inspiration; and therefore infallible to the minutest detail: that the Bible as we now have it is a thoroughly reliable reproduction of the originals, and in no way impaired by the few translations that are to be found in it. “From this time forward,” he says, “we cannot fellowship any who believe otherwise, or who can tolerate such belief.” He says they would have announced this decision sooner, only there was a difference of judgment among the few with whom they met, and they hoped that with more time it would all come right, in which hope they have been disappointed,—as regards some at least.

(January 1887) Shelford (Great Cambs).—Please to report in *Christadelphian* that after consideration, I, with sister-wife and son, have come to the conclusion—“That we firmly believe in the inspiration of the whole of the Scriptures; that we will fellowship only those who believe the same; and we also refuse fellowship to all who, while believing the whole of the Scriptures to be inspired themselves, yet extend a fellowship to those who do not.” We should be pleased to receive a visit from any brother or sister endorsing the above who may be passing this way. Our address is:—A. Simper, The Ropery, Great Shelford, near Cambridge.”

(February 1887) London (NEW CROSS).—(*New Cross Hall, No. 1 Room, Lewisham High Road, S.E. Sundays at 6.30 p.m.*)—Brother Clifford, referring to intelligence appearing two years ago under “Lewisham,” reporting the efforts in that district, says:—“Commencing in a private room with very few brethren and sisters the attendance kept increasing to an extent that made it necessary we should have a hall to proclaim the Gospel of the Kingdom. The work then commenced has never been discontinued, but has been carried on with vigour, and with the result that several have been brought to a knowledge of the Word. There are open-air meetings in the summer, which causes a good deal of opposition—no less than three tracts having been written against us. A minister, from whose chapel seven brethren and sisters came, recently published a sermon in which he spoke of “the poor deluded Christadelphians,” stating that we seek to deceive all who listen to us. A letter was written to him, asking if he was willing to discuss the question, he has not even replied to it. Brethren at New Cross, being a part of the Camberwell Ecclesia, are all of one mind on the complete Inspiration of the Bible as a vital matter. They were encouraged lately by the obedience of two to the command of Christ, whose names appeared in the January number, under Camberwell Intelligence.

(July 1887) Aberdare.—Brother T. L. Davies defines the position of the Cwmaman brethren thus:—“We believe in an inallible Bible. We will fellowship those only who believe likewise. We believe that certain brethren (to wit brother Chamberlin and Exchange brethren) do not believe in a totally inspired and infallible Bible. We do not, have not, will not fellowship any of this mind, neither do we countenance them in any way. This is our position, and our action has been entirely in harmony with our declaration.”

(July 1887) Guernsey.—Brother Jefferys writes to say that it is in Guernsey, not Jersey, that he and sister Jefferys have settled. They are glad to say they are not alone, but meet with a brother and sister Renouf, at whose house they break bread on the first day of the week, according to the command. There are 20 miles of water between brethren in Jersey and Guernsey. Brother Renouf, also writing from Guernsey, speaks of the great gratification afforded to himself and sister Renouf by the arrival of brother and sister Jefferys. They had just written a letter lamenting their isolation in the truth. He also reports an unexpected and cheering visit from brother Wood, of Tamworth, and says:—“Any brother or sister (believing in a fully inspired Bible) will be made most welcome should they visit the island.”

(September 1887) Framfield.—Brother Randell says:—“Kindly report in the *Christadelphian* for the information of the brethren who might be coming this way that brother and sister Randell of this place are in fellowship with the brethren who believe the Bible to be wholly inspired. We came into the truth six

years ago with that understanding, and with more light we adhere more firmly to it. It may interest you to know that after an invitation to decorate, we used your Jubilee motto in this place on June 21st—blue letters on large white ground. It looked grand. A large fire nearly two miles from the house made it light enough for our banner to be seen at night. We received many congratulations—the parson and village squire included. We were asked to let it remain up till after the next Sunday, which we did. It has had a good effect. The people do not seem so afraid of us since then.”

(September 1887) Elmira (N.Y.)—“We believe in the totally inspired character of the Bible. We have been accused of following brother Roberts in an unscriptural and unrighteous course; but we see it to be our duty to make it known through the *Christadelphian* what camp we belong to, and that we will fellowship none who remain undecided as to the inspired and unerring character of the Scriptures, or who countenance those who say that they believe the whole of the Scriptures themselves, and yet extend fellowship to those who do not. The idea that brother Roberts has exercised lordship over God’s heritage is a pure invention. It has been created and fostered by men whose feelings unite them to understand the course he has taken. Is it not strange that the stone should find fault with the hammer, which has been acknowledged by them in former days to be in the hand of God? After our withdrawal from some here, some of those remaining requested another meeting, but this we declined as useless, seeing it was said, “All you want us to do is to fall into line and worship brother Roberts.” One has since asked to be forgiven all his hard sayings against us, saying, “Now I see brother Roberts to be right in his defence of a wholly-inspired Bible, and the course that he took in separating from the unclean thing. We will be pleased to receive a visit from any brother or sister passing this way, who are free from crotchets, sound in the faith, and decided as to the entire perfection of the Bible as the Word of God. We meet for the breaking of bread in the parlour of the Oddfellows’ Hall, West Water Street, Richardson’s Block, at 11 a.m. Sundays”—GEORGE WALKER, GEORGE M. SWAINSON, Mrs. KATTY SHARP, Mrs. GEORGE WALKER, Mrs. SUTTLIF.

(January 1888) BLACKBURN—In a communication of a later date, brother Brookfield states facts that point to a large early increase of the numbers of those in Blackburn, who stand upon the basis of the whole truth, uncompromised.

(January 1888) ELLAND—Brother Drake reports the addition of Brother and sister Joseph Cheetham, John Cheetham, and brother and sister David Akroyde—all from Sowerby Bridge meeting. Sister Jane Elizabeth Cheetham, of Huddersfield, has been united in marriage to brother W. H. Iredale. These additions increase the pleasure of carrying on the work of the truth at Elland. “We are grounded and settled on the necessity laid upon us by the truth to keep apart from the loose basis of fellowship laid by those who cannot affirm the inspiration and truthfulness of the Scriptures.

(April 1891) DOVER—Shortly after our last intelligence, we had the pleasure of a visit from brother Guest, of London, who spent the greater part of an evening with us, in conversation upon the things connected with the truth. I will mention here, as I have not done so before, that the Dover ecclesia is founded entirely upon the belief of the Scriptures being the wholly inspired and infallible word of God.—T. BRAND.

(August 1892) CREWE—We have pleasing intelligence this month. Our brethren, who have constituted a separate meeting in Crewe, have united with us on the basis of a wholly inspired Bible, though that question had nothing to do with their separation. We met for the first time on Sunday, May 15th, when brother Clothier, of Chester, gave an excellent address on the subject of “Unity and united effort.” Brother Clothier has paid us a visit every alternate Sunday for the last two months. The lectures he has given have drawn good audiences, and his exhortations to the brethren have been a source of edification and comfort.—GEO. WAKEFIELD.

(June 1893) SOUTH YARRA (*Suburb of Melbourne*).—Owing to the great depression which has prevailed in the Colonies for the last eighteen months, and consequent want of work; several of our brethren have been compelled to seek employment in other fields. The number includes our brother Gordon, secretary, also brother Dillon who followed as secretary; which is one reason which intelligence has not been forthcoming. Also brethren Dando, Tyson and Gregory. In addition to these losses, four brethren and two sisters have left South Yarra to meet at Melbourne. With sorrow we record the death of our beloved sister, Phoebe Morris, who, by her gentle disposition and great love of the truth endeared herself to us all. Her probation was short, but she was faithful in spreading the good news of the coming Kingdom. Over a year ago she moved to Traralgon with her family, and by her lending *Christendom Astray* to those she had an opportunity of conversing with, nearly three dozen copies of that work and other works were disseminated in the place. At the funeral brethren Mathieson and Betts, who reside within a few miles of Traralgon, spoke of the life and death of our sister, and gave a description of her hope and “one” faith in which she died. Our additions have been as follows, by immersion: — 31st October, 1892, Mrs. DANDO, wife of brother Dando (neutral); November 11th, EMMA and JANE GORDEN, sisters of brother H. Gorden; December 9th, 1893, SUSANNAH SLADE, formerly Baptist, sister of brother Slade. Brother Slade, after a few years’ absence from the table, has returned to fellowship. Our basis of fellowship is that the whole Bible, in its first form, was the inspired work of God, and in all parts free from error of any kind. Neither will we fellowship any who believe otherwise, or any who would fellowship those who hold and tolerate partial and fallibly inspiration.—GEO. F. WALKER.

(July 1893) MANCHESTER *Meeting Room, 198, Brunswick Street, Ardwick, Sundays, 3.0 p.m., and 6.30 p.m.*—We struggle on, in weakness and adversity, which would discourage us if we were not instructed in the Word which tells us that these things are necessary. Sister J. Holland (wife of brother T. Holland) and brother Hayden have ceased fellowship with us. We desire it to be known, for the information of any of the faithful visiting this City, that our basis of fellowship includes a wholly inspired Bible, *and no compromise.*—J. E. ASTIN.

(November 1893) ABERGAVENNY—Brother M. Wyllie, of Southampton, writes under date September 20th (too late for publication last month) as follows:—“I and my sister-wife have just returned from a very pleasant holiday at Abergavenny (Mon.), arising chiefly from the fact that under the blessing of the Father, through communication with my old confrères (by whose agency some years ago I embraced the truth), I was able to convince them that although holding the truth as to the inspiration of the Scriptures, they were in a false position through their inaction in remaining in fellowship with those ecclesias in whose midst views had been propagated subversive of that essential truth, and who “as ecclesias” had neglected to take the necessary steps to purge themselves of such, but had rather condoned and justified such offences. Upon realising their position, with the exception of a few, who although admitting the necessity for action on the part of the ecclesia, yet require a short time to think the matter over, the ecclesia resolved to place themselves in a right position with the Deity, and with the brethren who had remained faithful in this matter at the earliest opportunity. They therefore at ecclesial meetings held on the 9th and 11th September, resolved that from henceforth *the first principle of truth forming the basis of their fellowship one with another in Christ should be:—The belief in the Divine inspiration and consequent infallibility of the Scriptures as originally written by God’s Prophets and Apostles.* and that they refuse to compromise that principle by associating in fellowship with those, who—whatever their belief—by their actions either directly or indirectly tolerate any teaching opposed to that foundation. That which had debarred us from fellowship having been thus removed we, with mutual joy and thankfulness, sat down together on Sunday morning, September 17th, and in the breaking of bread, &c., commemorated the great love of the Father to us; and in the evening I lectured to an interested audience. As the lecturing brethren are somewhat physically weak, I am sure I am expressing their sentiments in stating how delighted they should be to have assistance in the way of lecturing by any brother passing that way, who may be connected with ecclesias established upon the same basis as themselves.

Brother H. C. Edwards, the newly-appointed recording brother of the Abergavenny ecclesia, writes officially and briefly in confirmation of the foregoing.

(November 1893) NEWPORT (MON.) -We have during the month received a very pleasing communication from Abergavenny, in which brother H. C. Edwards, solicitor (who has been appointed as recording brother, *pro tem.*), informed us that slightly more than half the Ecclesia, which hitherto has been in fellowship with "Partial Inspirationists," have now cut themselves off from their old associates, and decided in favour of fellowship only with those who maintain "the complete Divine Inspiration, and consequent infallibility of the scriptures as originally written by God's prophets and apostles." They have always held the scriptures to be wholly inspired and infallible, but have heretofore maintained a neutral position in reference to the division caused some years ago by the agitation of the doctrine of partial inspiration. They have asked for help in the lecturing department, and we have arranged to send brother J. Lander for Oct. 15th, when a free discussion upon "Our Unity and Welfare, and the Interests of the Truth" has been decided upon by our brethren there. We hope to hear a good report from our brother when he returns. We have had an addition to our numbers, in Sister Goodchild, who has removed from London, in all probability to reside permanently in Newport.—Our lectures have been as follows: Sept. 17th, "If a Man Die shall he Live Again?" (brother T. J. Cross); 24th, "Christ, the future King of the whole Earth" (brother C. W. Heath); Oct. 1st., "Felix Trembled! Why?" (brother J. Lauder); 8th, "Destruction cometh! and they shall seek peace and find none" (brother E. S. Schofield).—W. COLLARD.

(January 1894) AUCKLAND.—I have to advise you that a satisfactory arrangement has been made with the Auckland Masonic Hall Ecclesia, and the eleven brethren and sisters who separated from them January 12th, 1893, as per my advice to you, which appears in the *Christadelphian* for May. The basis (though not exactly all that was required by the Arch Hill Ecclesia) has been accepted, therefore, we are now one ecclesia. The basis, among other things, affirms the divinity of the Bible as a record, and its infallibility as a revelation of the way of salvation.—S. HARRISON.

(November 1895) NORTHAMPTON -Since last writing we have had lectures delivered by the following brethren:—Brother Gamble, of Leicester; brothers Challinor, R. R. Jardine, Shuttleworth, and C. J. Allen, of Birmingham; also brothers White and Evans, of London, and our brother Eling. In consequence of certain reports being circulated we deemed it advisable to pass the following resolution:—

"That we re-affirm the basis of fellowship, signed by the brethren November, 1892," which is as follows:—

- (1.) That we believe the Scriptures of Truth (*i.e.*, the Bible) in all their parts; Doctrine, Narrative, Prophecy, History, &c., were given by inspiration of God; therefore when the originals came from the Holy men of God (who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit") they were perfect; *i.e.*, unerring of infallible.
- (2.) That we cannot bid "God speed" by fellowshipping anyone who does not consent to the foregoing.
- (3.) That we cannot fellowship those (though endorsing the foregoing) who would extend the "right hand of fellowship" to those not in sympathy with the above.—F. CORT.

(July 1896) WEST BROMWICH.—As the result of some current friction, the arranging brethren write and request the publication of the following:—“Our basis of fellowship is on a wholly-inspired Bible, believing the same to be true in all its parts, excepting only such errors as may have crept in by transcription or translation, and we are severally prepared to meet any charges brought against us concerning the same.”—J. HOLLIER, T. PRICE, J. HOLLAND, WM. H. PHIPPS, and J. MARRIOTT, arranging brethren.

(November 1896) PITTSBURG.—A declaration, signed by the fourteen members of the ecclesia here, is forwarded for publication, that they “believe the Scriptures to be wholly inspired; and will not, knowingly, fellowship those who believe in partial-inspiration.” Those who read the extract from brother Welch’s letter, appearing among the cover notes of the *Christadelphian* a month or two back, will understand the meaning of this. [SEE BELOW]

DR. WELCH IN REPLY.—Replying to the allegation that he was willing to fellowship partial-inspirationists, Dr. Welch writes thus to brother Clark, of Derby, who suggests the publication of the extract as an off-set to misrepresentations that have been made:—“I did not invite to a fellowship, and then fellowship those brethren of the Pittsburg ecclesia with the knowledge, on my part, that they were of the partial-inspiration camp. Of their attitude on that question I was entirely ignorant until I was informed of it by brother Mosley. Since then they have again suggested our fellowshiping, and I have positively refused until they publicly (that is, before the ecclesias) take the proper attitude towards God’s Holy Word. I will not, knowingly, fellowship any brother who believes in partial-inspiration; nor will I, knowingly, fellowship a brother who believes in complete inspiration of the Bible; but who, knowingly, will and does fellowship partial-inspirationists. Such is my attitude towards God’s Word, and towards ecclesias, and towards a brother or brethren.”—L. B. WELCH.

#### ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED “THE DECLARATION” AS THEIR BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP

(October 1878) MELBOURNE.—Brother W. J. Evans forwards a lengthy communication in response to the equivocal allusion to the Melbourne ecclesia in the *Christadelphian* for May last. Referring to his own antecedents, on which, probably, the said allusion was founded, he remarks, after narrating the facts, “I have deeply repented of the past, and prayed earnestly for forgiveness. I thank God that I feel stronger in the faith and hope of the Gospel than ever I did before, and am quite convinced now of what I did not fully 54arasse before, viz., that there is no salvation out of Christ, and no way of getting into him but by believing the whole truth and obeying it. Since my re-admission to fellowship, I have endeavoured to atone for the past to the best of my ability by untiring effort in the cause of the truth. And now leaving my own personal history, I will give you a brief history of the progress of the ecclesia from its foundation to the present. The first meeting was held in the house of Joseph Brown, Park Street, Emerald Hill, the following members being present: Samuel Jackson, Ellen Jackson, Annie Fincher, Robert Brown, John Bishop, Joseph Brown, Annie Jane Brown, the writer, and sister-wife Rebecca Evans. It was then resolved to form an ecclesia, on the basis of the propositions embodied in the *Declaration* of first principles; also resolved that any hereafter seeking to be admitted to the fellowship of this ecclesia should be required to yield an intelligent and willing assent to the said propositions before admission into the name and fellowship of Christ. The first meeting for the breaking of bread was held about sixteen months back—March twelvemonths. We met for some eight weeks at brother Brown’s, when himself and family removed to another part, at brother Bishop’s, in Dorcas Street, Emerald Hill. About this time four of our members had removed, and two had been added to our numbers. Believing that if we could secure a public room for our meetings, we should, under the divine blessing, succeed in bringing the truth to operate upon some intelligent and honest minds and hearts, brother Bishop and the writer obtained the Temperance Hall, at a low rental, for Sunday evening meetings. The first meeting was held in the September of last year, since which time meetings have been held every Sunday evening, at which the

writer has lectured upon various subjects bearing upon the Kingdom and Name, to small but deeply attentive audiences, several of whom have manifested such an interest in the truth as will, we trust, ere long develop into obedience. The present members are as follow: Samuel Jackson, Ellen Jackson and Annie Fincher, late of the Derby ecclesia, England; ROBERT BROWN (44), manufacturer; JOHN BISHOP (34), soap boiler; ELIZA BISHOP (28), wife of brother Bishop; JOSEPH BROWN (31), bookkeeper, his wife, ANNIE JANE BROWN (24); AGNES BROWN (36), wife of brother R. Brown; BENJAMIN F. HARRISON (53), late mariner, his wife, ANNA HARRISON (35); ELEANOR WARNER (22); THOMAS THOMPSON (60), gardener; AMELIA KEARSWELL (28), teacher; REBECCA EVANS (36); and the writer, W. J. EVANS (36), builder. We have lost one brother by death, viz., brother A. Hunter. We are, I am glad to say, working lovingly and unitedly together, waiting for the Great Captain of our salvation.”

(June 1897) CHRISTCHURCH.—“We have lost by removal to Wellington, sister Lilly Morgan, daughter of our brother and sister Morgan. We commend her, with the blessing of God, to the Wellington ecclesia. We give a cordial welcome to brother and sister Challinor, who have returned to this ecclesia, after an absence of about three years, during which time they have sojourned in England. They have (D. V.) decided to settle permanently amongst us, and will prove a valuable addition. I am sorry to say we have had trouble, with the result that two meetings are now held. Those who are away from us now number about 12. With a view to bring about a re-union, we decided to adopt the Declaration as our Basis of Fellowship, with the result that some came back again. Those 12 who are now meeting apart from us, are averse to having any ‘Basis’ or formulated statement, as to what they believe. But we trust that by-and-bye these dear brethren and sisters, whom we esteem very highly, will change their views on this matter, and with the blessing of God, we shall yet meet together once more, ‘in the bonds of love and peace.’ We are now meeting upon ‘The First Principles of the Oracles of the Deity,’ as set forth in the propositions contained in the Declaration, and prefaced by this clause, viz., ‘That the Book currently known as the Bible, consisting of the Scriptures of Moses, the Prophets, and the Apostles, is the only source of knowledge concerning God and His purpose at present extant or available in the earth, and that the same were wholly given by inspiration of God in the *writers*, and are, consequently, without error in all parts of them, except such as may be due to errors in transcription or translation.’ This, then, is our ‘Basis of Fellowship,’ and we shall be pleased to welcome any brother or sister travelling this way, who can endorse the above.”—ALBERT LEES. [What we want as a basis of fellowship is *the truth*, and this, of course, requires statement. When men are clear as to the truth, they have no reserve in declaring it. When reserves arise as to the form of profession or confession, and especially when exception is taken to an explicit and sound definition, it is a symptom of something unsound. *The Declaration* was written as an exposition for the public, and not as a definition for fellowship. It is sound enough so far as it goes; but if it is adopted in preference to another, **which explicitly excludes errors that dangerously undermine the revealed basis of approach to God,** it might be that it is adopted **as a door of error and not** as a defence of the Faith. It all depends. It is not re-assuring to hear of men saying that God did not require the death of His Son, in the work of our salvation. Perhaps such men are not with the brethren. If it is supposed the *Declaration* is consistent with such a doctrine, then the *Declaration* is a poor basis of fellowship, though a useful demonstration of first principles.—ED.]

## ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED “*THE ECCLESIAL GUIDE*”

The *Ecclesial Guide* is a suggestion: not a mandate—which is not within the function of any (by Christ) unauthorised brother. It only becomes a rule when made such by an ecclesia adopting it: and even then it remains outside the structure of an ecclesia’s constitution. The ecclesia takes so much of it as pleases them, and makes it theirs. There must and there always will be rules of some sort in every body of people who have a collective and mutually-related existence. It is a question of rules that work for good or those that work for evil. If we could have apostolic bishops, it would be a relief: but where is the wisdom of playing at what we have not and cannot have unless God speak by the spirit? — From Ecclesial Notes; *The Christadelphian*, 1884, p. 426

(June 1884) WORCESTER (MASS.).—Brother Brigham writes to say that the brethren here are much pleased with the *Ecclesial Guide*. It would, he thinks, have been still more highly valued in the troublous times that have gone by. All here are endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. Brethren coming this way will find a welcome at 13, Mechanic’s Street, or 199, Union Street.

(September 1884) MUMBLES—Although for some few months no report has appeared from here as to our progress in the truth, we have not been idle. For some months past our attention has been directed to the question of adopting, or otherwise the “*Ecclesial Guide*.” The question of its adoption was settled by ballot in its favour, and the necessary modification having been made as to officers and numbers of same, &c., we have got into working order (under what may be termed the new dispensation). We find things going on smoothly and peacefully. All things should be done decently and in order, we therefore recommend our sister-ecclesias to adopt a uniform procedure in management, which would answer as a counterpart to our being able to agree on the faith with one voice. During last month also, the question of to baccho smoking and public-house visiting was brought before our managing brethren. After considerable conversation thereon, it was resolved to recommend the brethren not to smoke tobacco in the streets and public places, and to refrain from sitting down in publichouses. Since our last report, we have had our summer outing, both for ecclesia and Sunday School—the former at Langland, and the latter at Bracelet Bay, on which occasions we were favoured with fine weather, and an absence on the part of the brethren and sisters, of those unseemly amusements which characterise *all* Gentile outings. The enjoyment of our ecclesial outing was enhanced by the presence among us of brethren and sisters from Neath, Swansea, Llanelly, Abergavenny, Birmingham, and Dudley. A short meeting for upbuilding was held at the close of the tea, and address delivered, the word read, praises sung, and prayer offered to God, and we left strengthened in the “inner man.”

(January 1885) SYDENHAM (CHRISTCHURCH).—Brother Disher, renewing for the *Christadelphian* and *Children’s Magazine*, says: “I can assure you, both are eagerly looked for. The children are quite delighted with it. It seems to make the Bible both pleasant and instructive to them. I may also tell you that we are still meeting in the Odd Fellows Hall, Montreal Street, Sydenham. It is rather out of the way for lectures, but it is the best we can get at present. I am also pleased to tell you we have adopted the *Ecclesial Guide* as our basis of fellowship, with slight alterations to suit our small numbers, so that any brethren coming to New Zealand will know where we are.” Some of the brethren have had to go elsewhere to look for daily bread; those left behind have been making a special effort during the last few months. Brethren Morgan and Challinor have given several lectures on the kingdom promised and the immortality of the Bible. This last quarter we have been going through the thirteen lectures, as we have not sufficient brethren to keep up the lectures. Our Sunday School is getting on well; the elder ones are beginning to understand the truth.”



(January 1886) Lowell (MASS.).—On October 19<sup>th</sup> our ecclesia made increase by the baptism into Christ of Mr. WARREN H. CLOUGH (25), formerly Methodist. Brother Clough, after a careful study of the Scripture, firmly holds the doctrines defined in the ecclesial guide, and on the assurance of an infallible Bible will strengthen us in our public efforts to enlighten others. May God give us increase and preserve us unblamable until the day of Christ is our prayer.—SAMUEL EVISON

(February 1886) Corliss, Perham (Minn.).—Brother Samuel G. Wallace writes:—“You have probably heard of my name through brother Wilson, of Strathaven, Scotland. About five years ago he and I used to discuss the matters of religion—he for the Christadelphian, and I for the Evangelical Union Church. But for prejudice, I should have seen the light sooner. But thank God my eyes are opened. Christadelphianism harmonises the whole Bible. I did not know who would baptise me, seeing there were no brethren here; but an ex-Free Baptist minister, named Pettigrew, (now a brother in the hope of Israel), baptised me. I have a brother in the flesh about 35 miles from here. I paid him a visit, and found a young unmarried man at work for him, named John Grantham, who held the very same views as the Christadelphians. It made me feel glad. He was formerly a Roman Catholic in the State of New York, but got disgusted with their form of worship when he was but fifteen years old. He came out west to Minnesota and studied the Bible for himself, and a year past in June, he was baptised for the remission of sins. He joined himself to no church, and I was the first person of like faith with himself he had met. So he is going to settle beside me as soon as possible. That would form an ecclesia of three. Brother Petticrew is a good speaker. So I think it would be good to have him our presiding brother. We can hold meetings in farm houses around the township. We are all starting to clear up a farm, so that we are not over wealthy; but we are rich in the love of the Lord, and the hope of Israel. I received “the Ecclesia Guide” from brother W. H. Wilson, Strathaven, which will be our standard. We believe the Bible to be wholly inspired.”

(May 1886) Greytown (Natal).—Brother Rees reports the formation of an Ecclesia in Greytown. It is the result of earnest effort on the part of brother Thomas Fisher during the two years he has lived here. Brother Rees says he came here from Maritzburg on a visit to see brother Fisher, and to witness and give such help and advice as might be wanted. After an examination as to their knowledge of the truth, GEORGE VICKERS MILNER (55), of Binbrook, near Market Rasen, Lincolnshire, and his wife ELLEN MARIA MILNER (both formerly Baptists) were baptised into the sin-covering name. Sunday, March 7<sup>th</sup>, we met for the first time as an ecclesia for the breaking of bread. It was decided to make a proper beginning by adopting the constitution as on page 39 of the guide, and the same statement of doctrine on page 45 of the same book, but to meet the want of the times, we have added as a first article “That the original Scriptures were wholly inspired.” Without such a statement the rest of the articles would not have a sure foundation to rest upon. There are others very much interested and I hope before I return to Maritzburg to have the pleasure of writing to you of their putting on Christ.

(May 1886) Boston (Mass.). — Brother Trussler writes: “Through the resignation of brother Rileigh, I am appointed Recording Brother (pro. Tem.) for the Boston ecclesia. It gives me much pleasure to say that it is sound in doctrine and in good health, each one working with a will. There is also love and unity that binds us together in the bonds of peace. Myself and sister T., thank God for his kindness in placing us among such a body of believers who strive to do that which is right, and help each other on the way. Our endeavour is not only to preach the gospel, but to practice it (believing that actions speak louder than words). In about two years this ecclesia has increased from twenty-two to forty-two, and is still growing. I think the present fruitful state of it is the result of a never-tiring labour in the proclamation of the word of God, and the discipline obtained from the use of the *Guide*. You could feel almost as much at home here as in Birmingham” (brother Trussler used to belong to Birmingham—ED.) “Obedience was rendered on March 26<sup>th</sup> last by Miss IVA VAN TASSEL (27), daughter of sister Mary Van Tassel, of this ecclesia. We meet in Chandlier Hall, 18, Essex Street, Boston.

(Excerpt from A Run to Ireland) neighbourhood of Belfast, but receiving the truth during a stay of some years in Scotland). Finding on his removal that there was no body in Belfast taking its stand upon the whole truth, unadulterated by the crotchets and speculations which have sprung up with a thick luxuriance since Dr. Thomas first called attention to the law and to the testimony, he set to work to make the most of the situation he found. He attended the meetings of the Conditional Immortalists, who comprised some men of honest and thoughtful mind, to whom, in his intercourse, he gradually introduced “the way of God more perfectly,” conversing and giving books to read. In the end a few received the truth (and in some cases were baptised) but without dissociating themselves from the religious organizations to which they belonged. There were one or two exceptions,—men who recongised and accepted the obligation of thorough going identification with the cause of the truth. With these, brother Maxwell oranised a small ecclesia on the basis of the *Guide*.

(September 1886) Lanesville (Va.)—The following is the document which was held over from last month for want of space:—

*Reiteration of the Doctrines endorsed by the present Membership of the Lanesville Christadelphian Ecclesia since its disintegration and division, February 15th, 1886.*

*We, the undersigned, having been mercifully called out from among the Gentiles as a people for Yahweh’s Name, and having accepted the call by “obeying from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered unto us, being then made free from sin and become the servants of righteousness, we should have our fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life.”—“Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever”—and having thus purified our souls by obeying the truth, through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren,” we do most earnestly desire the loving unity and fellowship with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ, and with all, in every country, and in every place who are *one in Christ*, and “for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren,” and who, in the aggregate, constitute “the ecclesia of Christ, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.” These, and these alone, can take the Christadelphian name, and with these, and these alone, we desire fraternal fellowship. And, wishing to record more in detail the principles and “form of doctrines” we believe and accept, we hereby declare:—*

1.—That we believe and accept the truth that all Scripture, as originally given, was given by the inspiration of God, and is consequently infallible, being profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, tha the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished into all good works—that a wholly inspired and infallible Bible is the word of the living God, upon which alone our faith, hope, and love are based.

2.—To save labour in writing out in detail, we will say that we accept as the doctrines of the Bible, “The statement of the doctrines forming the Christadelphian basis of fellowship,” which may be found on pages 45 to 49 of the *Ecclesial Guide*, published by Robert Roberts, Editor of the *Christadelphian*, Birmingham, England; and that we accept the *Ecclesial Guide* as a *general rule* in the conduct of the branch of the true ecclesial vine which we desire to represent, subject, however, to such suitable modification as we may deem proper in one branch of the “True Vine.”

3.—We believe and accept the teaching of Jesus that we “are not of the world” but being taken out from among the Gentiles, we are cut out of Daniel’s “*mountain*, ” Jeremiah’s “*destroying mountain*, ” and Zechariah’s “*great mountain*, ” to form the stone kingdom, and having put off our Gentile nationality when we put off the old man and put on the new man, which is Christ, we change our nationality and citizenship each one becoming a “Hebrew of the Hebrews,” no longer an “alien from the commonwealth of Israel and a stranger from the covenants of promis,”—“no more strangers and foreigners,” but “fellow

citizens with the saints and of the household of God.” *Therefore*, Christadelphians, having changed their nationality and citizenship do not register as citizens of Gentile commonwealths, nor voice their will in Gentile politics. They “are come to the ecclesia of the first born, enrolled, (or registered) in heaven,” (Heb. 12.) and their citizenship, or commonwealth is in heaven out of which also they wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, (Phil. 3.)

4.—We believe and accept the truth that no true Christadelphian ecclesia can exist without the keeping of the commandments of Christ, as a rule of life, especially the two great commandments upon which hang all the law and the prophets and which embrace the love of God, the love of Christ, the love of his brethren, and the love toward your neighbour, “which is the fulfilling of the law.”

5.—We believe if any man consent not to the above sound doctrine, and the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus, he cannot be a member of the ecclesia of Christ, and if already one by profession, the commandment is imperative, “From such withdraw thyself.”

6.—Should there be uprising of the *flesh* in the ecclesia, such as bitterness, wrath, anger, clamour, and evil speaking, with all malice, it must be put away at once, by withdrawal from it, for the ecclesia can have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.

7.—“Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy, for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.” “Ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if it be so, that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his” (Rom. 8:9).

(February 1889) NEW BRIGHTON.—The ecclesia meets in the Odd-fellow’s Hall, Colombo Road, Sydenham. There are no immersions to report. The meeting has been changed from the ground floor to the proverbial upper room, to make room for the “Rinking Mania.” The basis of fellowship, on the lines of the suggestions in the *Ecclesial Guide* has been adopted. Brother Wilstead has returned to New Brighton, in the hope of improved circumstances, enabling him to settle down there. The ecclesia loses the company and kindly co-operation of sister Flavel, jun., through her marriage with brother Neal, of Napier, where she has gone to reside. The brethren feel cheered by the appearance from Sydney of the local monthly paper, *The Messenger of the Ecclesias*.

## ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED THE “BIRMINGHAM STATEMENT OF FAITH”

Before dispersion, there was introduced to notice, on behalf of the managing brethren, a pamphlet prepared for the ecclesia, containing a verified statement of the faith; a scripturally supported specification of the fables to be refused, an enumeration of the arrangements adopted for the guidance of ecclesial affairs, the various meetings held, with a statement of their objects and mode of procedure, the names and duties of official brethren; and a list of the names and addresses of the brethren and sisters, constituting a complete “Record of the Birmingham Christadelphian Ecclesia.” The pamphlet extends over 34 pages, of a size convenient for the pocket, and is issued at 4d. Brethren at a distance can be supplied should they so desire. — *The Christadelphian*, 1868, p. 22

(Excerpt from November 1872) ROCHESTER (N. Y.). —We adopted the order of the Birmingham ecclesia, on April 29<sup>th</sup>, 1871, and have found it work better than any other system of order ever tried among us.”

(Excerpt from March 1876) WALKERTON.—Brother Gunn writes as follows: I am sure that you will be rejoiced to learn that in this town, in which I have spent seven years in solitude, in the truth, an ecclesia has at length been organised. In November, 1874, brother Thomas Adamson, of New Hamburg, Co. of Waterloo, whom you met there and at Summerfield, removed to this place with his family, his wife and four of his daughters being baptised members of the one body. In consequence of the disturbing influences existing elsewhere, it was deemed advisable that we should meet informally for some time, which we did in brother Adamson's house, where, during the winters of 1874–5, I delivered a course of lectures on the important subjects that have engaged so much attention of late, in England and America, and respecting which so many who commenced to run well, have made melancholy shipwreck of their faith. Occasionally strangers came to hear, to whom we discoursed on the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, or elements of the gospel. In the month of May, 1875, we formed an ecclesia, the members being brother T. Adamson; sisters, Lydia Adamson, his wife; Hannah Adamson, Sarah Adamson, Elizabeth Adamson and Mary Ann Adamson, his daughters; Mrs. Harriet Oakley, late of Cheltenham, England, and myself. Afterwards, on July 28, we unanimously adopted the basis or statement of the One Faith, drawn up and adopted by the Birmingham ecclesia in 1871, together with the statement of fables set forth in the *Record* of that year, to be rejected.

(Excerpt from April 1876) SWANSEA.—The brethren here have adopted and printed the statement of the one faith appearing in the *Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia* of 1874–5. They have been compelled to take this step on account of the advocacy of unscriptural views in their midst. The step has resulted in the separation of the Goldie family, and one or two others. Brother Randles, in communicating this result, while deeply regretting it, says the step has been forced upon them in defence of the purity of the faith and the name of the Son of God.

(July 1877) OLDHAM.—Brother Hatton reports that the brethren here have adopted the Birmingham basis of fellowship. They number six: brother and sister Clalford, brother Watson and sister Watson, and brother and sister Hatton, earnestly waiting the appearing of the Master, and praying that they may find acceptance at his hands.

(Excerpt from April 1879) SWANSEA.— At a meeting of the Agricultural Hall brethren, called to consider the advisability of bringing about an amalgamation between the Agricultural and Oxford Street meetings, it was decided, in order to remove all future doubts and misunderstandings, to require as a condition of such amalgamation, that every one taking part in it should besides adopting the faith as defined in the Birmingham statement, declare his entire rejection of the doctrine that Christ was free from the effects of Adam's transgression; and of the doctrine that Christ's obedience was not the result of his own voluntary will. When all are prepared to make this declaration, amalgamation may ensue."

(Excerpt from June 1879) SWANSEA.— All the brethren and sisters constituting the Oxford Street ecclesia, have signed the following declaration: "We, the undersigned, members of the ecclesia meeting in Oxford Street, Swansea, declare that we meet upon the one faith, as defined in the Birmingham statement, and at the same time declare that we entirely reject the doctrine that Christ was free from the effects of Adam's transgression, and also the doctrine that Christ's obedience was not the results of his own voluntary will; we feel called upon to make this declaration in order that no uncertainty may exist in the minds of brethren at a distance, and who may wish to fraternise with us when at any time they should visit Swansea."

(July 1879) SKEWEN.—John Morgan, Margaret Morgan, Joseph Eldridge, and Elizabeth Eddon have adopted and signed the declaration adopted by the Oxford Street brethren in Swansea [Compiler's Note: See excerpt above], as appearing in the intelligence from that place last month.

(Excerpt from March 1880) BLACKPOOL.—Brother R. Davies writes: “I am happy to inform you that the brethren here have succeeded in forming an ecclesia upon the Birmingham basis, the first meeting of which was held on Sunday, February 1<sup>st</sup>, 1880, at the house of brother J. Greenhalgh, 4, Albert Terrace, North Shore, where we shall continue to meet for the present.

(Excerpt from September 1880) KIDDERMINSTER.—Brother Bland reports (his report was too late for insertion last month): “During the past month we have been arranging the affairs of our ecclesia in a more satisfactory manner. Rules have been formed for the guidance of the ecclesia, and adopted at a meeting held for that purpose, and we have agreed that our membership shall be based upon the ‘Statement of Faith’ adopted by the Birmingham ecclesia. Officers have also been elected for the remainder of the year. A book club is about to be commenced for those to whom it will be convenient, and we have agreed to take the *Christadelphian* yearly, for the use of those members who cannot afford to purchase it themselves. I am sorry to state that the Sunday afternoon class for the study of Eureka has had to be given up—at least during the summer months—partly because of the lack of interest manifested and partly because, in this part of the vineyard, ‘the labourers are few.

(Excerpt from October 1880) LEICESTER.— In addition to withdrawals notified in my last, our number has been further reduced by the removal of brother Robinson to Sheffield, sister Cooper to Philadelphia, U.S.A., and sister Farmer, who has been united in marriage to brother Curry, to Bristol. The ecclesia has decided upon thorough reorganisation, and has adopted the rules in force in Birmingham<sup>2</sup>, with the modifications required by local circumstances.

(Excerpt from November 1880) LLANDEGLA. — Brother Lawton reports the formation of an ecclesia at this place, “on the Birmingham basis of faith.”

(February 1882) SYDNEY.—Brother Hawkins reports the obedience of ARCHER O’TOOLE (18) and LAURENCE O’TOOLE (20), sons of Brother and Sister O’Toole, JOHN EVAN GOFF (48), formerly lay preacher in a “Gospel Tent” (an auxiliary mission); he was very difficult to convince that his gospel was not the Gospel of God, but at last he saw the light; JULIA GOFF (22), daughter of the above, and HENRY HOWELL (32), son of Bro. D. Howell. (These cases of obedience were reported in a previous communication, but in some way overlooked.) Since our last writing, MARGARET REID (24), now wife of Brother W. Ferguson, and, lastly, SUSAN KENNEDY (40), have obeyed the truth.

Our number has also been increased by various removals to Sydney, viz., Brother R. G. Burton, from Dunedin, N.Z.; Brother and Sister J. S. Hawkins, from Burrawang, N. S. W.; Brother Samuel Hawkins, from the same place; and Brother W. H. Payne, and Sisters S. A. and L. S. Bower, from Birmingham, who safely arrived here September 22<sup>nd</sup>. So the Sydney ecclesia now numbers over fifty souls, and our basis of fellowship is identical with that of the Birmingham ecclesia. We still meet at the Masonic Temple, Clarence Street, morning and evening.

(July 1882) ABERGAVENNY—There is a small ecclesia, numbering about thirty, at this place, meeting in the Christadelphian Synagogue, erected by themselves, some two or three years since. Believing that the “Declaration” sets forth, in a concise form, the leading features of the faith which justifies, and, accepting

---

<sup>2</sup> Interpreted specifically this references the ecclesia’s constitution but is suggestive that the BSF was also adopted.

this as an epitome of their basis of fellowship, there has for some time past been a growing desire on their part to be in co-operation with the brethren and sisters of whom the *Christadelphian* is the recognized periodical. This has now taken a definite shape. Brother Henry Turner, of Birmingham, being in the neighbourhood, on his business rounds, met the leading brethren, by appointment, and, after some conversation, there was found to be no barrier to fellowship. He, therefore, broke bread with them, on Sunday, May 20, and lectured in the evening to a good audience. The ecclesia will be glad if any lecturing brethren passing to or from South Wales, *via* Abergavenny, will call.—W. BEDDOES.

(Excerpt from March 1882) BARROW-IN-FURNESS—There have been friends of the truth in this place for a long time, but for years past they have been in sympathy with what we are obliged, for the sake of distinction, to speak of as Renunciationism—now nearly defunct. This has operated as a barrier to that cordial co-operation which is at all times desirable among those who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. There has now come a change. Brother Butler, writing for the rest, says they have been in a transition state for some time, and have at last “taken a determined stand in favour of the truth as expounded in the pages of the *Christadelphian*. At a meeting of the ecclesia, held on the 20<sup>th</sup> of January, it was decided to cut off all connection with the party represented by the “Christian Lamp,” and to adopt the basis of fellowship of the Birmingham Ecclesia, meeting in the Temperance Hall. We were almost ripe for such an arrangement, though it might have been delayed for some little time, but a visit from Brother D. Clement, of Mumbles, precipitated matters. He came here at our invitation, in order to assist us against the ‘Rev.’ W. Briscoe, who was advertised to deliver the course of lectures which he had given at Mumbles. In justice both to Brother Clement and ourselves, it may be said that we assured him before he came, that we agreed with him on the sacrifice of Christ, so that the way was prepared for us coming to an amicable arrangement. We are thankful that he did come, and also for the manner in which he brought affairs to a successful issue. Bro. Roberts is aware of what transpired, and knows that everything was done that was necessary to put us on a proper foundation.

(May 1882) GREAT BRIDGE—We have been encouraged by the following additions to our number, by induction into the sin-covering name in baptism, *viz.*, Mr. and Mrs. DENNY, formerly Campbellites, and EDWARD GRIFFITHS (30), miller, formerly neutral. We have made a special effort to set forth the truth by two week night lectures, on March 28 and 31, by Bro. Roberts and Bro. Shuttleworth, of Birmingham. The former was attended by a very good audience, but on the second evening there was a sad falling off. Our Sunday evening lectures continue to be well attended.

On Easter Monday, we took advantage of a general holiday to hold a social gathering of the ecclesias meeting at Bilston, Dudley, Great Bridge, and Wolverhampton. We met together at 3 o’clock, and spent two hours before tea in a very profitable manner, in conversation on the truth. At 5 o’clock, 93 brethren and sisters sat down to tea, a goodly number being present from Birmingham. After tea, a most enjoyable meeting was held. The brethren have adopted the Birmingham rules of fellowship, with such alterations as their different circumstances require.—W. H. HARDY.

(May 1882) SYDNEY.—Sister Wood, in a letter to Sister Roberts, of Birmingham, says: “There is an idea elsewhere that there are two ecclesias here, one in Balmain, the other in Sydney, which is not correct. We all meet together in the ‘Masonic Temple,’ Clarence-street, Sydney. It is true a great portion of the brethren live in Balmain, but you will understand better when I explain to you that Balmain holds about the same position to Sydney that Birkenhead does to Liverpool, only that the distance between is greater, for we have to start about an hour before the time of the meeting, to be punctual. About a quarter of that time we travel by a steamer, and the remainder of the time is taken up by getting to and from the boat. We number about fifty, with Brother J. J. Hawkins as secretary, and all form their faith upon the Bible truths, as contained in the ‘Birmingham statement of the faith,’ and judging by the principle that Christ lays down, ‘by their works ye may know them,’ some are, indeed, walking very worthily of their high

vocation, and seem to make everything subservient to the one object, *God's will*. I mention this, for I know it is very encouraging to know that thousands of miles away there are other parts of the body in harmony with the mind of Christ. Two or three of our recent additions have lectured, these last few weeks, on Sunday nights, and so relieve Brothers Hawkins and Bayliss, who have had the brunt of all the work up till lately. We all live a good distance from the place of meeting, but we consider it as central as any place we could get, and a good place for the proclamation of the truth, but I am sorry to say that we have but few that come to hear, and those that come are, almost without exception, brought through the private exertions of the brethren and lending of books, and not through advertisements of lectures.”

(January 1883) NIAGARA (KY).—Brother J. W. Griffin writes:—“About twelve months ago Brother G. P. Pruitt, of Cairo, wrote a short but correct statement of our condition, some denying the name Christadelphian, some denying the appearance of the unjust at first resurrection, many not understanding question of resurrection and judgment, and more pretending to understand but denying the truth. We endured this state of things too long, from weakness and for peace. “The wisdom that is from above is first true, then peaceable.” Some of us (16) finding no peace in companionship, with error have withdrawn and oranised upon the Birmingham statement of faith, and are determined with the Father’s help to try to be one as our Adam brother prayed we should, and ‘Pray the God of patience and consolation grant us to be likeminded one towards another according to Christ Jesus’ that we may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

(February 1883) SPOTTSVILLE (KY.)—Brother R. C. Green writes:—Dr. Thomas introduced the truth here some 30 years ago. The good seed soon sprang up, and prospered till the no judgment doctrine came. This caused great trouble among the brethren at the time, and came very near destroying the influence of the truth in a public way. A few, however, remained who, though not in harmony, continued to meet and break bread. A great effort was made on the part of some to hush the matter and prevent further discussion, and thus things have remained, with only an occasional outbreak, until recently. The question of the nature of Jesus, which created so much trouble in England in “1873,” created some little stir, but was not regarded as a matter of much importance, the brethren for the most part, however, inclining to the free life theory. Since “1879,” the two subjects have again been brought before the ecclesia, causing some of us to resolve to unite ourselves on a surer basis of fellowship. With a view to this end, on the eighth of October, 1882, an agreement was presented to the brethren, setting forth that we, the undersigned, agree that the (published) statement of the “one faith” upon which the Birmingham ecclesia is founded, is true and Scriptural, and that the fables specified therein should be rejected, that the above should constitute the basis of fellowship among believers of the truth, and that we hereby withdraw from fellowship with all who will not endorse the above by signing this agreement. This was signed by Jas. W. Griffin, L. M. Griffin, E. J. Griffin, A. T. Green, W. J. Green, R. C. Green, Mary J. Griffin, Sallie E. Lester, Patsie M. Griffin, E. W. Pruitt, Elizabeth Butler, Virginia A. Butler, Sue F. Green, Bettie Cosby, Oma Griffin, J. E. Griffin, W. J. Connaway, G. P. Pruitt. Since the recent agitation previously mentioned, the following named brethren, becoming dissatisfied with their former immersion, have been reimmersed: J. E. Griffin, Jas. W. Griffin, E. J. Griffin, G. P. Pruitt, E. W. Pruitt, Elizabeth Butler, Virginia A. Butler, Bettie Cosby, Omia Griffin. Brother Jas. W. Griffin, who has been a devout member of the ecclesia since its earliest existence, made a very interesting and impressive address at the water’s edge, explanatory of his present action. Brother Pruitt and Sister Elizabeth Butler expressed themselves in a similar manner privately.

(March 1883) BOSTON (MASS).—Brother Mackellar reports the return of Brother Edmund Edgecomb; also Brother Philip Brown, who came from Edinburgh, Scotland, nine months ago, but who was led to believe that we were not sound in doctrine, and that there were among us certain that were not fit to associate with. “Brother Brown has come to the conclusion that his informers have been misleading him, and he now rejoices in being united to the body of Christ in Boston; also Sister Elizabeth Seaborn, who met with us on Sunday for the first time since her return from Canada. We are truly grateful to the Deity

for the above results, especially as there has been an enemy among us who have tried to cause schism. We are keeping the truth before the Boston public. Several are reading *Twelve Lectures*. We have adopted the statement and basis of fellowship of Birmingham, as the rules, with slight alterations, are better suited to our circumstances.”

(August 1885) Redfern.—Bro. R. G. Burton reports that about fifteen brethren and sisters are now meeting at the New Masonic Hall, Castlereagh-street. On May 6<sup>th</sup> they immersed into the sin-covering name HARRY WARADLE (22), after an intelligent statement by him of his belief. As a body and individually they endorse the “Statement of Faith” in use at Birmingham, but in amplification of that have added as follows: “We believe the Bible to be the inspired word of God, and the only safe guide in all matters of faith and practice; also, that Light or Knowledge brings responsibility; by which we mean that those who may come to an understanding of the Gospel preached by Jesus and his apostles and recorded in the Scriptures, will if disobedient to the divine commands, be raised and punished; and, further, a clause declaring that it is inconsistent for a “saint” to have any fellowship with the political, municipal, or religious systems of the day.

(January 1886) Great Bridge.—Brother W. H. Mosley writes as follows:—“The brethren and sisters meeting at Brother Hollier’s house in Farley Street, Great Bridge, have separated themselves from Great Bridge ecclesia meeting in the Odd Fellows’ Hall, Great Bridge, and are now meeting on exactly the same basis as the Temperance Hall ecclesia, respecting inspiration and fellowship. Our action has been taken with great reluctance and after a careful and serious consideration, holding forth every possible consistent means to prevent the same. Signed on behalf of the aforesaid brethren and sisters, W. H. MOSLEY.” At the same time, Brother Hardy reports that the following resolution was passed by the Great Bridge ecclesia, at its annual business meeting, on December 14<sup>th</sup>:—“That we believe the Scriptures (viz, all the books of the Old and New Testaments) were in all parts of them given by inspiration of God; and that we cannot offer fellowship to any who hold the doctrine of partial inspiration.” He adds a P.S., which probably indicates, though it does not state the explanation of this (to those at a distance) puzzling state of things. The P.S. is this: “Our intention in carrying out the above is not to cut off whole ecclesias, but to test for ourselves all who present themselves for fellowship with us.”

(April 1886) Halifax, (N.S.)—Brother Mitchell writes:—“For some few years, on each first day, we have met privately in our own houses to break bread and to exhort one another. At first there were only two of us; now, our number is eight and feeling that something should be done to bring the truth before the public we decided to rent a Hall, so as to have our ecclesial duties performed in a more public manner that the alien might be invited, and feel at liberty to come and hear the Truth, as it is in Jesus, read and expounded in a very humble manner perhaps, but in harmony with the oracles of God. We rejoice in the knowledge of the glorious truth, and we feel it our duty to bear testimony to it and to be witnesses for it, in our day and generation knowing that the time is very short to labour now. “The times of the Gentiles” are fast drawing to a close. The number God is taking out of them for His name will soon be complete, and then comes our gathering to the judgment seat for our Lord’s approval. May our heavenly Father grant us grace and wisdom, that we may patiently endure all trials, and not faint, but “labour for His name’s sake, knowing that our labour is not in vain in the Lord.” Our ecclesia is composed of the following persons: — Brother David Brown, brother Charles Rusted, sister Rusted, Sister Coleman, sister Mitchell, brother F. R. Moreash, brother F. F. Stevens, brother Edward F. Mitchell. Sister Coleman, on account of her advanced age (88 years), is unable to meet with us, but she remembers the Lord Jesus in the appointed way, each first day at her own home. Our basis of fellowship is the “Birmingham Statement of the Faith,” and believing the Scriptures in every part of them are given by inspiration of God. “That the man of God may be perfect—thoroughly furnished,” etc., etc. The address of our hall is “Mumford’s (late Oddfellow’s) Hall, Argyle Street. Faithful brethren holding to the *Statement of the Faith* above given will be most gladly welcomed.”



(May 1886) Melbourne.—Brother Chas. Tucker writes: “I am instructed by the brethren in Williamstown to write to inform you that the undermentioned brethren and sisters have withdrawn themselves from the Melbourne ecclesia, and have formed themselves into an ecclesia in Williamstown, meeting at brother Gee’s house for the present—Brother and sister Tucker, brother and sister Gee, brother and sister Nunnerley (formerly of Liverpool ecclesia), brother and sister Pearce, sister Jackson, and sister Fincher. We have decided to fellowship no one but those who hold the entire inspiration of the Bible, and can endorse the statements of faith as laid down by the Birmingham ecclesia.”

(May 1886) Greytown (Natal).—Brother Rees reports the formation of an Ecclesia in Greytown. It is the result of earnest effort on the part of brother Thomas Fisher during the two years he has lived here. Brother Rees says he came here from Maritzburg on a visit to see brother Fisher, and to witness and give such help and advice as might be wanted. After an examination as to their knowledge of the truth, GEORGE VICKERS MILNER (55), of Binbrook, near Market Rasen, Lincolnshire, and his wife ELLEN MARIA MILNER (both formerly Baptists) were baptised into the sin-covering name. Sunday, March 7<sup>th</sup>, we met for the first time as an ecclesia for the breaking of bread. It was decided to make a proper beginning by adopting the constitution as on page 39 of the guide, and the same statement of doctrine on page 45 of the same book, but to meet the want of the times, we have added as a first article “That the original Scriptures were wholly inspired.” Without such a statement the rest of the articles would not have a sure foundation to rest upon. There are others very much interested and I hope before I return to Maritzburg to have the pleasure of writing to you of their putting on Christ.

(June 1887) Hartlepool.—Brother J. Monaghan writes:—“Since brother J. T. Irwin came to Haverton Hill from America, last August, we have visited each other pretty often; and about six weeks ago brother George McMillin came to the same place from Greenock, Scotland. So long as we are in the vicinity we intend to meet to celebrate our Lord’s death until He comes. We can only do so at present once a fortnight, as Haverton Hill is distant from Hartlepool about 12 miles. I can go to Haverton Hill one fortnight, and they can come down here another. We broke bread in Hartlepool on the 24th of April, and at Haverton Hill on the 8th of May. We endorse the same belief as the Birmingham ecclesia, and any brother coming this way will be made welcome, if he is of the same mind, only they should write before coming, to know which of the places the meeting will be at. Brother Irwin’s address is Haverton Hill, and mine 24, Middlegate Street, Hartlepool. I can assure you, although our numbers are small, it is a great benefit to us to meet together to exhort each other, and so much the more as we see the day approaching.”

(Excerpt from March 1888) LEEDS -Afterwards, a number separated from the Albion Street meeting, and formed a meeting in Wellington Road, on the basis of the statement of faith accepted by the Birmingham Ecclesia, and the complete inspiration of the Scriptures.

(February 1883) SPOTTSVILLE (KY.)—Brother R. C. Green writes:—Dr. Thomas introduced the truth here some 30 years ago. The good seed soon sprang up, and prospered till the no judgment doctrine came. This caused great trouble among the brethren at the time, and came very near destroying the influence of the truth in a public way. A few, however, remained who, though not in harmony, continued to meet and break bread. A great effort was made on the part of some to hush the matter and prevent further discussion, and thus things have remained, with only an occasional outbreak, until recently. The question of the nature of Jesus, which created so much trouble in England in “1873,” created some little stir, but was not regarded as a matter of much importance, the brethren for the most part, however, inclining to the free life theory. Since “1879,” the two subjects have again been brought before the ecclesia, causing some of us to resolve to unite ourselves on a surer basis of fellowship. With a view to this end, on the eighth of October, 1882, an agreement was presented to the brethren, setting forth that we, the undersigned, agree that the (published) statement of the “one faith” upon which the Birmingham ecclesia is founded, is true and Scriptural, and that the fables specified therein should be rejected, that the above should constitute the

basis of fellowship among believers of the truth, and that we hereby withdraw from fellowship with all who will not endorse the above by signing this agreement. This was signed by Jas. W. Griffin, L. M. Griffin, E. J. Griffin, A. T. Green, W. J. Green, R. C. Green, Mary J. Griffin, Sallie E. Lester, Patsie M. Griffin, E. W. Pruitt, Elizabeth Butler, Virginia A. Butler, Sue F. Green, Bettie Cosby, Oma Griffin, J. E. Griffin, W. J. Connaway, G. P. Pruitt. Since the recent agitation previously mentioned, the following named brethren, becoming dissatisfied with their former immersion, have been reimmersed: J. E. Griffin, Jas. W. Griffin, E. J. Griffin, G. P. Pruitt, E. W. Pruitt, Elizabeth Butler, Virginia A. Butler, Bettie Cosby, Omia Griffin. Brother Jas. W. Griffin, who has been a devout member of the ecclesia since its earliest existence, made a very interesting and impressive address at the water's edge, explanatory of his present action. Brother Pruitt and Sister Elizabeth Butler expressed themselves in a similar manner privately.

(July 1888) MIDDLESBORO-After the immersions reported last month we held a meeting for organization for ecclesial work, which we effected by adopting the statement of faith of the Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia, as the basis of fellowship. On these conditions we were joined on Sunday, June 10th, by brother and sister James McGraw, formerly of Dudley, and brother William Mullen, of Irvine, Scotland. These additions, with brother Monaghan, of East Hartlepool, who meets with us once a fortnight, bring our number to eight. We are meeting in the house of brother Hunter, No. 3, Clarence Street, Haverton Hill, for the present.—S. ROBINSON.

(September 1889) NOTTINGHAM- Brother Joseph Stone writes:—"We have had an addition to our number by the removal of sister Fellows from Oldham, who is now meeting with us. We have adopted a constitution on the lines of the one used by the Birmingham Temperance Hall ecclesia, containing rules for the effectual working of the ecclesia in harmony with the commandments and precepts laid down in the Word, the *Statement of the Faith* forming our basis of fellowship—naming the doctrines to be rejected—and the most prominent commandments of Christ. We are having a number printed, so that each brother and sister will have a copy."

(January 1891) CANNOCK (*See DUDLEY.*)-Brother Jackson reports that the following have been compelled to make a stand in defence of the entire inspiration and infallibility of the Bible:—Brother and sister S. Dawes, brother and sister Jackson, senior (the latter after several weeks neutrality), brother and sister Jackson, junior, brother and sister Barker, sister Morgan, sister Cooper, brother Rider. These have made the Birmingham statement their basis of fellowship, and are meeting at brother Jackson's house to remember Christ and to help one another in the race for life. Brother Jackson says: "The result is a trying and sorrowful one, supplemented as it is by a trial of (especially to myself) a far more searching character. I allude to the sudden death at the Birmingham tea meeting of the one who has shared my joys and sorrows and been my companion in the truth for about 17 years, which event happened only a few days after she had decided not to tolerate corrupt doctrines concerning the Scriptures. The blow is a staggering one to me, and requires a supreme effort of faith in the reality of the 'far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory' to enable me to look upon it as a 'light affliction.'"

(April 1891) BALLARAT. — Brother J. C. Gamble reports the immersion of WALTER AUSTIN DALTON (26), on Sunday morning, January 11th, and the arrival in Ballarat of brother Kenny, from Melbourne. This, says brother Gamble, is the first we have gained by transfer. On January 15th, we met and formed ourselves into an ecclesia, re-endorsing our statement of faith, which is the same as is adopted in the Birmingham constitution, and consequently we maintain a wholly-inspired bible. We start with 13 members, and are not without hope of others embracing the truth. We are meeting opposition, of course. We are denounced from the pulpit downwards "by those who speak evil of those things they understand not," but we are taking action to remove the evil impressions. We have not commenced public addresses, but we publicly invite all to come and hear and consider the truths we are entrusted to proclaim. For a considerable time past we have had two bible classes during the week, whilst on Sunday evenings we

have been reviewing the historic incidents in connection with the cities of Palestine, in which we have a very interesting and profitable study, well-suited to both brethren and friends.—J. C. GAMBLE.

(March 1892)LEEDS-*Wellington Road*.—I have much pleasure in reporting another addition by the baptism in water of WILLIAM KINGHORN (23), formerly Church of England. He was immersed on Sunday, February 7th, and received into fellowship the same day. The ecclesia have drawn up a book of rules and “Basis of Faith,” mostly taken from the one in use at Birmingham; a copy of which may be had by any ecclesia by applying to Secretary, 129, Camp Road, Leeds. Our lectures for the month have been:—February 7th, “The Eternal Purpose” (brother Soothill); 14th, “Where shall we spend Eternity?” (brother Jas. Briggs); 21st, “Baptism” (brother Thos. Howe); 28th, “Life alone in Christ” (brother Z. Drake). The meetings are fairly well attended at present, and we trust our feeble efforts may be instrumental in leading some to take an interest in the things of God.—G. B. SUGGITT.

(April 1892) GUELPH (Ontario). — Brother C. H. Evans announces “the baptism, on February 4th, of GEORGE SUNLEY (25),” also “the death of sister Harriet Tolton, *née* Haives, wife of brother Benjamin Tolton, at the early age of 24, primarily through the dreadful disease diphtheria, contracted from her infant, who had died a few days previously. While sincerely sorrowing with the bereaved, we cannot but reflect that those falling asleep in Christ are removed from much evil existing in the present constitution of sin, where the sight of the eyes and the hearing of the ears is only painful, and that continually made the more apparent and intense in proportion as the word of Truth and righteousness is apprehended. May I state, also, that the few believers here meet on the basis of ‘the Truth,’ as epitomised in the Birmingham Statement of Faith, and so faithfully upheld and contended for in the *Christadelphian*. (This is to avoid misunderstanding by those seeking our fellowship.) We rejoice exceedingly in the company of Christ’s faithful ones at all times.”

(March 1893) ABERDARE—On Sunday, January 15th, a lecture in the afternoon on “Earth or Sky: which will be the everlasting abode of the righteous,” and in the evening on “The Bible Hell: do the scriptures teach the eternal torment of the wicked.” Our little hall was filled with an attentive audience at both meetings, and we secured the insertion of a report in a local weekly, in which a lively correspondence (now stopped) has for some time been carried on anent “The Doctrine of Hell.” We had the company of sister Lander, of Treorky, at the breaking on bread. We have adopted the Birmingham basis of fellowship, and a code of rules, and the writer having been appointed recording brother, communications intended for the ecclesia should be addressed to him as follows:—GEORGE HOBBS, 12, Griffith Street, Aberdare, South Wales.

(June 1893) FAIRFIELD.—I write to inform you that as there are several brethren and sisters living in this neighbourhood, being from 18 to 20 miles from Sydney, we have formed an ecclesia at Fairfield some few months ago. We meet on the basis of the Birmingham Statement of Faith. We believe in a wholly inspired Bible, and have no sympathy with the age restrictions that some would impose on candidates for baptism, nor with the idea of excluding strangers from our meetings. We are in fellowship with and visit the Leichardt ecclesia. The names of the brethren and sisters forming our little ecclesia are:—Brother and sister Barton, now on a visit to England, sister Louie Barton, brother and sister Killip, sister Maberley, of Fairfield, sister Brinkman, of Guildford, sisters Lane, and brother and sister Wood (late of Birmingham), Canbez Vale. On 26th of January we spent a profitable time with the Leichardt ecclesia at the house of brother Killip, Fairfield, as a farewell gathering to brother and sister Barton. We had Bible readings, earnest exhortations, singing and prayer.—F. R. WOOD.

(Excerpt from September 1894) OLDHAM—For some time past we have been revising our “Constitution” (or Rules), and have now completed and printed same together with our “Basis of Fellowship and Epitome of the Commandments of Christ.” We have always adhered to the Birmingham

Basis, and our constitution is also on the lines of the Birmingham ecclesia, so far as it is applicable to a much smaller meeting like ours.

(November 1895) CARLINGHOW—Sister Hayes, my eldest son and daughter, along with myself, have formed ourselves into an ecclesia here on the Birmingham basis. Meetings for breaking of bread at my house—Sundays, 2.45 p.m.; Sunday evening, for consideration of Scriptures, 6 o'clock. We shall be glad of the fellowship of any of like precious faith who may come this way. My address is:—W. G. HAYES, Station House, Carlinghow, near Batley, Yorks.

(May 1896) WANGANUI (N.Z.).—We are pleased to report the obedience of three to the requirements of the truth by immersion: ANNIE MOTLEY (18), ELLEN GOLDSACK (26), and B.MARY TAYLOR (17), the last-named being the youngest daughter of brother and sister A. Taylor. We held a special meeting on

November 11th, formally adopting the Birmingham basis of faith as the basis of the Wanganui ecclesia.<sup>3</sup> Since writing the above we have had the pleasure of assisting one more to obey the command of our Lord, Miss MOON being baptised on December 29th, 1895. We have had our brother Roberts amongst us, and were filled with joy to find in him a character full of love and tenderness such as we had not dared to hope for in one who has had so much fighting to do in contending for the faith. We are afraid that the brethren have given him too much work for him to derive much good from his visit to our side of the globe. [It is all right, brother Dexter; a letter just to hand from brother Roberts says that the “working holiday,” though a trifle too much “working” at times, has proved more truly recruiting than would a time of aimless inactivity.—C. C. W.] Brother Roberts gave three lectures here in the theatre, about 400 being present on each evening, which, perhaps was not bad in a town of about 5,000. The papers (two) gave a very full report of the lectures, and, above all, very correct. We have also to report that brother W. Challinor and his sister-wife have settled in Wanganui since their return to New Zealand, from Bourton-on-Water, England. We are pleased to welcome them, especially as our brother Challinor is able to speak to the public. We hope to have a lecture every Sunday evening. We meet now at the Druid's Hall in morning for breaking of bread, and lecture in evening.—FRANK DEXTER.

(July 1896) WELLINGTON.—On behalf of the majority of brethren and sisters of the Wellington ecclesia, I have to report that for some considerable time we have felt the necessity of, and been desirous of introducing a basis of fellowship; and now, owing to the determined and bitter opposition of the minority, and their refusal to recognise the Birmingham statement of faith, we have thus been compelled to withdrawn from the following:—Brethren Parton (2), sisters Parton (2), sisters Jepson (3), sister Hutchings, sen.; and sister Florence Hutchings; leaving them in possession of the Alhambra Hall. We now meet for the time being at 132, Adedaile Road, on the Birmingham basis of fellowship, believing it to be in harmony with the testimony of the prophets, apostles, and Jesus Christ. I have also the pleasant duty of recording the fact that Mr. RITCHIE and his wife, after a good confession, were inducted into Christ by haptism on Sunday, April 5th, afterwards uniting with us in fellowship, and partaking of the emblems in memory of our Lord till he comes.—DAVID MCKINLAY.

---

<sup>3</sup> Note: The Wanganui ecclesia had been reporting ecclesial Intelligence since 1887 or 9 years prior to this adoption.

(August 1896) PERTH, WESTERN AUSTRALIA.—It is with great pleasure I write to inform you of the Christadelphians who gathered together here from the different ecclesias believe in the one Faith, and take the Birmingham constitution as their basis of fellowship.<sup>4</sup> These are the names of all who meet together here:—Brother F. F. Hulsten, from Melbourne; brother F. Bates and sister Bates, of Nottingham, England; brethren C. Tucker, Melbourne; J. Watling, Albert Hall, Sydney; S. Jewitt, formerly a member of the Temperance Hall, Sydney; sister Hannah Gee; sisters M. Scott and B. Scott, and brother Tyson, all of Melbourne; brother J. W. Burke, Albert Hall, Sydney. When we numbered ten we thought it wise to form ourselves into an ecclesia, and on January 26th we met and did so, and ever since have been working together in the unity of spirit and in the bond of peace, and as far as I can tell we are doing our utmost endeavours to serve the living and true God. On April 12th two brethren Brown met to break bread with us. They were asked to endorse the Birmingham constitution, and on those grounds they withdrew. A meeting was convened to meet them on the following Thursday night, April 16th, when we discussed matters with them. After some little discussion, the question was asked again, would they endorse the Birmingham constitution? The reply was they had not considered it, therefore the meeting terminated until they examined and studied the said constitution. The result I will report in due course.—J. W. BURKE, *Sec.*, Moore Street, off Hutt Street, Perth, W.A.

(December 1896) AULTMAN AND AKRON (O.).—Sister Mrs. F. A. Burt reports the immersion of her husband and herself. They will meet with the Akron ecclesia.—Another communication from Akron says:—“This is to notify that there is an ecclesia of Christadelphians comprising six members, who have cut loose from a large ecclesia of partial-inspirationists—about 28 members. We renounce all their errors, and wish to be known as true Christadelphians, holding the truth in its purity as brought to light by John Thomas, and upheld by Roberts, Williams, and other true brethren. We accept the Birmingham and Chicago statements as the one Faith to which we hold, and shall be governed by their rules.”—JOHN SOMMERVILLE, E. J. SOMERVILLE, H. A. SOMMERVILLE, THEODORE JENTSCH, ANNIE JENTSCH, HENRY JENTSCH.

(September 1897) LINCOLN.—At the request of brother Kirkland, of Nottingham, who is trying to bring about a union of the Boutham Avenue and Masonic Hall brethren we give place to the declaration of the former to this effect:—“We meet upon the basis of faith defined in the statement of faith, published at 139, Moor Street, Birmingham (and see May *Christadelphian*, 1885). ‘The ecclesia believes that the Holy Scriptures were originally produced, in all parts of them, by inspiration of God; and that, in no case, were the writers left to their own unaided efforts. That the original writings were free from error, rendered infallible by the superintending lower of the Deity. That we henceforth refuse to fellowship any who do not accept this belief.’ This we affirmed in 1885, and re-affirmed in 1886. It was endorsed by those who united with us in 1890, who had been separated from us, through misunderstanding, doubtless, on our part. It is our position now, notwithstanding any statement to the contrary. We have never, from the time of our declaration in 1885, knowingly departed from that position.”

(September 1897) SAN ANTONIO (Tex.).—There is an ecclesia in this city numbering 23 members, most of whom have been in isolation in different parts of this state, and Louisiana, for some time before coming here. Short crops, and hard times among farmers, caused the brethren to seek employment in the city. Some are running dairies, some working at the carpenter’s trade, and others are working at anything

---

<sup>4</sup> Note: This Perth ecclesia existed prior to this organization using the BSF and had been reporting ecclesial Intelligence since 1891. See Intelligence, *The Christadelphian*, September 1892.

they can find to do that is honourable. The members threw their little mites together, and bought lumber, and built a shed, 18 by 20 feet, for a place of meeting; where the ecclesia meets every Sunday for worship, and to carry on our Bible School; also for the public proclamation of the truth. A week ago last Sunday, we organised a Bible School, with a membership of 33, and on last Sunday, we met at 10 a.m., and had our first Sunday School exercises. The written essays, and the recitations from memory, as well as the answers to questions propounded by the teachers of the (3) classes, were all very satisfactory and encouraging, and we have good reasons to hope that good results will follow, and that our efforts will be crowned with success, should the Lord be willing and favourable. We are delivering a regular course of lectures on the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, one lecture each and every Sunday. Our meetings are attended by a few of the alien, some of whom manifest an interest in the truth. We are all satisfied with the Birmingham statement of faith as a basis of union and fellowship. It will be adopted by the Christadelphian brotherhood of Texas at our next fraternal gathering<sup>5</sup>, to be held at our old camp-ground in Blanco Co., Tex., beginning on the 7th day of Aug. next. If any true and faithful brother should pass this way, and is willing to aid us, either publicly or privately, in sowing the good seed—which is the unadulterated word of God—and watering the heavenly plants, that all may grow in grace and in the knowledge of the truth, so as to “be no longer babes tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive,” he will find a hearty welcome in our midst, and we promise him all the hospitality and encouragement we are able to afford.

(October 1897) PERDANALAS RIVER (Tex.).—“At the fraternal gathering convened on August 7th. at Junction School House, on Perdanalas River, Gillespie Co., Tex. (as announced in the August *Advocate*), the Birmingham Statement of Faith was adopted as the basis of fellowship by the brethren of the meeting. We feel it our duty to make it known to the brethren in Texas and elsewhere that we endorse the said Statement of Faith as the truth brought to light again by Dr. Thomas. We hope for and desire the co-operation of all the brethren of like precious faith. We felt the necessity of adopting the above Statement of Faith for the sake of unity on account of the conflicting views and doctrines held among brethren in Texas on the new covenant and priesthood of Christ. Our meeting was entirely harmonious, with fairly good attendance both of the brethren and the alien. We were greatly encouraged and built up in our most holy faith by able workmanlike lectures delivered by brethren W. H. Wolfe (of Lampasas, Tex.), W. J. Greer and O. Tanner (Blanco Co., Tex.), and Jos. Greer (San Saba, Tex.). There were 22 lectures and exhortations delivered. The meeting lasted eight days. Our next annual fraternal gathering is to be at the same place (Junction School House) in August, 1898 (the Lord willing). We will give timely notice as to the exact date when it will commence in the periodicals. We extend a hearty invitation to the brethren to come and be with us, and help us to declare the good news concerning the Kingdom of God in the name of Jesus Christ, to edify and build each other up in the one faith and hope of our high calling.—JOS. GREER.

(December 1897) PEMBROKE DOCK.—Since my last communication we have had the pleasure of the company at the breaking of bread of brother and sister Jenkins, of Ferndale. Brother Jenkins met with us on two occasions. We have also had our numbers increased by the removal from Kinnersley of sister H.

---

<sup>5</sup> This 1897 Intelligence item demonstrates the decline of the brotherhood: The “Christadelphian brotherhood of Texas” is not an ecclesia and this action should have never been taken at a fraternal gathering according to bro. Roberts repeated warnings about ecclesiastical legislating at fraternal gatherings. Every ecclesia should have independently adopted their basis of fellowship, as all others before them had done.

Lewis, who has kindly undertaken the duties as my housekeeper. We have lost, for the time being, the company of sister E. Thomas, who has taken a situation in the country, and has consequently been unable to meet with us for some time. The address of the meeting for the breaking of bread (which is at my house) is 12, London Road, Pembroke Dock, where we shall be glad to have the fellowship of any true brethren passing down this way. We had a meeting on the 9th instant, and adopted the Birmingham constitution and basis of fellowship, and formed ourselves into more uniform working order, brother Keepence being appointed secretary.—H. DAVIS.

(December 1897) SLEAFORD.—We have great pleasure in forwarding our intelligence, to notify that unity between the two meetings at Sleaford has been effected; and the subjoined is the basis of that union, which has been accepted by all of the One Faith at Sleaford. The basis of fellowship being “the truth,” as defined in the “Statement of Faith” and “Doctrine to be rejected,” published at 139, Moor Street, Birmingham; with a like declaration upon the Scriptures, as contained therein, being the foundation of our belief; also that no brother or sister shall break bread with any community with which the ecclesia is not in fellowship and union upon the above basis.—J. KIRK.

### **ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED THE “EDINBURGH BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP”**

(July October 1882) DUNDEE—We have rented a Hall in a central part of the town (72, Overgate), where we meet every first day for worship, and will be glad to have the fellowship of any honest minded brother or sister, who at any time may be in this neigh bourhood. We have adopted the Edinburgh basis of fellowship, and their rules for ecclesial affairs for our guidance so far as practicable in our circumstances. We have also a mid-week meeting on Thursday evenings at eight o’clock, for the study of the Scriptures, and a school for children on Sunday afternoons, which will help to keep us profitably employed while waiting the Great Deliverer.—J. MORTIMER.

### **ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED THE “LONDON SYNOPSIS OF THE FAITH”**

(Excerpt from September 1871) EDINBURGH.—In addition to the usual lectures, the brethren here have commenced a series of public readings from the *Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come* (articles by Dr. Thomas). So far, the experiment has been encouraging, an increase in the attendance and interest of the meetings being visible. They have also commenced a depot of Christadelphian publications after the London style. It is found that the actual presence of the works tends more to their circulation than the simple announcement that they are obtainable from Birmingham.

(August 1877) STOCKPORT.—Brother G. Waite reports that at the Quarterly Meeting of the ecclesia, held July 1<sup>st</sup>, the whole of the brethren and sisters now constituting the Stockport ecclesia, expressed their non-approval of the Halifax-Sale no-will theory, and re-affirmed their position as defined in the London Synopsis of the Faith. Two only have identified themselves with the Sale meeting, “and of course,” says brother Waite, “they, like all who lose their hold on any element of the truth, think the step we have taken an unnecessarily harsh one. And truly I can say, that if we had no higher authority than human to consult, we should have refrained from it, because we deeply love those from whom we now stand aloof. Sympathy uncontrolled is a stronger power than reason; but we cannot let sympathy rule when the truth is at stake, and the “filthy rags” of the Orthodox wash-tub are held out for our acceptance in lieu of the “pure and white linen” characterising the faithful and true. The no-will theory will never do anything like the mischief that was wrought by the Nottingham heresy, and we now see the good results of that evil day, inasmuch as the minds of the brethren have been more fully educated on this great question, and consequently are better prepared to deal with all assaults, let them come from what quarter they may. The truth commands a good hearing at Stockport, and many are now interested. I hope to report several

additions soon. Brother Ashcroft visited us for the second time on the 17<sup>th</sup> ult., and gave a course of three lectures.”

(January 1882) GRANTHAM—Brother Brooke, whose immersion was notified last month, goes to Wolverhampton. It has been decided to have “Finger Posts” down monthly, and stamp the name of the room on them. We are continuing the lectures as heretofore, with the assistance of Bro. Richards, of Nottingham, and Bro. Royce, of Peterborough. I omitted to notify that we sometime back adopted the London Basis of Fellowship; we find it very useful when examining candidates.—JOHN T. HAWKINS.

(May 1883) SYDNEY.—Bro. J. J. Hawkins reports the immersion of CAROLINE GORDON (25), wife of Bro. F. D. Gordon. He adds:—“With the idea of establishing a closer degree of intimacy between the different ecclesias scattered in these colonies we have sent a circular letter to ten ecclesias. Giving them the basis of our fellowship contained in the statement of the faith, and our rules, informing them of our status as an ecclesia, and giving them all information as to our method of conducting our meetings. Our librarian, Bro. Sendall, leaves here by the ‘Sorata’ for London. But he hopes soon to return. We have desired him to express to the London ecclesias our pleasure at noticing the love and unity existing between them, and that we hope to emulate their spirit and example.” We have also an interesting letter from Brother Gordon (recently brought to the truth), in which he says:—“For fifteen years, I had imbibed assorted adulterations; verily, I wandered in a land of broken cisterns. In the course of that time, I came to the conclusion that if the Bible propounded such fables as I was desired to believe, it was no book for me. Repeatedly have I taken it up and read, but to no purpose. It was a riddle, which I ultimately cast from me in despair—determined not to read it nor support any of the recognised sects which claimed the Bible as their guide and test book. About six years ago I begin to read Swedenborgian writings, as well as French, Russian, and Turkish history, ancient and modern. Such study aroused me to fresh action, which terminated when your *Twelve Lectures* were placed in my hands. Imagine a man in the desert, hungry and thirsty, and with faint hopes of satisfying his cravings—when, as he least expected it, both food and drink are within his reach! In a similar position I found myself, almost wondering whether I was mad or sane. After a long and careful investigation, it was my desire to be buried with Christ in baptism. This done, I rose to newness of life, and have now been about eight months engaged in running the race for life; and I am prepared at all times to give an answer respecting the faith and hope set before me in the gospel. My wife began to read to see what power had led me to be so anxious for wisdom and understanding in Scriptural things. The result was that she herself soon desired to witness a good confession. This she was enabled to do last month, and we now both rejoice together in the hope of the glory that shall be revealed.”

#### **ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED THE “ISLINGTON BASIS OF FAITH”**

(November 1882) NORTH LONDON.—(*Wellington Hall, Wellington Street, Upper Street, Islington, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.*) Brother Owler, in reporting the formation of two new ecclesias in London, says, “We are all anxious that it should be widely known that the new ecclesias have been formed on the principles of love and peace and goodwill.” He refers to the circumstances leading to their formation, thus:—“The work has for years been carried on quietly and perseveringly, and the good seed has been carried into the public parks and in the by-ways by zealous brethren; while at various times and in different districts, halls have been hired and the gospel proclaimed. The result of these labours has been recorded in the *Christadelphian* from month to month, and many of those who obeyed the truth resided in districts far distant from our hall. Until recent years the majority of the brethren resided in North London, where our efforts have been chiefly concentrated. The truth, however, has now penetrated south, east, and west. This fact led to a proposal—which was not unforeseen by those who have eagerly and anxiously watched the progress of the truth in the metropolis—to plant another light stand in the extreme west. This proposition was made twelve months’ ago, by brethren residing many miles from our hall, requesting the ecclesia to



sanction the establishment of a new one at Fulham. When the proposition came up for consideration, another was made embracing the district in question, and extending it still further. The object of this latter proposal was in effect simply to widen the area, and consequently appealed for co-operation to a larger number of brethren. Both propositions were considered, and the ecclesia (the Fulham brethren consenting) sanctioned the second proposition, as being more likely to maintain a separate organization. The brethren, however, were unable to obtain a hall in the locality agreed upon, and, after waiting some months, the Fulham brethren intimated that they had formed themselves into a separate ecclesia, on the same basis as at Islington. The brethren in southwest London then applied for, and obtained, the sanction of the ecclesia to establish another light stand in the City of Westminster, or neighbourhood. A hall was shortly afterwards obtained, and on Sunday afternoon, Oct. 1, 51 brethren and sisters left us to carry on the work of the Lord, as a separate ecclesia, at Westminster. There are now three ecclesias in London, meeting on the basis of 'the one faith,' and all in fellowship. I consider this event unique in the history of the truth in these closing Gentile times. Meetings have been formed many times, and oft out of contention, or in consequence of error, and have become synagogues of Satan. But in this instance, at least, the arrangements have been made in harmony with the principles of the gospel, and in a fraternal spirit, so essential in provoking each other to love and good works. Brethren visiting London will now have no difficulty in discovering a meeting-place within a reasonable distance of the stations of the principal railways, and will, no doubt, be glad to find all of one body, and members in particular. I have also to announce that Brother and Sister Benton have left London for Southampton; and Sister Geo. Phillips has gone to Peterhead. Brother Franklin, who was immersed in 1873, and has been in fellowship with those holding erroneous views on the taking away of sin, has been added to our number.

(November 1882) WESTMINSTER.—(*Victoria Hall, 327, Vauxhal. Bridge road, near Victoria Station, Sundays, 11 and 7.* Frank Jannaway officially announces the formation of this ecclesia, in accordance with the intimation made by Brother Owler in the foregoing. (See November 1882 North London-Wellington Hall) After describing the circumstances leading to it (already set forth by Brother Owler), he says, "We have, with the consent of the Islington ecclesia, formed ourselves into the WESTMINSTER ECCLESIA. Nay, I may say, with their *entire approbation*, in token of which they have kindly presented us with a very handsome service for the breaking of bread. The hall is situated within two minutes' walk of Victoria Station, and is at the rear of a bookseller's shop, the entrance being through a door at the side. It is capable of seating nearly 100 persons, and has been taken by the brethren for one year certain, at the end of which time (if our Master has not come) we hope to have obtained a larger hall. We number in all 55 members, among whom I am pleased to say are many experienced and well tried brethren, which at the commencement of an ecclesia is so desirable. Our first general meeting was held on Sept. 17, when the presiding and managing brethren were elected for the ensuing 12 months. Our opening lecture was to have been delivered by Bro. J. J. Andrew, but on account of a severe cold, he had to give way, and the lecture was delivered by our Bro. A. Andrew on October 8, when our hopes were fully satisfied, the hall being well filled; the subject was "Christendom astray." Thus far we have made a good commencement, and our prayer to the Giver of all good gifts is that we individually and collectively shall make a good finish, and receive a welcome into *that* state of things yet to be established. I may add that although we and those at Islington and Fulham form entirely separate ecclesias, yet CO-OPERATION is our motto, and we are thankful for the willing and worthy fellow labourers so close at hand. Our other lectures for the month are:—Oct 15, "What is man?" by Brother A. T. Jannaway; 22, "The Devil of Christendom," by Brother Atkins; 29, "The future inheritance of the righteous" by Bro. A. Andrew.—FRANK JANNAWAY

To this Brother Arthur Andrew adds the following remarks:—"Previous to the present year there was only one ecclesia in London, meeting on the doctrinal basis recognised by the brethren who refused to accept the heresy known as Renunciationism, and that was the ecclesia meeting in Islington. About a year since, however, sixteen brethren and sisters living in Walham Green and the neighbourhood, near the extreme southwest part of London, finding it inconvenient and expensive to come so far, applied to the

ecclesia for its sanction to their forming a separate ecclesia. This application was met by a proposal, supported by brethren living in the west and south-west of London, to establish an ecclesia embracing, in addition to Walham Green, the districts of Brompton, Chelsea, Pimlico, and Westminster, as it was thought by them that a larger ecclesia would be more efficient and better in various ways. This was agreed to, and search was made for a hall for some months without success, and eventually the brethren at Walham Green withdrew from the more comprehensive scheme, and constituted themselves into a separate ecclesia. The advisability of proceeding with the larger plan was then considered, and it was unanimously decided by those concerned to proceed with it, and for some months the matter was in suspense, simply for want of a suitable hall, a thing very difficult to obtain in London, as in most other places. At last a hall has been obtained, not altogether a 'suitable' one, as it is very small, but one which may serve as a makeshift for six or twelve months, by which time, if the Lord does not return in the meantime, we hope to obtain a more commodious place of meeting. It will probably serve for some time for the meetings of the brethren, though we hope it will soon be found to be too small for the meetings for the public. It is situated very near to Victoria Station, and is very accessible from various parts. There are now, therefore, three ecclesias in London meeting on the same doctrinal basis, viz., the one in Islington (numbering about 200), Westminster (about 50), and Walham Green (I believe, about 20 m number)."

## **ECCLESIAS THAT ACCEPTED THE CHICAGO BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP**

(December 1896) AULTMAN AND AKRON (O.).—Sister Mrs. F. A. Burt reports the immersion of her husband and herself. They will meet with the Akron ecclesia.—Another communication from Akron says:—"This is to notify that there is an ecclesia of Christadelphians comprising six members, who have cut loose from a large ecclesia of partial-inspirationists—about 28 members. We renounce all their errors, and wish to be known as true Christadelphians, holding the truth in its purity as brought to light by John Thomas, and upheld by Roberts, Williams, and other true brethren. We accept the Birmingham and Chicago statements as the one Faith to which we hold, and shall be governed by their rules."—JOHN SOMMERVILLE, E. J. SOMERVILLE, H. A. SOMMERVILLE, THEODORE JENTSCH, ANNIE JENTSCH, HENRY JENTSCH.

## **THE ROYAL ASSOCIATION OF BELIEVERS IN NEW YORK (1854)**

### CONSTITUTION<sup>6</sup> OF THE ROYAL ASSOCIATION OF BELIEVERS IN NEW YORK.

#### **1.—THE NAME OF THE ASSOCIATION**

In the age contemporary with the apostles "Christian" was a name *unappropriated* by any religionists, other than the true believers who were "first called Christians at Antioch." But in the nineteenth century, this is not the case. Every ecclesiastical association in "Christendom," from "the Mother of Harlots" to

---

<sup>6</sup> While this ecclesial constitution, which outlines the basis of fellowship of this ecclesia, predates *The Christadelphian* and ecclesial Intelligence reports, it is worth noting its existence as well as its relationship to Nottingham's constitution (1866) and the Jersey City ecclesia's basis (1881).

Mormonism, the most recent of her Babylonish and adulterous generation, now appropriates the *once* distinctive and unblemished appellation to itself. For this reason, we conclude not to attempt to distinguish our Association by a name so universally *misapplied*; differing also, as we do, so essentially in faith and hope from all *modern* “Christian” names, sects, and denominations.

The “one faith” and “hope” we confess as “*the children of the kingdom,*” are *royal*. We believe in a Messiah, even Jesus, who shall subdue unto himself, and for his brethren, *a royalty*, bounded only by “the uttermost parts of the earth”; in which royalty we hope to participate, when, as Micah testifies, the first dominion shall come to the stronghold of the daughter of Zion; and *the kingdom* to the daughter of Jerusalem.” The apostle Peter, in writing to his Christian brethren dispersed through the provinces of Asia Minor, who also believed in this royalty, saith, “Ye are a chosen generation, a *royal priesthood*, a holy nation, a purchased people; that ye should publish the goodness of him that hath called you out of darkness into his wonderful light.” Besides this, the Apocalypse affirms that the Lord Jesus has made such “*kings and priests for God, to reign upon the earth;*” and adds in another place, “They sat upon *thrones*, and judgment was given unto them: and they lived,... and they shall be the priests of God and of Christ, and shall *reign* with him a thousand years.”

Seeing then that it is fit that a society, or association, of whatever kind, should have a designation; and deprecating strongly the imposition of a name by which we should be characterised as the adherents of any person, however esteemed; we agree that the title of our confederacy shall express the great subject-matter of the gospel, *i.e.*, ROYALTY. Our decision, therefore, is that our ecclesiastical union shall be entitled “THE ROYAL ASSOCIATION OF BELIEVERS” in New York.

## **2.—THE ASSOCIATION DEFINED**

The Association is an aggregation of persons who believe “the things” covenanted to Abraham and to David, “concerning the kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ,” and have therefore been “immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”

## **3.—OBJECTS OF THE ASSOCIATION**

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, whose scriptural position is defined in No. 2, DO HEREBY confederate ourselves into a visible association, for the weekly remembrance of the Lord Jesus in the breaking of bread; for the celebration of the high praises of God; for the reading of the Scriptures; for the support and proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom; and for mutual assistance in time of need.

## **4.—WHO ARE INVITED TO MEMBERSHIP**

“The wisdom from above being first pure, and then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy”—we cordially invite all immersed believers of the gospel preached to Abraham, Israel, and the Gentiles, by the Angel of Jehovah, Moses, Jesus, and the apostles, who are disposed to illustrate this “wisdom from above” in word and deed, to unite with the undersigned for the purposes set forth in No. 3.

## **5.—WHO HAVE THE PRIVILEGE OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP WITHOUT MEMBERSHIP**

Being the Lord’s table, and not the table of the Association, all of good report within the city or without it, who, believing the gospel of the kingdom, have been immersed, are cordially invited to worship with us; the only privileges withheld being a participation in the direction of our affairs, and speech without previous invitation.

## **6.—WHO ARE INADMISSIBLE TO MEMBERSHIP**

“The kingdom of God” believed being “righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit,” we hereby disallow the membership of our Association to any immersed believers who cannot prove that they walk as becomes the kingdom of God and of Christ.

#### 7.—ADMISSION TO MEMBERSHIP

Immersed believers of the gospel of the kingdom are admissible to membership by the unanimous consent of the Association, the absence of any objection *privately* stated in the presence of the applicant, who will make his application for admission to a presiding brother, or silence, being taken for consent.

The immersion of a believer of the gospel of the kingdom by a brother of our society, appointed to administer it, of itself constitutes the baptised person a member of our Association.

#### 8.—THE EXECUTIVE OF THE ASSOCIATION

Our Executive is for the maintenance of decency and order in the meetings of the Association; the administration of the Supper and Baptism; attending to the admission of applicants to membership; the removal of any misunderstandings or difficulties that may arise to the hindrance of the objects of the Association; the disbursement of its contributions; and for whatever else needs to be attended to in behalf of the society.

In the heritages of God, planted by the apostles, these functions, with teaching, were distributed to “apostles,” prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers,” “helps and directors,” endowed with certain specified natural qualifications, and appropriate spiritual gifts, “for the perfecting of them for the work of the ministry, and the edifying of the body of Christ.” These *perfected* saints, or holy ones *perfected for the work*, were the many-branched candlestick of the heritage to which they belonged. They were, collectively, the eldership or presbytery of the association, and classified by Paul, in his letter to the Philippians, as “*the bishops and deacons*,” or, in another place, “*members in particular*.” We acknowledge the desirableness of an exactly similar institution as the Executive of the Association; and could we avail ourselves of brethren possessed of the natural qualifications, specified by Paul to Timothy and Titus, in whom “*the word of Christ dwelt richly in all wisdom*,” we should be disposed to submit ourselves to them as “over us in the Lord;” but, seeing that at present such are not available, we agree that the executive functions of our Association shall be discharged as follows:—

Three, four, or more, as the necessity of circumstances may demand in the unanimous estimation of the brethren, shall be selected because of their scriptural intelligence, good qualities and report. These select brethren shall not be regarded as “officers,” but simply as brethren in particular, *especially interested in promoting the objects and welfare of the Association*. After speaking of elders, called *episcopoi*, or bishops, *i.e.*, overseers—Paul then proceeds to speak of others, called *diakonoi*, or deacons, *i.e.*, overseers of the poor, and of secular affairs, almoners, etc.

Of the latter, he says: “Let these ALSO *first* be proved,” implying by “also” that the *episcopoi*, or overlookers of the flock, should be proved as well as the *diakonoi*, or superintendents of secular affairs. These select brethren of our Association may therefore be considered, not as “bishops and deacons,” but as *probationers*, who may or may not become official.

4. One of these brethren shall preside in rotation at the meetings of the Association for the breaking of bread and mutual edification. He will regulate the meeting for breaking of bread, according to No. 11, and will be careful to see that “all things be done decently and in order,” as there prescribed. If any applications for admission to membership, or for baptism, be made upon his day, or during the ensuing week, it will be his duty to ascertain the candidates’ fitness in the presence of one or more. He will then make report of such fitness to the Association at its ordinary session, and during the “contribution;” and,

if there be no objection, admission to membership shall be expressed on the following Lord's day, by the presiding brother extending to the accepted the right hand of fellowship for the whole. If the application be for baptism, then the subject's fitness being ascertained, the presiding brother shall administer it, or provide for its administration. At the conclusion of the meeting, he will announce the brother whose turn it will be to preside at the next assembly.

## 9.—EXPOSITION OF THE WORD TO THE EDIFICATION OF THE ASSOCIATION

In Ecclesiastes it is written, "Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear than to give the sacrifice of fools; for they consider not that they do evil. Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter any thing before God; for God is in heaven and thou upon earth; therefore *let thy words be few.*"

The Apostle James also saith: "Be swift to hear, and slow to speak, slow to wrath." Yet it was said to certain of old time "*perfected for the work*" by the Spirit: "Ye may all prophesy, one by one, that all may *learn*, and all may be *comforted.*" "He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and *exhortation*, and comfort." Exhortation is, therefore, a part of prophesying, and, in being attempted, must be done without debate "to the edifying of the Church," or not at all. Hence, the apostle saith, speaking to the prophesiers, "Seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the Church;" and to all members in particular, "Let all things be done unto edifying."

We understand from these and other portions of the Word, "that it inculcates *much thought and few words.* Exhortation is hortatory instruction of a consoling character, founded on the testimony of God. We expect therefore, that those who "exhort" will first call our attention to some portion of Scripture by reading it, then show us the interpretation of what he has read, and afterwards bring it home to us in words of kindness, for our edification and comfort. *To open a masked battery upon brethren is not "exhortation,"* and, being neither courteous nor christian, will not be allowed; but it will be the duty of the presiding brother to stop it immediately, by rising and politely inviting such offender against good manners to take a seat. "Let thy words be few." In consenting, therefore, to suffer prophesying from uninspired men of ordinary talents and information, brethren will be expected to restrict themselves to fifteen minutes at most, unless at the discretion of the brother who presides.

## 10.—OF DIFFICULTIES AMONG MEMBERS

If "Christ dwell in our hearts by faith," the Spirit of Christ will be there; and "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," or freedom from the dominion of the flesh, which is sin. Difficulties arise from the absence of this Spirit in one or both. *It is the duty of brethren not to burden others with their misunderstandings,* but to settle them before sundown by themselves. But if this cannot be effected, let them invite a brother to assist them in a return to oneness of mind. If the matter can by no means be reconciled, the case may then be referred to one of the select brethren, who, alone, or assisted by the other select brethren, shall labour to restore harmony without laying it before the Association. If this cannot be effected, the case may be reported to the Church, and we agree to withdraw the privileges of our society from the party who shall be manifestly in the wrong.

## 11.—THE ORDER OF WORSHIP

After the custom of those instructed by the Apostles, the Association will convene for worship on the first day of the week. The members being assembled, the brother whose turn it is to preside will take the chair, and invite us to unite with him in invoking the blessing of the "Father of Lights," and his acceptance of our spiritual sacrifices in the name of Jesus Christ, the Apostle and High Priest of our confession. After

this the presiding brother will invite us to sing a portion selected from the Psalms of David or the “Paraphrases,” which may be proposed by himself, or by some other of the brethren, as he may prefer. The singing being ended, Scripture-reading will commence.

A portion should be read from each of these four divisions: *First division*, from Genesis to Job, inclusive; *second*, from Psalms to Malachi, inclusive; *third*, from Matthew to Acts, inclusive; and *fourth*, from Romans to Revelation, inclusive. The presiding brother may distribute the reading among the best readers, reading a portion also himself according to his discretion. The four divisions are each to be read continuously to the end, beginning with the first chapter of Genesis, the first Psalm, the first chapter of Matthew, and the first chapter of Romans. After the reading, singing as before. A contribution will then be taken up, to defray whatever expenses may be incurred in carrying out the objects of the Association. The admission of members will be attended to at this juncture, according to Nos. 7, 8, 4.

The presiding brother will then proceed to the breaking of bread, any brother he may call upon being the medium of its distribution. He will remind the brethren of what it celebrates—as, the love of God, the self-sacrifice of Jehovah’s King for the saints, and for the world of which Abraham and He, and we with them, are all the heirs, etc. He will then give thanks for the things memorialised by the bread, or invite some other so to do. After its distribution, he will proceed in like manner with the wine.

When the wine is returned to the table, he will state how much time remains for the continuance of the session, and that it can now be occupied by expositions of the Word to edification according to No. 9. When these are finished, the meeting may be concluded with singing and prayer. This order may be succinctly stated as follows:

1. Prayer by the presiding brother.
2. Singing.
3. Scripture reading:
  - a. From Genesis to Job.
  - b. From Psalms to Malachi.
  - c. From Matthew to Acts.
  - d. From Romans to Revelation.
4. Singing.
5. Contribution, and Reception of Members, if any.
7. Breaking of Bread, etc.
7. Exposition of the Word to edification.
8. Singing.
9. Prayer.

We, the undersigned, having duly examined the Constitution recorded in this book, in subscribing our names do thereby attest, that the position defined in No. 2 is ours; and that we approve and accept of its provisions, and are determined to abide by them, and to use our influence in causing them to be respected.

Signed by  
CHARLES HALYBURTON.\*\*\*<sup>7</sup>  
HENRY O. BENNETT.

---

<sup>7</sup> \*\*\* The four with this sign affixed to their names consented to act as “select brethren” to carry out the constitution they have subscribed.

JOHN THOMAS.  
THOMAS BARKER.  
JOHN McDONALD.\*\*\*  
JAMES MERRY \*\*\*  
ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.\*\*\*  
WILLIAM TOWERT.

## THE JERSEY CITY (NJ,US) BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP (1881)

*The Christadelphian*, 1881, p. 456-457

Jersey City, New Jersey,

June 20<sup>th</sup>, 1881.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—I am directed by this ecclesia to forward to you a copy of our “*Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship*,” and to accompany the same with a statement explanatory of our action and position.

The members composing the Christadelphian body in this city, after having given up their place of meeting in Franklin Hall, as you are aware, connected themselves with the body meeting in Lundy’s Hall, West Hoboken. Continuous disorder and dissension was the result of this fusion, which, while deleterious in its effects and disheartening to all true brethren of Christ, was patiently but painfully endured, in the hope and desire that matters ultimately might improve. This hope was manifestly not well founded, matters waxed worse and worse, until forbearance ceased to be a virtue.

In addition to this, efforts, which many agreed should be made on behalf of the truth, were opposed, and last, but *not least*, there were false and defective doctrines held and advocated by some. Matters continuing in this condition, it was apparent beyond all doubt, in the interest of peace and harmony, and for the preservation of the truth in its purity and completeness, that a change should be effected, and that a separation from the contentious was absolutely necessary.

Accordingly, on Sunday, March 6<sup>th</sup>, a meeting was called on March 13<sup>th</sup>, “for the purpose of taking measures for the formation of an ecclesia which shall, in *Name and Doctrine* fully conform to the Representative Christadelphian Ecclesia, in Birmingham, England.” After an informal expression of views by the several brethren, a committee (composed of Bros. Johnson, Scott, Vredenburgh, Coddington, Washburne, and Seaich) was appointed, “to prepare a statement expressive of our faith, (the same to be the truth, the *whole* truth, and nothing but the truth), that is, the unadulterated, unqualified, and uncompromised truth of the gospel of our salvation, viz.:—the ‘One Faith,’ once for all delivered to the saints, and in complete harmony with the doctrine believed and proclaimed by our late brother, Dr. John Thomas (of revered memory), and the Representative Christadelphia Ecclesia, in Birmingham, England, the same to be submitted to the ecclesia for their consideration, which, if approved, shall be recognised as their ‘Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship,’ and shall receive their assent, agreement, and signature; and shall also require and receive the same from each and all others who shall seek to fellowship with them.”

In accordance with these directions, the said committee, on March 27<sup>th</sup>, formally presented a document, which, having been fully considered, was duly accepted, and unanimously adopted, and received the signature of every member present. (This document was what might be called an act of incorporation). It set forth, that, “We, the undersigned, do hereby form ourselves into an association, which shall be known

as ‘The Christadelphian Ecclesia of Jersey City, New Jersey,’ for the purpose of a weekly remembrance of the Lord Jesus, in the breaking of bread; for the proclamation of ‘the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus the Christ;’ and for mutual spiritual edification and encouragement; and to this end to herewith acknowledge the following ‘Statement of Faith’ to be our ‘Basis of Fellowship,’ to which we give our unqualified assent, agreement, and signature.”

Here follows a statement of faith and basis of fellowship, “largely compiled,” as the secretary observes, “from the *Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia*; statements and epitomes made at various times in various published works.” (Any one applying to Bro. Joseph Seach, Jun., 47, East 31<sup>st</sup> Street, New York City, N. Y., will be furnished with a printed copy). With the leading features of it our readers are familiar. We subjoin a few extracts of a special character:—

Faith and Obedience must be accompanied with and manifested by good works, for as “the body without the spirit (breath) is dead, so faith without works is dead also.” “It is incumbent upon us to render willing obedience to those (secular rulers) who are in authority over us, in all matters *which do not conflict* with the commandments of our Heavenly Father, when in such event it is our imperative duty to obey God rather than men.

It is contrary to the teachings of Christ and his inspired apostles to resist evil, or to take up arms for any purpose whatever.

WE REJECT the following theories and dogmas, as making void the Word of God, and being *altogether contrary* to the “form of sound words” recorded in the scriptures of truth, and *we hold no fellowship* with any who believe, advocate, or sympathize with them:

‘The Trinity—the Eternal Sonship of Christ—the Personality of the Holy Spirit—the Personality of the Devil—the Immortality of the Soul—No Judgment at the coming of Christ—Immortal Emergence of the just—Bestowal of Incorruptibility or Immortality before Judgment—that Jesus suffered and died as a substitute for man, to appease the wrath of an offended Deity—Heaven the abode of the Righteous—Eternal Torment of the Wicked—Salvation out of Christ—Universal Resurrection—Universal Salvation—Infant Salvation—Infant Baptism—Salvation achieved by Works—‘Renunciationism’ of every form and colour.

‘*All intelligently immersed believers* in the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus the Christ.’ Who ‘walk worthy of the high calling to which they have been called,’ and who shall give their *unqualified* assent, agreement, and *signature* to our ‘Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship’ shall be eligible to membership in this Ecclesia.

‘All persons of good report, resident in this city, or visitors from abroad, who have been immersed upon an intelligent profession of their faith, in the ‘things concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus the Christ,’ who shall give their *unqualified* assent, agreement, and *signature* to our ‘Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship,’ are cordially invited to participate with us in our order of worship. No persons shall be entitled to, or receive our fellowship in the truth, who, while they may themselves believe and ‘declare the whole counsel of God,’ and are in every respect unobjectionable in their own persons, yet join themselves to, or fellowship with others who ‘consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness,’ (from whom we are commanded to withdraw ourselves), and *reject or deny any portion* of our ‘Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship.’

(October 1881) JERSEY CITY (N.J.)—See article “The Truth in and about New York,” present number, page—Brother Seach further reports several accessions to the ecclesia so recently reorganised. Names



and particulars are as follows:—A. J. GLOVER. Formerly Baptist, who had been searching for the truth for some years; NILS PETERSON, formerly Methodist, whose attention was first directed to the truth by Brother Frank Norton, and who has since, in his somewhat distant isolation, by the study of the Scriptures, in connection with several Christadelphian works, found “the truth as it is in Jesus” JOSHUA SADLER, of the race and stock of Israel (after the flesh), who, through the faithful efforts of an intelligent Christian wife, is no longer a stranger “from the covenants of promise.” These, in the presence of a number of the brethren and sisters, on Sunday afternoon, July 31<sup>st</sup>, rendered the obedience which the truth enjoins, in being buried with Christ beneath the watery wave.

Brother Vredenburg writes concerning the action described in the article already referred to. He says:—We have all along felt the need of something which would put us in a better light before our brethren, as many had, in these parts, wandered away from the truth, and it seemed questionable whether *the faith* had any substantial advocates. Not until we separated from the West Hoboken meeting were we able to say ‘yea’ to the question whether there were such. We are now able to say ‘yea,’ for which we are grateful beyond expression. God is knitting our hearts together in love, and three men are seeking their way into the name which mantles with a robe of righteousness, so that we are bearing fruit, bless God. To Him be all the glory, through his dear son.” [Compiler’s Note: See article “The Truth in and about New York,” under; Futher Proof Taken / Volumes 1 to 30]

#### **ECCLESIAS THAT ADOPTED THE “NEW JERSEY STATEMENT OF FAITH” (1882)**

(February 1882) WORCESTER (MASS.)—Brother J. N. Jones says: “We have been through much trouble here, and although our experience has been a sorrowful one, yet it has taught us wisdom, and we rejoice that the truth still prevails amongst us. We have been obliged to reorganize the ecclesia upon better rules and principles than ever before, a copy of which rules and basis of faith and fellowship I am requested to forward to you. (The publication of the basis is not necessary: it is identical with Jersey City.—ED.) Unity and peace reign in our midst. On September 14, I baptised into Christ, LENA A. HOLMES, daughter to Sister Holmes, and sister in the flesh to my Sister wife. We are also cheered by the addition to our ecclesia of Brother and Sister Faulk, of New Zealand, who arrived here *via* San Francisco Col.”

(October 1882) LOWELL (MASS.)—“I have to report the formation of an ecclesia here, consisting of the following: Brethren Henry Hoyle, Samuel Evison, Robert Judd; Sisters Mary Evison, and Ellen Judd. Bro. Hoyle is, I believe, the first who has been brought to a knowledge of the truth in Lowell. He was examined and immersed Sunday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, by Brother Evison in the presence of Brother Gray, of Lawrence; several brethren and sisters came to admit him to fellowship. We held a meeting on Wednesday evening and adopted the New Jersey statement of faith and basis of fellowship, and resolved to meet at 10.30 a.m. every first day for breaking of bread at Brother Evison’s, where any brother or sister, coming this way, will be welcome.”—ROBERT JUDD

## THE NOTTINGHAM ANTIPAS ASSOCIATION OF BELIEVERS (1866)

(*The Christadelphian*, 1866, p. 52)

### THE TRUTH IN ORGANIC MANIFESTATION AT NOTTINGHAM

THE obedient believers in “the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ” at Nottingham, having lately come through a trial which has left them purified and strengthened in faith, though slightly reduced in numbers, have resolved on placing their church organization on a basis which will secure ecclesiastical individuality and efficiency, and at the same time conserve the faith upon which they are built, so far as organization is capable of doing such a thing. They have adopted the “constitution” which was devised and adopted by the ecclesia in New York in 1853, and published in *the Herald of the Kingdom and Age to come* for January, 1854, in which, as the reader will see from a perusal of the document subjoined, the master strokes of Dr. Thomas’s pen are clearly evident. This constitution we have been requested by the brethren in Nottingham to publish, so that their position in respect to all parties may become known. The name adopted by the Nottingham brethren as the designation of their association on the basis of the constitution, differs from that chosen twelve years ago by the New York brethren, which was “The Royal Association of Believers, &c.” This name was intended to express the *future* bearings of the high calling in respect to the position to which the brethren of Christ will be exalted as kings and priests in the age to come; but it has since appeared to the New York brethren, under the guidance of our beloved brother and teacher Dr. Thomas, that it is more expedient to adopt a designation expressive of the *present attitude* of those who are called in Christ, in relation to the outer world of darkness against which they are called upon to testify and towards which it is their duty to exhibit the light, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear. In accordance with this view, they have taken upon themselves the title of “The Antipas Association of Believers,” &c. For a vindication of this designation, which is the one adopted by the Nottingham brethren, we refer our readers to the first paragraph of the subjoined document which, in our judgment, is unanswerable. Our readers are not unaware that the name Christadelphian has also been employed to distinguish the genuine professors of the gospel of Christ from the great mass outside claiming to be considered “Christians.” This designation, which was devised to meet the contingencies of the brethren in America in a time of war, is not set aside by ‘Antipas,’ but continues to be the individual designation of those holding the truth in purity and righteousness, while the other is a collective name importing the hostile attitude assumed by Christadelphians as a community towards the professing churches of the day. Christadelphian is a private or family name. and Antipas a public name. The one defines the relation Christwards of those accepting the designation, and the other their relation worldwards. Brethren of Christ and witnesses for the truth are the two ideas expressed in the phrases. In plain Saxon, these phrases would be acknowledged and claimed by every section of the Great Babylon of apostasy which reigns supreme from the Pope in the ohair of St. “Peter” to the Mormon elder, declaiming his lustful and blasphemous doctrines from a wooden rostrum. They would therefore define nobody in their Saxon form. But in the form above set forth, they are repudiated by everybody except those intelligently and courageously holding the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

But to the document, which is as follows:—

#### CONSTITUTION OF THE ANTIPAS ASSOCIATION OF BELIEVERS IN NOTTINGHAM.

##### 1. *The Name of the Association*

In the age contemporary with the apostles, “Christian” was a name *unappropriated* by any religionists, other than the true believers who were “first called Christians at Antioch.” But in the nineteenth century this is not the case. Every ecclesiastical association in “Christendom,” from the “Mother of Harlots” to Mormonism, the most recent of her Babylonish and adulterous generation, now appropriates the once distinctive and unblemished appellation to itself. For this reason, we conclude not to attempt to

distinguish our association by a name so universally misapplied; differing also, as we do, so essentially from all *modern* “Christian” names, sects, and denominations.

Seeing, then, that it is fit that a society or association, of whatever kind, should have a designation; and deprecating strongly the imposition of a name by which we should be characterised as the adherents of any person, however esteemed; we agree that the title of our confederacy shall express our entire separateness from, and disapproval of, all other forms of religion extant, and at the same time show our fixed adherence to “The One Faith” and One Lord, even Jesus who is the Christ.

The word Antipas is found in [Rev. 2:13](#), and signifies “*against all*”; it is introduced here to express our opposition to ALL pretenders to Christianity. Antipas is styled “my faithful witness.” Hence the name is identical with all who hold fast “the Name,” and who do not deny the faith of Christ. Our decision therefore, is that our ecclesiastical union shall be entitled “The Antipas Association of Believers in Nottingham.”

### *2. The Association Defined*

The Association is an aggregation of persons who believe “the things” covenanted to Abraham and to David, and elaborated in the preaching of Christ and his apostles, concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ, and who have thereupon been “immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”

### *3. Object of the Association*

The weekly remembrance of the Lord Jesus in the breaking of bread; the celebration of the high praise of God; the reading of the scriptures; the support and proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom; and mutual assistance in time of need.

### *4. Who are invited to Membership*

“The wisdom from above being first pure, and then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entrusted, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy”—we cordially invite all immersed believers of the gospel preached to Abraham, Israel, and the Gentiles, by the Angel of Jehovah, Moses, Jesus, and the Apostles, who are disposed to illustrate this wisdom from above” in word and deed, to unite with the undersigned for the purposes set forth in No. 3.

### *5. Who have the privilege of Christian Worship without Membership*

Being the Lord’s table, and not the table of the Association, all of good report within the town, or without it, who, believing the gospel of the kingdom, have been immersed, are cordially invited to worship with us; the only privileges withheld being a participation in the direction of our affairs and speech without previous invitation.

### *6. Who are inadmissible to Membership*

“The kingdom of God” believed being “righteousness peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit,” we hereby disallow the membership of our Association to any immersed believers who cannot prove that they walk as becomes the kingdom of God and of Christ.

### *7. Admission to Membership*

Immersed believers of the gospel of the kingdom are admissible to membership by the unanimous consent of the Association, the absence of any objection (*privately* stated in the presence of the applicant, who will make his application for admission to a presiding brother), or silence, being taken for consent.

The immersion of a believer of the gospel of the kingdom by a brother of our Society, appointed to administer it, of itself constitutes the baptized person a member of our Association.

### *8. The Executive of the Association*

Our Executive is for the maintenance of decency and order in the meetings of the Association; the administration of the supper and baptism; attending to the admission of applicants to membership; the removal of misunderstanding or difficulties that may arise to the hindrance of the objects of the

Association; the disbursement of its contributions; and for whatever else needs to be attended to in behalf of the Society.

In the heritages of God, planted by the apostles—their functions, with teaching, were distributed to “apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, helps, and directors,” endowed with certain specified natural qualifications and appropriate spiritual gifts, “for the perfecting of them for the work of the ministry, and the edifying of the body of Christ.” These *perfected saints*, or holy ones perfected for *the work*, were the many-branched candlestick of the heritage to which they belonged. They were, collectively, the eldership or presbytery of the Association, and classified by Paul, in his letter to the Philippians, as “*the bishops and deacons*,” or, in another place, “*members in particular*.” We acknowledge the desirableness of an exactly similar institution as the Executive of the Association; and could we avail ourselves of brethren possessed of the natural qualifications specified by Paul to Timothy and Titus, in whom “*the word of Christ dwelt visibly in all wisdom*,” we should be disposed to submit ourselves to them as “over us in the Lord”; but seeing that at present such are not available, we agree that the executive functions of our Association shall be discharged as follows:—

Three, four, or more, as the necessity of circumstances may demand in the unanimous estimation of the brethren, shall be selected because of their scriptural intelligence, good qualities, and report.

These select brethren shall not be regarded as “officers,” but simply as brethren in particular, *specially interested in promoting the objects and welfare of the Association*. After speaking of elders, called—*episcopoi*, or bishops, *i.e.*, overseers, Paul then proceeds to speak of others, called *diacouoi*—*diakonoi*, or deacons, *i.e.*, overseers of the poor and of secular affairs, almoners, &c.

Of the latter, he says: “Let these *also* be first proved,” implying by “also” that the *episcopoi*, or overlookers of the flock, should be proved as well as the *diakonoi*, or superintendents of secular affairs; these select brethren of our association may therefore be considered, not as “bishops and deacons,” but as probationers who may or may not become official.

One of these brethren shall preside at the meetings of the Association for the breaking of bread and mutual edification. He will regulate the meeting for the breaking of bread, according to No. 11, and will be careful to see that “all things be done decently and in order,” as there prescribed. If any applications be made for admission to membership, or for baptism, upon his day, or during the ensuing week, it will be his duty to ascertain the candidates’ fitness in the presence of one or more. He will then make a report of such fitness to the Association at its ordinary session, and during the “contribution,” and, if there be no objection, admission to membership shall be expressed on the following Lord’s day by the presiding brother extending to the accepted the right hand of fellowship for the whole. If the application be for baptism, then, the subject’s fitness being ascertained, the presiding brother shall administer it, or provide for its administration. At the conclusion of the meeting he will announce the brother whose time it will be to preside at the next assembly.

#### 9. *Exposition of the Word to the edification of the Association*

In Ecclesiastes it is written, “Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear than to give the sacrifice of fools; for they consider not that they do evil. Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God; for God is in heaven and thou upon the earth: therefore *let thy words be few*.”

The Apostle James also said: “Be swift to hear, and slow to speak, slow to wrath.” Yet it was said to certain of old time, “*perfected for the work*” by the Spirit: “Ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may *learn* and all may be comforted.” “He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and to *exhortation*, and comfort.” Exhortation is, therefore, a part of prophesying, and, in being attempted, must be done without debate, to the edifying of the ecclesia; or not at all. Hence, the apostle saith, speaking to the prophesiers: “Seek that ye all may excel to the edifying of the ecclesia; “and to all members in particular let all things be done unto edifying.”

We understand from these and other portions of the word that it inculcates *much thought and few words*. Exhortation is hortatory instruction of a consoling character, founded on the testimony of God. We expect, therefore, that those who exhort will just call our attention to some portion of scripture by reading

it, then show us the interpretation of what he has read, and afterwards bring it home to us in words of kindness, for our edification and comfort. To open a masked battery on brethren is not “exhortation.” and, being neither courteous nor Christian, will not be allowed; but it will be the duty of the presiding brother to stop it immediately, by rising and politely inviting such offender against good manners to take his seat. “Let thy words be few.” In consenting, therefore, to suffer prophesying uninspired men, of ordinary talents and information, brethren will be expected to restrict themselves to fifteen minutes at most, unless at the discretion of the brother who presides.

#### 10. *Of Difficulties among Members*

If “Christ dwell in our hearts by faith,” the Spirit of Christ will be there; and “where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty,” or freedom from the dominion of the flesh, which is sin. Difficulties arise from the absence of this Spirit in one or both. It is the duty of brethren not to burden others with their misunderstandings, but to settle them before sundown by themselves. But if this cannot be effected, let them invite a brother to assist them in return to oneness of mind. If the matter can by no means be reconciled, the case may then be referred to one of the select brethren, who, alone, or assisted by the other select brethren, shall labour to restore harmony without laying it before the Association. If this cannot be effected it may be reported to the ecclesia, and we agree to withdraw the privileges of our Society from the party who shall be manifestly in the wrong.

#### 11. *The Order of Worship*

After the custom of those instructed by the apostles, the Association will convene for worship on the first day of the week. The members being assembled, the brother whose turn it is to preside will take the chair, and invite us to unite with him in invoking the blessing of the “Father of Light,” and his acceptance of our spiritual sacrifices in the name of Jesus Christ, the apostle and high priest of our confession. After this, the presiding brother will invite us to sing a portion selected from the hymn book (Golden Harp), which may be proposed by himself or by some other of the brethren, as he may prefer. The singing being ended, scripture reading will commence. A portion should be read from each of these four divisions: *First Division*, from Genesis to Job, inclusive; *second*, from Psalms to Malachi, inclusive; *third*, from Matthew to Acts, inclusive; and, *fourth*, from Romans to Revelations, inclusive. The presiding brother may distribute the reading among the best readers, reading a portion also himself, according to his discretion. The four divisions are each to be read continuously to the end, beginning with the first chapter of Genesis, the first Psalm, the first chapter of Matthew, and the first chapter of Romans. After the reading, singing as before. A contribution will then be taken up to defray whatever expenses may be incurred in carrying out the object of the Association. The admission of members will be attended to at this juncture, according to Nos. 7 and 8, paragraph 4.

The presiding brother will then proceed to the breaking of bread, any brother he may call upon being the medium of its distribution. He will remind the brethren of what it celebrates, as the love of God, the self-sacrifice of Jehovah’s King for the saints, and for the world of which Abraham and He, and we with them, are all the heirs, &c. He will then give thanks for the things memorialised by the bread, or invite some other so to do. After its distribution, he will proceed in like manner with the wine.

When the wine is returned to the table, he will state how much time remains for the continuance of the session, and that it can now be occupied by exposition of the word to edification, according to No. 9. When these are finished, the meeting may be concluded with singing and prayer. This order may be succinctly stated as follows:

1. Prayer by the presiding brother.
2. Singing.
3. Scripture Reading:
  - a. From Genesis to Job.
  - b. From Psalms to Malachi.
  - c. From Matthew to Acts.
  - d. From Romans to Revelations.

4. Singing.
5. Contributions and reception of Members (if any)
6. Breaking of Bread, &c.
7. Exposition of the Word to edification
8. Singing.
9. Prayer.

Signed by George Owen,\* John Pepper, George Hinds, William Smedley, John Phelps\*, William Brabson, Joseph Wootton,\* Richard Edwin Hopcraft, William Turney,\* W. J. Turney\*, Henry Kerry, Edward Turney\*.

\* The six with this sign affixed to their names were unanimously chosen, and consented to act, as “select brethren,” to carry out the constitution they have subscribed.

### **JERSEY (U.K.) BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP (1896)**

(April 1896) JERSEY—The half-yearly business meeting of the ecclesia was held on Thursday, January 7th, when the presiding and other serving brethren were unanimously re-elected. It was also decided to compile a summary of belief as held by us, to be adopted as the basis of examination previous to immersion and fellowship. This has been completed and printed, and will be supplied to any brother applying to the recording brother for the same. The second anniversary of the establishment of the Sunday School was celebrated on Sunday, February 2nd, when the children received books for prizes. The meeting was varied by the singing of anthems and hymns, and addresses were given by brethren Gallichan and Prigg. The number of scholars was stated to be 21, with an average attendance of 17. The teachers number eight, with an average attendance of seven.—N. J. PRIGG.

### **THE TOTTENVILLE (N.Y.) BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP (1896)**

(August 1896) TOTTENVILLE (N.Y.)—We wish to inform the members of the body of Christ that the ecclesia here has been reorganised and upon a sound basis. We have taken a decided and a firm stand on the responsibility question that has so long agitated the body. We take our stand on the true basis of Scripture that knowledge of the word of God makes a person responsible, whether immersed or not.<sup>8</sup> We are governed by the laws of Christ, and all difficulties shall be dealt with accordingly. We do not recognise any earthly lords or masters, for all members are on equality. All things appertaining to the ecclesia is done in unity of action. Any member of the body who holds and walks in accordance with the Scriptures of truth shall not be exempt from fellowship, and we extend a cordial invitation to all such to make us a visit. We hold meetings every first day of the week in memory of our absent Lord and Master. Meeting begins at 10–30 a.m. with Bible-class for members and children, followed by exhortation and breaking of bread. We are now eight members, and several interested in the ways of life. We hold meetings during the week at the different members’ houses. We do all we can to hold the doctrine pure, trying to conform ourselves with God’s ways, hoping and waiting patiently for the return of our elder brother, Christ Jesus. We hold our meetings on Sunday at sister Robinson’s house, Broadway. We send greetings to all the faithful of the household of God.—GEO. E. OSTBURG.

---

<sup>8</sup> This is noteworthy because this is two years prior to the BASF.

## INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL ACTIONS

### INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS

(June 1866) PAISLEY.—Brother J. B. NEWLANDS of this place, writing on April 21st says, “Ecclesiastically, we are not in a very good state. An attempt was made a short time ago to introduce an unbaptized person to our communion, which has resulted in dissatisfaction to a number, on account of his rejection. Those who would preserve the truth in its integrity are charged with being “uncharitable,” but these things do not trouble us much. We know that the way of life is not a smooth one, and with the help of our heavenly Father, we hope to fight the good fight of faith successfully.”

(Excerpt from August 1866) BRADFORD-ON-AVON.—Mr. C. Dealtry, whose energy and eloquence are now employed anew in the cause of truth, to which he was turned from Adventism, through the instrumentality of Dr. Thomas, who immersed him, has created a stir in this place. This he has done with some considerable success. Four immersions have taken place, and others are interested. Mr. Dealtry has been called away to other parts (being in fact, employed in similar work at Whitby,) and the Editor has accepted an invitation to supply his place at Bradford-on-Avon for a few days. The Editor has done so, however, on the express understanding that this walking in at an open door, shall not commit him to the fellowship of any who may not prove to be of the one faith, in its purity of doctrine and practice.

An ecclesia must be far gone in spiritual decay, or else has never attained to spiritual vigour at all, when the rejection of an unimmersed claimant to fellowship causes “dissatisfaction” in it. Such an ecclesia had well act on the exhortation of Paul: “Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith.”—EDITOR.

(August 1866) GLASGOW.—We have received the following communication in reference to the statement of Brother Mulholland, published last month. It will tell its own story:—“In the ‘Intelligence’ of last month’s *Ambassador*, there appeared the following statement:—‘There is no meeting at present in Glasgow, who hold the truth unadulterated by the commandments of men.’ Now, for the truth’s sake, and the information of all true Christadelphians, who may at any time visit this city, I beg to say that there is a meeting, held every alternate Sunday at my house (10, Victoria Street, Govan,) and on the intervening Sundays at the house of Brother Fleming, 251, Parliamentary Road. As to our faith, we have received it principally by the aid of Dr. Thomas’s writings, and they have not (nor could have) any connection with such a meeting as that referred to last month, where they are every Sunday discussing which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and where they hold all sorts of foolish doctrines, including that of immortal-soulism, seducing spirits, personal devil, two salvations, pre-existence of Christ, salvation without baptism, &c. There are not many of us, but in this matter we happen, in a certain sense, to be perfect, as we just number SEVEN. We are endeavouring to keep our little light on an eminence, and are determined to stand as faithful witnesses, at whatever cost. Your brother, &c., WILLIAM CLARK.”

The writer of the foregoing, who is at present in Leith, on account of a temporary interruption in his trade (ship-building) on the Clyde, is for the time in fellowship with the brethren assembling in Calton Convening Rooms, Edingburgh (Brethren Ellis, Tait, Smith, &c.,) which would seem to be a guarantee of his good faith in the matter above referred to.

(Excerpt from January 1868) BIRMINGHAM.— Before dispersion, there was introduced to notice, on behalf of the managing brethren, a pamphlet prepared for the ecclesia, containing a verified statement of the faith; a scripturally supported specification of the fables to be refused, an enumeration of the

arrangements adopted for the guidance of ecclesial affairs, the various meetings held, with a statement of their objects and mode of procedure, the names and duties of official brethren; and a list of the names and addresses of the brethren and sisters, constituting a complete "RECORD OF THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN ECCLESIA." The pamphlet extends over 34 pages, of a size convenient for the pocket, and is issued at 4d. Brethren at a distance can be supplied should they so desire.

(November 1868) GLASGOW.—Brother Clark states that an effort has been made by the Dowieites in Edinburgh to amalgamate the various discordant bodies in Glasgow, who make more or less a profession of the truth. This took the form of addresses on "Union," by one of their number, delivered at the various meeting places where permission to speak was obtained. The application for permission to use the meeting-place of the Christadelphians was responded to in the following letter:

"DEAR SIR.—I received your letter and laid your proposal before the brethren with whom I associated, and we unanimously decline having to do with the proposed scheme of unity. The truth rightly understood and affectionately believed, is the only basis from which edification and comfort can be developed. We cannot recognize and fellowship individuals, who are either ignorant or perverters of some of the first principles of the oracles of God, for, in so doing, we should be acting a cruel and wicked part to them in propping them up in a false position, which, in all likelihood they would only come to know when it was *too late*. Our desire is to be found faithful and true witnesses for God's truth. There are many in Glasgow professing to believe the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Anointed; and if there be disunion among them, it arises from the fact that they either do not know the truth, or that it has no hold upon the affections: in either case, the result is death. Taking your letter in connexion with a short article which appeared in this month's *Ambassador*, it appears to us that you are one of those whose toleration goes the length of fellowshiping one who denies the only hope of Christ's brethren, viz., the resurrection of the dead. If so, then it is our duty to warn our brethren everywhere against this modern Oregonism, lest it beguile the unwary.

Were it even possible to patch up a union of all who profess to know the truth, they would have no affinity, like the legs and feet of Nebuchadnezzar's image. We are not against union among the remnant of the woman's seed now scattered in the wilderness, but shall be right glad to welcome among us any who have taken the promises of God to their heart, as their only hope and portion for ever. But we have no idea of constituting ourselves churches, after the pattern of the apostacy. You will perceive at once that there is no affinity between us upon this subject; and two cannot walk together unless they be agreed.

I am yours, on behalf of the Christadelphians, meeting at 280, George Street, Glasgow, WILLIAM CLARK, Sec."

Brother Ellis, of Edinburgh, commenting on the subject, says: "Your friend, Alexander Black, is at present visiting in Glasgow, on the Sundays, with the view of bringing all the parties there into one meeting. His foundation is similar to that propounded by Alexander Campbell some twenty years ago, viz: a confession that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. The grand mistake that he, and other well-meaning people fall into, is the supposition that unity can be attained at pleasure. Unity is the result of certain affinities coming to the knowledge of each other, and wherever these certain affinities exist, and a mutual knowledge of them is attained, unity must be the inevitable result. But the attempt to cultivate unity by ignoring the truth, understandingly loved, will always result in more division."

(February 1869) LEITH.—An ecclesia has been formed here, under the circumstances referred to in the intelligence from Edinburgh. The brethren, in connection with brother Ellis, have engaged St. Andrew's Hall.



(Excerpt from July 1869) LEITH.—Thanks be to God, he is a brand plucked from the burning. I am giving the town the benefit of 5000 of the enclosed, a tract of eight pages, entitled ‘Plea for the Revival of the Religion of Jesus,’ (written many years ago, if we recollect rightly, by Mr. James Cameron, of Edinburgh, a member of the meeting as it existed before the split which resulted in the development of Dowieites and Christadelphians, now published in an edition of 5000, as above announced, with advertisement of Christadelphian works at end, and Bible mottoes on the top of the pages, and the following head line before the title: ‘Published by the LEICESTER CHRISTADELPHIAN ECCLESIA, for gratuitous distribution.’ — EDITOR *Ambassador*.)

(Excerpt from July 1869) LEITH.—The Leith brethren, after negotiations with that part of the late Edinburgh ecclesia now meeting in the Temperance Hall in connection with brethren Smith and Gascoyne, have come to a friendly understanding and written agreement of fellowship with them on the basis of identity of attitude on “the questions at present in dispute among the professors of the truth in this locality;” but consider it best for the interests of the truth meanwhile to maintain their separate organization in Leith.

(Excerpt from July 1869) LEICESTER.— I am giving the town the benefit of 5000 of the enclosed, a tract of eight pages, entitled ‘Plea for the Revival of the Religion of Jesus,’ (written many years ago, if we recollect rightly, by Mr. James Cameron, of Edinburgh, a member of the meeting as it existed before the split which resulted in the development of Dowieites and Christadelphians, now published in an edition of 5000, as above announced, with advertisement of Christadelphian works at end, and Bible mottoes on the top of the pages, and the following head line before the title: ‘Published by the LEICESTER CHRISTADELPHIAN ECCLESIA, for gratuitous distribution.’ — EDITOR *Ambassador*.)

(Excerpt from November 1869) PHILADELPHIA, Pa.,—We have a communication from this place, signed “Christadelphians of Philadelphia,” which, we presume, though unauthenticated by individual signature, is a genuine document. It incidentally contains the address “William Campbell, 130, Slate-street West, Philadelphia. Its object is to “inform Christadelphians throughout the world of the history of the ecclesia of Philadelphia, and of our present location; in order, that any passing through or sojourning for a time in our city, may have the opportunity of uniting with us in celebrating God’s love, and the love of His only begotten Son, in the unspeakable gift of him for our redemption. The formation of the body originated in the removal from another city of one individual, in the spring of the year 1859

(January 1870) WATERLOO (Iowa.)—Brother Geo. Moyer, writing to brother W. A. Harris, says “There are eight of us here, out and out for the truth. We hold no fellowship with those half-hearted persons, who are always learning but never come to a knowledge of the truth. There are others who are learning, and even now are with us, save in obedience. There are also a very few who are known to us as mortal resurrection opposers, speaking evil of things they understand not. We treat all such kindly, but tell them plainly how they err, not knowing the Scriptures.”

(Excerpt from January 1870) WATERLOO (Iowa.)—Brother Geo. Moyer, writing to brother W. A. Harris, says “There are eight of us here, out and out for the truth. We hold no fellowship with those half-hearted persons, who are always learning but never come to a knowledge of the truth.

(Excerpt from January 1870) ROCHESTER, (N. Y.)—Brother O. Morse writing Dec. 7th, says, “There is in this place an ecclesia of the living God, who have come out of the Gentile darkness that covers the earth, and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, being separated from Hibronism, Dowieism, and all other “isms” which lead from the truth. We are in full sympathy with true Christadelphians, wherever found.

(Excerpt from March 1870) MANCHESTER.—On the following Wednesday evening, we met at the room for the purpose of answering questions and objections. The room was filled, all seats being occupied. Our meeting was rather noisy. We had difficulty in keeping some restless spirits under control. Much confusion arose from several attempting to speak at once, which showed us the necessity of establishing rules for the guidance of the meeting. On the following Sunday evening, I spoke on the “Unknown God.” The room was full; the number probably 120. The people were attentive all the time; and were quiet and orderly. The next Wednesday evening the room was crowded, a number having to stand. We had drawn up a few rules and read them before permitting any question; and appointed a chairman to see them adhered to. By this means, we were able to keep better order, and the questions were asked and answered much more satisfactorily than before. We had one or two turbulent spirits in the meeting who kept the chairman busy towards the close. On the whole, the meeting was satisfactory. On Sunday evening, the 30th January, the audience was not so large, numbering from 40 to 50. They listened very attentively to an address from brother John Birkenhead on the kingdom. On Wednesday evening, February 2nd, the room was again filled. We got rid of some unreasoning fellows by confining them to the rules. After going out, a number of them did what they could to annoy us from the outside, by knocking at the windows and throwing mud at them, and making other loud noises. As we paid no heed to these manifestations, the rabble outside dispersed, and the meeting proceeded without further interruption of any moment, finishing about ten o’clock. The Christadelphians seem to be the subject of talk for the whole neighbourhood.”

(April 1870) GLASGOW.—Brother Hodgson, writing from Wishaw, says: “The friends in Glasgow, who, for some time, have been meeting apart, have submitted their differences to a further investigation, before neutral brethren, and after a somewhat lengthy and patient examination, have succeeded in removing the cause of separation out of the way. Only a few side issues remain to be adjusted preparatory to a re-union, which it is to be hoped will be more stable and enduring than anything of the kind which has existed among them in the past.”

(Excerpt from May 1870;( see Birmingham November 1869 for history)) BIRMINGHAM.— During the month, FRANCISAUGUSTUS CHATWIN, whose ease will be remembered as that of the youth who some months ago resigned his connection with the brethren in consequence of the pressure of clerical relations, and who left without being convinced the Christadelphian faith was unscriptural, being simply reduced to a state of bewilderment, has applied for re-admission amongst the brethren. He in effect says in his letter of application, that a thorough and painful re-consideration of his position having convinced him of his mistake, and impels him to seek to resume his place. The matter was considered at a meeting of the ecclesia held on Monday, April 11th, and it was decided that the only course open to the brethren was to comply with the request of the letter, and gladly receive the wanderer, and help him to redeem the day by a steadfast and patient profession of the faith, without wavering, and a submission to the cross of Christ in all things. His case was shown not to come under the statement of Paul that there was no return for anyone relapsing into hostility *after having tasted the heavenly gift and the powers of the world to come*; but that it rather was the case contemplated in the words of James “If any of you do err from the truth and one convert him, let him know that he that converted a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins.”[Compiler’s Note: “Letter of Application” is giving to an ecclesia from a member who would like to apply to an ecclesia]

(June 1870) LEITH.—(Scotland): Brother Paterson writes: “The meetings in Leith, which were temporarily given up on account of the Dr.’s recent visit to Edinburgh have now been resumed. Our design is to establish an ecclesia in the place which shall, in all respects, be separate and distinct from that of the Temperance Hall, Edinburgh, at the same time occupying a friendly position towards the latter ecclesia. We have obtained, as our meeting-place what is called the Trafalgar Lodge Hall, situated in Constitution Street, (No 89,) one of the most respectable streets in the town; our meetings are at half-past

eleven forenoon, for breaking of bread and exhortation, and half-past six evening, for the proclamation of the truth. I hope we shall succeed in promoting the cause of the truth in the locality.”

(Excerpt from November 1870) GRANTHAM.—Brother Hawkins writes, “I see by the current number of the *Christadelphian*, I am credited with much more than belongs to me by brother Wootton. His remarks have resulted from a conversation I had with him some months ago, and the lapse of time has produced a confusion of recollection in his mind contrary to the exact facts of the case. I was secretary to a fund for the conduct of the *Gospel Banner*, the fund being provided by shareholders, of whom I was only an individual. We were disgusted with the despotism of Mr. James Wallis, and we hoped to sustain the *Gospel Banner* in spite of him, he having threatened not only to crush it, but also his “brother,” Henry Hudston, who was a young struggling tradesman at the time. The *Gospel Banner* did its work, and helped to shatter up Campbellism, and it left many of us free from sectarianism, and ready to coalesce with the truth, when fully presented to us.

(Excerpt from July 1870) EAST ZORRA.— Although they had been brought up in connection with the Church of England, they were, for several years, a sample of a rather numerous class at the present day, who believe that good moral conduct, with honesty of purpose, is all-sufficient for anything that *may be in the future*.

On doctrinal points the ecclesia is still perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment; striving together for the faith of the gospel; increasing in the knowledge of the mystery of God, the Father, and of Christ; and determined to walk more and more, as becometh those who are called out of darkness into marvellous light. We are all looking forward with expectation and pleasure for a visit from Dr. Thomas this summer.

(January 1871) CHELSEA, (Mass.)—Brother J. Bruce, writing November 25th, mentions putting the ecclesia in communication with brother Hodgkinson, from Scarborough, on his arrival from Europe by the *Calabria*. Bro. Hodgkinson wrote, and afterwards visited them, expressing his pleasure at finding an already-formed ecclesia so near Boston, his place of habitation. Brother Hodgkinson writes the Editor, December 8th, in similar terms.

(January 1871) LEITH.—Brother Paterson (Nov. 15th) reports the obedience of JAMES LEVELL, who resides in South Leith. “We are gradually,” says brother Paterson, “but steadily growing here, not only in numbers, but in unity of mind and purpose, in our fellowship one with another, and our working on the truth’s behalf.”

(January 1871) WEST PHILADELPHIA, (Penn.)—Brother Smithiman, writing, November 23rd, expresses the joy caused in the Philadelphia ecclesia by the announcement of the removal of a brother and sister (Blount) to the neighbourhood of Dudley, near Birmingham. This joy is caused by the fact that no fewer than nine of the Philadelphian brethren come from Dudley, and have many friends and relations there to whom they are anxious the truth should be introduced. They were just on the point of writing to the Birmingham brethren about doing something in Dudley, when the announcement in question appeared. When they landed in America they were steeped in Methodism. What a change! they exclaim, has taken place since then. They wish the same change to take place in many estimable relatives, whom they mention by name, and who hold prominent positions in the religious body to which they belong.

(Excerpt from February 1871) BIRMINGHAM.—The usual quarterly meeting of the ecclesia was held on Monday, January 2nd. After tea, the reports were read. The number of additions during the past three months had been 12. No business of public moment was transacted.

The past month has witnessed an incident which, for some reasons, it would be better to say nothing about, but which, for others, requires mention. A letter was read to the ecclesia announcing that a number of the brethren and sisters—whose number was afterwards reported to be twelve—had held a meeting, and resolved to open a room in Bradford Street, and establish a branch ecclesia there; and asking the countenance and co-operation of the brethren and sisters at the Athenæum. A meeting was called to consider the matter, at which brother Roberts submitted reasons why the proposed branch ecclesia should be treated as a faction and not as a fraternal movement. Chief among these were warnings from Dr. Thomas, read from three several letters received a considerable time before, to the effect that a certain brother, who had gone to America with him in the *Idaho*, and had been expelled from his house in disgrace, had returned to England, and would, on his arrival in the latter country, seek to enlist the sympathies of envious or disaffected persons, and set up a rival meeting. This brother was one of the twelve. As an illustration of the sort of procedure that had led to his expulsion, brother Roberts read from the said letters an account of how the said brother (James Martin) had, while in charge of the Dr.'s house in his absence, opened and made a copy of, and re-sealed a private letter, addressed by the Dr. to his wife, who happened to be out at the time, and to whom the said James Martin handed the closed letter on her return, as if nothing unusual had happened. On hearing this, the meeting was adjourned for three days to allow of brother Martin's attendance to hear and explain the matter, and one of the brethren was deputed to proceed, at the expense of the ecclesia, to Hereford, where brother Martin happened to be, to give him notice of the adjourned meeting and its purpose. At the adjourned meeting (Thursday, January 12th), brother Martin being present, brother Roberts went into the whole matter from the commencement, and concluded by proposing that all taking part in the proposed Bradford Street meeting should be considered as brethren walking disorderly, and withdrawn from. This proposal was not voted upon, as another was submitted and adopted, to the effect that they be not withdrawn from at once, but that time be given them to manifest the nature of their procedure. As to brother Martin, who spoke at considerable length in his own defence, it was decided to withdraw from him at once, as a mischief-worker and a person of proved untruthfulness and dishonour, two only dissenting. On the following Sunday, at a full meeting of the ecclesia, a brother while concurring in the estimate formed of brother Martin, desired the brethren to recal their withdrawal from him, and re-consider the matter, on the ground that the suddenness and unexpectedness of the decision would establish a bad precedent. Two only voted for this course. About twelve voted for time being given to brother Martin to repent, upon which a brother cogently remarked that he had time to repent in the isolated position in which he had been placed, and could reinstate himself at any time by due acknowledgment, and request for forgiveness. The rest of the ecclesia, in an overwhelming vote, refused to go into the matter again, and re-affirmed withdrawal from James Martin.

(March 1871) CALCUTTA.—Brother Capt. Brown, writing December 29th, mentions the arrival from England, of brother G. CHITTY, who it will be remembered was immersed at Deal, last year. Brother Brown says he has joined the ecclesia there, and was warmly welcomed as an addition especially valuable on account of his gifts and his zeal. It is hoped the ecclesia may be benefitted, and the truth extended though the soil in Calcutta is not remarkably good.

(May 1871) DEVONPORT.—The brethren here have been cheered by the addition of Mr. W. F. DASHPER, the writer of the tract of which mention was made some time ago. Brother Dashper, who is a middle aged active man, thus writes of his own case: "I suppose you have been informed by brother Moore that I have at last, after so many months' consideration, resigned my connection with the Sunday School as Librarian, and also the vice-presidency of the Mutual Improvement Class, at Morice Square, Devonport, and cast in my lot with the despised people called Christadelphians. I can assure you that the step thus taken has given me a great deal of anxiety, which you will judge must have been the case, when I inform you that for the last twenty years I have taken some interest in every thing connected with the Chapel and Sunday School. From the friendship of many also whom I esteem, I shall now certainly be cut off, besides having a wife, sister, and brother-in-law, still connected with the place. My wife's conversion I shall pray, labour and hope for, and I think, already I have some ground to believe it will not be very

long before most of the prejudice is removed, if she does not become connected with us. I sincerely trust that the union thus formed may be of mutual advantage, and continue until faith is realized in sight. Our only hope of peace and happiness is in the speedy coming of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; this glorious event I am confident should be the key note sounded by every child of God. Every event around us is undoubtedly tending in that direction. May we be enabled to rejoice in its prospect, and shout when it arrives, "Lo! this is our God, we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation."

Brother Moore, writing February 28th, mentions the visit of a man who applied for relief, saying he was a brother. He gave reference to brother Hage of Newark, to which he said he belonged. Brother Moore relieved the man, who went his way. Brother Moore afterwards wrote brother Hage, and brother Hage replies there never was such a brother at Newark, and that no doubt he is the man who imposed upon him some time ago. Brother Hage says he is resolved never again to receive a professed brother without credentials signed by the Secretary of the ecclesia to which he says he belongs. [Query: Would not credentials be liable to be forged? A better way would be to ask reference and decline acting to any extent till the referee was heard from. This course would have been effective in the Devonport instance. Representations of urgency should be disregarded until satisfaction is obtained.—EDITOR.]

(May 1871) GLASGOW.—Brother O'Neill, writing, March 16th, reports continued exertions for the truth with visible, but not as yet mature, results. Brother Ellis lectures every Sunday evening. The room heretofore occupied by the ecclesia as sub-tenants, at 280, George Street, is now in their sole occupation. The man under whom they rented, died, and failing to find a suitable place of meeting elsewhere, they concluded to take it upon their own shoulders, trusting to week-day lets to make up the rent. The room is henceforward to be called the Christadelphian Synagogue.

(Excerpt from September 1871) BIRMINGHAM.—The ecclesia has been strengthened by the removal of brother and sister Shuttleworth from Leicester to Birmingham—brother Shuttleworth having found employment in the office of *The Christadelphian*, in connection with the machinery created by Dr. Thomas's will. Leicester, however, we understand, will not be entirely deprived by the change, as the brethren contemplate availing themselves occasionally of brother Shuttleworth's services. In connection with the same machinery (referred to), a mahogany glass case has been affixed outside the Athenæum, displaying the various publications issued in connection with the truth, with the prices. Gold lettering informs the passers-by that they are issued under the auspices of "THE CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY," and that they are on sale in the building. In this way it is hoped still further to extend the spreading influence of the truth. Booksellers won't undertake to promote the circulation of works connected with the truth, so the friends of the truth are obliged to do it themselves. A candle was never made to be put under a bushel.

(Excerpt from October 1871) LONDON.—The brethren have arranged to remove their place of meeting from the Metropolitan Hall, Gower-street, to the Wellington Hall, Upper-street, Islington. The change, it is expected, will be one for the better in several respects.—Bro. Nichols has been lecturing in St. James's Hall, Notting-hill, with what result we have not heard.

(Excerpt from January 1872) BIRMINGHAM.—During the month, the ecclesia has shifted its meetings from the Athenæum to the Temperance Hall. (Some have imagined the office of the *Christadelphian* is removed as well, and have sent letters to the Temperance Hall. Let all and sundry take notice that there is no change in this respect. The Editor continues in occupation of the Athenæum Rooms, though the necessities of the truth have required a change of meeting place). In connection with the change, as our readers last month, were made aware, a more public effort has been made in the shape of an attack on the religious leaders. This, so far, has been crowned with entire success. The hall each night has been crowded

with a highly respectable and attentive auditory. It is computed that there would not be much under a thousand people present on each occasion.

(January 1972) SWANSEA.—Brother A. W. Goldie writes November 21st: “I have much pleasure in announcing that brother John Morgan (our withdrawal from whom was announced in the November number) has been brought to see and acknowledge his error, and has been received again into fellowship by the ecclesia.”

(Excerpt from April 1872) ABERDEEN.—Brother Alexander Robertson, writing March 14th, alludes to a statement in a previous letter that there were a few friends of the truth scattered through this town; and says these have now been formed into an ecclesia and desire to be in fellowship with those only who are known as Christadelphians; having no sympathy with those who hold the truth in compromise with error. Including brother and sister Harvey, of Old Meldrum, they number thirteen. They meet in George Street Hall, which holds about three hundred people.

The ecclesia now formed is independent of the friends mentioned in “A Run North for the Truth’s sake,” whose deliverance from all identity with such as make the truth void, would be a cause of joy.—EDITOR.

(April 1872) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Mycroft, writing March 19th, says: “During the last month we have had seven additions to our ecclesia, five by immersion, viz., ELIZA SHIPSIDES (52), FREDERICK ALLCOCK (27), and his wife HANNAH ALLCOCK (27), formerly Baptists; WILLIAM BALL (28), formerly neutral, and WILLIAM BUCKLEY (26), formerly Baptist local preacher; also ANN ELIZABETH WOOD (sister to brother E. Turney), and ANN L. HANCOCK, who had previously been immersed on their reception of first principles, but had stood aloof from the Christadelphian ecclesia partly on account of their non-concurrence in Christadelphian views of the judgment, which after careful reconsideration, they now accepted. They were received into fellowship on Sunday morning, February 28th. Others also are expected shortly to take the same steps.

“The quarterly meeting of the ecclesia was held during the month. The accounts for the quarter showed a considerable addition in contributions over the previous quarter. It was announced that in consequence of the great inconvenience arising from the place of meeting being too small to seat comfortably the number of people who come to hear the truth presented on Sunday evenings, a brother had kindly taken the Lecture Hall of the Mechanics’ Institution (a room capable of holding 400 persons), and placed it at the disposal of the brethren, until our new synagogue which is in course of erection, is finished. On Sunday morning, February 25th, the brethren and sisters assembled in the Lecture Hall for the first time.

(May 1872) BIRMINGHAM. — A special meeting of the ecclesia was held on the previous Tuesday, to consider the propriety of holding a suggested Fraternal Gathering. The result will be seen in a short article on page 225. [Compiler’s Note: See PROPOSED FRATERNAL GATHERING for article under; Futher Proof / Volumes 1 to 30]

(Excerpt from June 1872) BIRMINGHAM.—During the month, there have been three immersions and one addition by resumption of fellowship on the part of sister Hatfield, who separated from the brethren eight years ago because they did not receive George Dowie. Two years ago she was re-immersed, believing her position unsafe at the date of her first immersion, many years ago.

(Excerpt from June 1872) LONDON.—On Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday, April 15th, 17th, and 18th, brother Roberts, of Birmingham, lectured in the Wellington Hall, Wellington Street, Upper Street, Islington, adjoining the meeting place of the brethren. There was a fair audience each night. The chair was occupied twice by brother Bosher, and once by brother Watts. At the same time, an event transpired

which may prove important in the history of the struggles of the truth in these latter days. A shop was opened, at 151, Upper Street, for the sale of Christadelphian publications, advertised on the signboard as “THE CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY’S DEPÔT.” The shop is in an excellent thoroughfare in the best part of London, from a religious point of view. Thousands of middle-class people stream past it every day. The opening of the shop is due to the enterprise of brother Bosher, who has long felt the necessity for such a thing; but the way for which was not clear until Dr. Thomas, by his will, directed the formation of a Christadelphian Publication Society, for the diffusion of publications teaching the truth—a scheme which he said he hoped, if the Lord delayed his coming, might be assisted by the testamentary dispositions of other friends, to the unshacklement of many honest minds from clerical or rationalistic bondage.

(Excerpt from July 1872) NOTTINGHAM.—“Since my last, we have had two additions to our ecclesia in the persons of RICHARD WOOD and his wife MARTHA, who some years ago were members of our ecclesia, but separated at the same time as those I wrote you about last month. All differences being now removed, they were received into fellowship again by the brethren.

(Excerpt from October 1872) TROY.—Brother George H. Ennis, writing August 9th, says:—“It is with feelings of pleasure that we read in the *Christadelphian*, from month to month, of the progress of the truth in various sections of this country and the world, and thinking it may interest and animate by our example the brethren, we will add a few words respecting the progress of the truth in this city. For the benefit of those readers who may be unfamiliar with the geography of this city, it may be as well to state that it is at the head of the navigation of the Hudson River, 155 miles north of the city of New York, a beautiful manufacturing city of about 40,000 inhabitants. It is distant (on the opposite side of the Hudson River) 6 miles from Albany, the capital of the State. Our ecclesia, which was organised about the 1st of January last, is mainly made up by removals from other ecclesias, Sisters Alton and Robb coming from Hamilton, Canada; brother Dobson from Rochester Ecclesia, New York; brother Wiley, and his sister wife from New York; your subscriber also from New York.

(Excerpt from November 1872) BIRMINGHAM.—The immersions during the month have been two, but one pertained to Dudley, under which heading particulars may be learnt. The other was the case of CHARLES YOUNG (16), grocers’ assistant. The annual meeting of the ecclesia was held on Tuesday, October 1st, when the usual necessary appointments for the year were made.—The consideration of whether there is to be another Fraternal Gathering next year, was postponed.—The occurrence of several intermarriages with unbelievers having been reported, the brethren caused a minute to be recorded in protest against the same, and as a reminder to all who take the name of Christ upon them, that the apostolic law restricts their matrimonial alliances to such as have given themselves to the Lord.

(Excerpt from November 1872) WHITBY. — The truth has only been attained by them through diligent search and study. They have been attending the meetings for about four years, and enquiring into those things, and at last wisely determined to cast in their lots together, for future life and incorruptibility, by being immersed into that name through which alone salvation is to be obtained. The following is a list of those now in fellowship at Whitby: Brethren Argument, Clarkson, Clegg, Coates, Harland, Mallinder, Mankin, Ripley, Robinson, Slade, and Winterburn; sisters Argument, Mallinder, Robinson, Slade, and Tiplady. [Compiler’s Note: Remember fellowship is within the ecclesia singular]

(Excerpt from December 1872) BIRMINGHAM. — During the past two months, a measure has been adopted which the increase and widely-scattered homes of the brethren had rendered necessary, and which seems likely to lead to better results than even were contemplated. The town has been divided into ten districts, and in each district a brother has been requested to have a care of the rest, in the matter of visiting, in case of absence, sickness and want, and other matters, which would not come under the

cognizance of the general body. In addition to these objects, some of the districts have, of their own accord, organized themselves for the promotion of the truth in their own especial parts of the town, and for a mutual drawing closer together than is possible in a large ecclesia. For these purposes, monthly meetings, in the house of the district visiting brother, have, in some cases, been resolved upon. Nothing resolved upon is to interfere with the meetings or operations of the general ecclesia.

(Excerpt from January 1873) Nottingham — The synagogue stands in Shakespeare Street, near its junction with Milton Street, in one of the best positions in the town. It is a somewhat ornate building, designed by brother Sulley, architect, to the directions of brother Farmer, on whom the burden principally falls. On the front of the building, cut in the stone, are the words “CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE,” Isaiah 8:20, with as a motto beneath; “*To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.*” Preference was given to the word “synagogue” on account of its Israelitish association. The truth is Jewish; salvation is of the Jews; the brethren of Christ are adopted Jews, and their hope is “the hope of Israel.” It is therefore meet that a building exclusively appropriated to their use should bear a name savouring of these things; for the name of the building then becomes in itself a testimony for the truth. “Meeting house,” “chapel,” “church,” “hall,” are all perfectly colourless; or worse, some of them bad coloured in this respect. The synagogue presents a neat, comfortable interior, with sitting accommodation on floor and gallery for between five and six hundred persons. Underneath is a large, well-lighted, high-roofed, airy room, of equal area with the one above. In this is an immersion bath, with conveniences behind; also for providing tea meetings. The room is to be used as a school room, and for the week night meetings of the brethren. The total cost has been about £3,000. Nottingham was the first place in Britain to receive the truth at the hands of Dr. Thomas in 1848. It is appropriate that it should be the first to erect a building in its service. We only hope it may be deserted before another year is out, because of the great eclipsing event for which we are looking, and waiting, and praying—the appearing of the Son of Man in power and great glory. The state of the living stones will then be the anxiety.

(January 1873) A SUGGESTION FOR AMERICA.—Bro. George H. Ennis, of Troy, N. Y., United States (much interested in the recent fraternal gathering in England), suggests the holding of a similar gathering in America. He says there is considerable enquiry among the American papers as to the doctrines of the Christadelphians, and such a meeting, he thinks, would tend to supply the information desired; and bring the brethren, who in most cases are personally unknown to each other, into close and encouraging ties of friendship. Those who favour the idea may desire to know Bro. Ennis’s address, which is, “care of Jesse Ferguson, 7, Seventh Street, Troy, New York.” This will enable them to correspond. Some brethren have said that America is not (for a variety of reasons) ripe for a contentionless and purely fraternal gathering. We shall see. At all events, we shall not have to wait long for the gathering from every land around the great presiding brother, who will “thoroughly purge his floor,” and remove all elements of evil.

(Excerpt from January 1873) CHICAGO, Ill.—Brother W. A. Harris says “We have thought it necessary to adopt the rule adopted in England and elsewhere, that when a stranger visits us, he be required to produce a letter of recommendation before we receive him into our fellowship; failing which, we appoint a committee to confer with him as to the identity of his faith and practice with ours. Please state this in the *Christadelphian* for the information of the brethren.”

(March 1873) ADELIN (Ogle County, Ill.).—Brother Coffman writes as follows: “The Ogle ecclesia having been misrepresented by the mere-manite wranglers on the subject of God manifest in flesh; will you allow me a place to set forth our views upon the misrepresented point. By God manifest we mean that a manifestation took place in the Son born of Mary, previous to his official anointing, as well as after. We regard this as a testimony to be believed, however we may fail to understand. Jesus says, ‘If you don’t



believe that I am he ye shall die in your sins.’ ‘To the law and testimony, if we speak not accordingly, the light is not in us.’ We know that the Deity is unchangeable and cannot die; yet the Son of God, the Saviour died, and thus God in manifestation died, for the Son of God was the manifestation. We regard Jesus as not only a medium of manifestation, but also the manifested one, as saith Jesus, ‘He that seeth me seeth the Father.’ Paul says, ‘God *was manifest in flesh,*’ and Jesus was he. The only begotten one that came out of the Father, was the spirit of the Father with mortality upon him, weak and tempted in all its points like as we. The Jews could not believe this, and said he blasphemed because he said he was Son of God, an equal of God, as all children are considered of their fathers. Jesus (from his babyhood upwards, in the days of his flesh) at once was composed of two sides, one in union with the other, for Deity is not annihilated when in union with mortality. He still remains Deity, though in manifestation through a flesh nature. Thus we understand Jesus when he says ‘I was before Abraham;’ and John when he says, ‘And Jesus was before me.’ But as regards the person Jesus, we do not understand him to have pre-existed. We understand him to have been a manifestation of his Father in the same sense that John was a manifestation of his father. Zechariah was not from all eternity, therefore John was not with him from all eternity; but the Father of Jesus was from all eternity, and in this sense he was before John. By this we can perceive that while the first Adam was of the earth, the second Adam, Jesus, was the Lord from Heaven. We accept Jesus as a God manifestation, as coming from the Father in the manner testified in Luke 1:35: The ‘Holy thing,’ an ‘Equal,’ ‘The Son of God,’ ‘Thy salvation,’ ‘A light to lighten the Gentiles.’ Consequently when he died and rose again he ascended from whence he came. The mortality being swallowed up in the Resurrection, he became con-substantial with Deity, of whom in the days of his flesh he was a manifestation by spirit, through or in the flesh. A mere human being, ever so highly endowed by Holy Spirit, would not be in the same relation to God as His own Word *made flesh*. Such a man would be a mere medium; not the ‘Holy thing,’ ‘Thy salvation,’ ‘The Saviour,’ ‘A light,’ and other titles by which the Lord Jesus is described. The foregoing sets forth the true position of the Ogle ecclesia on this important subject.”

(May 1873) DEVONPORT.—Brother Dashper reports, that on Wednesday, April 3rd, CHARLES SMART (17), brother in the flesh to brother George Smart, who left the ecclesia at Devonport about twelve months since for Chicago, U.S., and WILLIAM CHAPPEL (30), for many years a follower of the Bible Christians, put on the saving name, whereby we must all be saved, by being immersed. Brother Chappel’s prejudice to the truth has been removed by the reading of books lent. We have a soldier belonging to the 2nd Queen’s Own, meeting with us. He is very attentive and intelligent. Suppose he applies for immersion, should it be administered? He is a sworn man to use the sword.

[Cornelius was in the same position, yet was immersed, and so far as we know, abode in the calling wherein he was called, in which, however, as an obedient disciple, he would do nothing forbidden by the Lord. If a man can be free it is better (1Cor.7:21) , but if he cannot, let him like a certain believer of whom we heard during the civil war in America, who, being drafted, marched but never fought, and came out of the war unhurt.—EDITOR.]

(Excerpt from May 1873) ADELINE, Ogle Co.—To brother Abraham Coffman and others, who do not accept the definitions published from this place in our March number, it is sufficient to let the fact thus become known. We cannot consent to let the *Christadelphian* become a medium for a controversy which is becoming a strife of words to no profit, but to the subversion of the hearers. In so far as your manifesto (apparently unobjectionable in itself) would tend to keep alive this strife, we must decline to publish it, regretting to appear in antagonism to you or to those you strive with.

(May 1873) CHICAGO (J W.).—See notice above to A. C. and others. We cannot record your proceedings while a division continues, the effect of which is to isolate both parties. [Compiler’s Note: This is referring to the May Adeline above.]

(Excerpt from August 1873) DUDLEY. — On Sunday, July 13th, says bro. Phillips, “we were further strengthened by the removal of brother and sister Hencher, of Droitwich, to Dudley, who will now form a portion of our ecclesia. They have had a long season of solitude at Droitwich, but have removed in time to trim anew their burning lamps and prepare for the glorious proclamation, ‘behold the bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him.’”

(October 1873) BRIERLEY HILL AND STOURBRIDGE.—For some time the brethren and sisters living in Brierley Hill, have formed part of the ecclesia at Stourbridge, a place about three miles distant, but on Sunday, September 7th, they began to meet together as a separate ecclesia. Brother Shuttleworth of Birmingham, was present to help and encourage in the good work. The new ecclesia consists of about ten brethren and sisters. The step was decided on at a meeting convened on the previous Wednesday. Three reasons for it were written down: 1st, many persons in Brierley Hill are interested in the truth, and would be likely to attend a meeting if there was one. 2nd, the distance from Stourbridge was inconvenient for brethren and sisters. 3rd, favour has been shown to the Renunciationist heresy by the Turney brothers at Stourbridge. For these reasons, the Brierley Hill brethren and sisters decided to withdraw from Stourbridge. Brother Parsons has kindly offered the use of his house for the meeting, till a suitable room can be obtained.

(Excerpts from October 1873) WEST HOBOKEN. — In a later communication, sister L. says “We are happy to be able to communicate to you a few more names, added to our number during the past month: brother BARTON and brother BEALE of Northport, Long Island. A letter from the last-named to sister Thomas may probably be interesting to your readers. It reads as follows: “I have through the directions of a friend, Mr. M. of Norfolk, Va., a member of the Christadelphian body, taken the liberty to address you. I received some papers from Mr. M. more than a year ago, which I read very carefully, and by them my eyes were opened; and since that time I have carefully studied the Scriptures, and am satisfied that they teach the true gospel of Christ. I now desire admission among you; and my object in writing to you is to learn the requirements, discipline and government. You will confer a great favour upon me by sending me what information you think I need, and I trust, advance the cause of Christ.

(Excerpt from December 1873) LONDON. — Although the London ecclesia has not been mentioned in the *Christadelphian*, in reference to the recent controversy which has caused division in several ecclesias, the subject has, of course, not escaped attention here. In addition to the printed matter issued on both sides of the question, which has been circulated amongst the brethren, and read by them, we have had five special meetings for the consideration of the matter, viz. a lecture by brother J. J. Andrew, who afterwards submitted to questioning thereon; a lecture by brother Watts (maintaining the unforfeited-life theory), who also answered questions afterwards; then a meeting at which brothers Watts and J. J. Andrew questioned each other in turn; and finally, a two nights’ discussion between brother J. J. Andrew and David Handley. This discussion is to be repeated at Maldon shortly. At first, many of the brethren were impressed with the ‘uncondemnation’ arguments, but upon further reading and reflection, assisted by the meetings referred to, most of them have come to see that the new theory is opposed to the Scriptures. On the 16th inst., we held a meeting, ‘to take into consideration the question of fellowship in relation to the controversy concerning the sacrifice of Christ;’ when the following resolutions were carried by a large majority (about 12 voting for amendments to the opposite effect):

‘That we believe that the Scriptures teach that Jesus Christ, being the seed of the woman, the seed of Abraham, the fruit of David’s loins, and made of a Jewish woman, thereby inherited the consequences of Adam’s sin, including the sentence of death passed upon the whole race of which he was a member, and that, therefore, he did not possess a life free from the Edenic condemnation; that through having God for his Father, he was enabled, although tempted in all points like as we are, to render perfect obedience to

the Divine will; and that in consequence of that obedience, he was raised from the dead and endowed with eternal life by the power of God.’

2.—‘That in view of the apostolic injunctions requiring us to be of one mind, especially in regard to the doctrine of the Christ, those who cannot endorse the foregoing resolution, and believe that Jesus Christ came in flesh free from the Edenic sentence of death, are hereby requested to withdraw from fellowship until they become of the same mind with us on the subject.’”

(Excerpts from October 1874) DALKEITH. — Previous to the date mentioned above we belonged to the Tranent Ecclesia, but having to walk from five to nine miles, we resolved, for the convenience of all, to meet in Dalkeith, and we took the opportunity of leaving Tranent on the occasion of brother Strathearn leaving for California. We who live at Dewartown have still from three to four miles to walk; only two of our number live in Dalkeith. Our number in Dalkeith is now fifteen. We shall be very glad to see any of the brethren in Dalkeith at any time. Our place of meeting is the Scientific Hall; hour of meeting, eleven o’clock.”

(Excerpt from September 1874) NOTTINGHAM. — the following resolution was unanimously passed:—“We the immersed believers of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, meeting in the Mechanics’ Lecture Hall, Nottingham, recognising the scripturalness of the statement of the one faith, recently issued by the London ecclesia, and the desirability of having such a defined statement of our faith, hereby adopt the same as our basis of fellowship.”

(Excerpt from November 1874) NOTTINGHAM. —Brother Burton forwards particulars of five additions since the last report, as follow: one by immersion, viz., SARAH LOCKTON (20), sister in the flesh to sister Mabbot, an attendant on Wesleyanism; one by removal, viz., sister Annie Hopper, from the London ecclesia, having obtained a situation in Nottingham; two by return to fellowship, viz., brother R. Hoe and sister A. Dabell. The return of these is consequent on the ecclesia having adopted a basis of fellowship, and having in compliance with their request admitted by majority that the withdrawal of the late ecclesia from bro. and sis. Phelps, in 1872, was unscriptural. The fifth addition is sister E. L. Phelps, who was immersed at Derby (see Derby intelligence for April), and who has united with the ecclesia upon a like understanding. [Compiler’s Note: It was up to the individual ecclesia to accept them.]

(December 1874) ABERDEEN.—Brother John Anderson reports that the division which there has been among the brethren here for some time is now at end—the principal causes of it having ceased to exist. The union was brought about in a very satisfactory manner. The brethren formerly meeting in George Street Hall, consequently, now assemble with those meeting in the Music Hall buildings.

(January 1875) BIRMINGHAM. — The new *Record* is at length published, and may be had for 6500., being larger in size than usual.[Compiler’s Note: The “*Record*” is the “RECORD OF THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN ECCLESIA”.]

(Excerpt from January 1875) LEICESTER.—Application has been received for return on the part of one drawn aside by the Renunciationist schism, but who now realises the truth concerning the Christ as Jehovah’s sin-bearer.

(Excerpt from February 1875) LEICESTER.—Brother Collyer writes, Jan. 13th: “You will be glad to hear that brother and sister Warner have been received into fellowship again. This was arranged after satisfactory proof of a true appreciation (on their part) of the important truth which has been discarded by the Renunciationists, with whom they have been for a time. Brother Warner has not suffered so much as if he had been in entire sympathy with the disaffected element during his absence from us. [Compiler’s

Note: The Warner's which left under reasons unknown after their eye's being opened were readmitted into the ecclesia.]

(Excerpt from April 1875) GLASGOW.—A special effort on behalf of the truth has been made by the brethren here during the past month. They engaged the Wellington Palace, a new hall on the south side, capable of holding over 2,000 people, and arranged with brother Roberts, of Birmingham, for a stay of ten days in Glasgow, and the delivery of five lectures, besides two addresses to the brethren. The lectures were extensively advertised by poster, handbills and newspaper advertisement. These enterprising arrangements involved a large outlay of money for a poor community like the Glasgow ecclesia. How did they manage it? Having set their mind on the plan, they prepared for it in advance, by having a special collection among themselves every Sunday for some months beforehand. In this way, a difficult task became quite easy, which was made more easy by a contribution from the public, by means of a plate placed at the door as the audience convened. This is a custom in Scotland. It is rather an opportunity for voluntary contributions than a collection, and there seems no reason, when a large hall is engaged for the benefit of the public, why the public should not be allowed to pay—not for the gospel, but for the comfort of a roof over their heads while it is being presented to them.

(July 1875) KEIGHLEY.—There are two intelligence communications from this part, but as they are from parties in a state of division and strife, where there ought to be union, we cannot, according to our rule, publish either until there has been an independent examination of the matter by chosen brethren, resulting either in reconciliation or the manifestation of those who cause the offence.

(Excerpts from July 1875) LONDON.— For the information of any brethren in the country who may be coming up to London at any time, and may be staying in the *south* of the Metropolis, I may mention that we have lectures every Sunday evening, at a room within three minutes' walk of "The Elephant and Castle," (a well-known central point, easy of access).

There is also at the same place, a meeting for the breaking of bread *every Sunday morning except the first Sunday in the month*, on which day the brethren on that side of the Thames meet with those in Islington; and there is a meeting for the study of the Scriptures every Thursday evening, at 8 o'clock. We have had Sunday evening lectures in that neighbourhood for some two years past, and a regular meeting there for the breaking of bread has latterly been found necessary, owing to the fact that many of the brethren and sisters reside in that neighbourhood, and the distance prevented them attending the meeting at Islington so often as they wished. Although, however, there are *two meetings*, there is only *one ecclesia*, as we work *unitedly* in all the general arrangements with regard to the two meetings; and, by the combined meeting on the first Sunday in the month, as well as in other ways, there is a constant intercourse maintained between those on each side of the Thames. [Compiler's Note: One ecclesia two locations because size of town only.]

(Excerpt from August 1875) BIRMINGHAM. — The report circulated by those who would destroy us, that people are received into fellowship without regard to their doctrines, is absolutely without foundation. The very reverse is scrupulously the fact, as anyone may ascertain by consulting any of the brethren, whether those who remained faithful at the time of the Renunciationist treachery or those who have recovered from the snare.

(Excerpt from September 1875) HALIFAX. — The brethren in Bedford Square send "a few words in reply" to what appeared last month from those who have separated from them. It is not a reply, however, but a response, since the facts then stated are admitted. They define their position thus: "That Jesus anointed was the Word made flesh; that he was Deity manifest in flesh, and that being so, it was absolutely impossible that he could sin." No doubt in a sense, and an important sense, this is true; but it

requires the qualification arising from the fact that Jesus overcame the world (John 16:33), which implies a fight, else were he no victor. His victory was of the character that he expects us to achieve—(Rev. 3:21). No doubt he was made strong for the conflict, but to assert the abstract impossibility of failure, is to confound the distinction between the Father and the Son, and to rob Christ's victory of its glory. The place for both sides of the question is indicated in the addendum to the article entitled "All things of God," appearing this month (page 429). We can only express regret that a crotchet should be made out of any one (isolated) part of so glorious a matter.—EDITOR.

(Excerpt from October 1875) FROME.—Brother Sutton reports the healing of the breach which for a while kept two sections of the ecclesia apart. They are now meeting in unity, striving together for the faith of the gospel.

(November 1875) SHEFFIELD.—Brother Boler reports: "Our ecclesia here has been disturbed for several months, through brother John Savage endeavouring to force upon the brethren the doctrine (from Halifax) which we believe is contrary to the teaching of the word, viz., that Christ had not a free will in the least degree in the matter of his obedience; that he was righteous because he could not be otherwise, from which the rest of us argued that his temptations, and his sufferings, and his obedience were in that case a mockery and not an example to us in any form whatever. Brother Savage was entreated to drop the subject, but he would not be prevailed upon to do so. Therefore, we considered it indispensably necessary to adopt a basis of fellowship containing the following definition:"—

"Christadelphians believe and teach that Christ was the Son of God by Mary, a virgin of the house of David, and therefore, God manifested in the flesh, by the Spirit, yet having, as an individual, a separate and independent will from the Father which he used as intelligently in compliance with his Father's will as we are asked to use ours, but that, though thus possessing the abstract capability to sin, he rendered a perfect obedience through the strength belonging to him as the Son of God, and was thus fitted to be that sacrifice of a sinless son of Adam which the righteousness of God required, in order that sin might be condemned in a sinless possessor of the very nature of him that offended in Eden, and a propitiation be thus provided for our approach to God from whom sin had severed us." This basis brother and sister Savage did not agree to after it had been passed, consequently they went out from us. There are also three who have not finally decided what course they will take; also another whom we fear has gone back into the world, and brother McDermott has removed to Halifax, where he is meeting with the brethren, in the Assembly Rooms, Harrison road. The following are the remaining faithful brethren and sisters:—John Dobbs, Joseph Boler, Ann Boler, James Skinner, Henry Leah, John Neale, Henry Graham, Miriam Sorby, Sister Wray, and John Waller.

(Excerpt from February 1876) ROCHESTER (N.Y.)—Brother J. D. Tomlin writes: "The ecclesia of Rochester is in a healthy state as far as numbers are concerned. We re-organised about a year ago with five members, and now we number thirty-two members. Twenty of this number were identified with Renunciationism, but upon investigation, they discarded that new doctrine.

(Excerpt from April 1876) SWANSEA.—The brethren here have adopted and printed the statement of the one faith appearing in the *Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia* of 1874–5. They have been compelled to take this step on account of the advocacy of unscriptural views in their midst. The step has resulted in the separation of the Goldie family, and one or two others. Brother Randles, in communicating this result, while deeply regretting it, says the step has been forced upon them in defence of the purity of the faith and the name of the Son of God.

(May 1876) SWANSEA.—A lengthy communication is to hand from those who have withdrawn as reported last month. They allege that it was not the adoption of the Birmingham statement of faith, but the

way it was done that led them to leave; and that they did not sympathise with the unscriptural doctrine which has been taught. With this brief statement, which is as long as appeared last month, we must leave the matter. We cannot open the pages of the *Christadelphian* to personal controversies. We will but add that the true friends of the truth are found on the truth's side, whatever difficulties or misunderstandings turn up. [Compiler's Note: See Swansea April above]

(July 1876) BURNET, (Tex.)— Brother J. Banta announces the obedience of GEORGE EDMUNDS (30), formerly Church of England, and originally a resident in Birmingham, England; and JAMES EPPERSON, brother in the flesh to J. L. Epperson, of San Fernando Valley.

(He mentions trouble from a case of disobedience of the law of God and man. The offence is confessed and repented of; but some think there ought not to be restoration to fellowship. There is needless difficulty created. All manner of sin shall be forgiven unto men, except the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit; and where God forgives, we ought to have no hesitation. It is only where sin is defended, or not acknowledged in all its heinousness, that sin erects a barrier.—EDITOR.)

(September 1876) BURNET, Burnet Co. (Tex.)—J.B.—To fellowship those who walk in darkness, by habit and profession, is to make ourselves partakers with their sin. You cannot maintain too stout an attitude on this point. But we should do wrong if we were to refuse to receive back brethren who may have wandered out of the way, and who, confessing and forsaking their sins, desire to return to paths of righteousness and love. We have before referred to the evidence. 2 Cor. 2:6-10 is conclusive if there were nothing else. Unpardonable sin is where there has been a complete apostasy and a wilful and presumptuous sinning against light. It is best to reserve doubtful cases to the Lord's judgment at his coming, that is, by receiving them in compassion while repudiating all complicity with their sin. We make it a rule not to publish the discussion of personal disputes in the *Christadelphian*. It would be best to try to come together again. If all are zealous against iniquity, there ought to be no difficulty in dealing compassionately with penitent and reformed perpetrators of it.

(Excerpts from October 1876) SWANSEA. — The brethren having a twofold object in view, viz, that of spreading the truth, and giving as much publicity to the occasion as possible, announced the opening by posters. The brethren now constituting the Swansea ecclesia, and being in fellowship with the faithful brethren wherever they may be found, met the first time on Sunday, Aug. 20th, for breaking of bread, as follows: B. Lowe, T. Randles, H. Harding, R. Peters, Susan Peters, Jas. Evans, sister Evans, W. Rendell, R. Langrave and sister Langrave. The foregoing brethren and sisters are determined to fellowship only those who adhere to the faith as defined, in opposition to all its enemies—the Renunciacionists, No-Willists and and Trine-immertionists and all others who make the truth void. In doing this, they reject the fellowship of those who deny the free-will and voluntary obedience of Christ—who was placed under trial, tempted in all points like his brethren, made perfect through suffering, whose prayers were heard in that he feared, and having overcome, he obtained salvation, is exalted to the right hand of the Father, where he appears as our high priest and intercessor. We wish our position to be unmistakably understood.

[In answer to a question, we beg to say that no brother, comprehending his position as a saint in the midst of an evil world to which he does not belong, could be found giving “an amusing and instructive literary entertainment,” least of all in conjunction with “jubilee singers” under the “patronage” of any honourable sinners, however “distinguished” in the jargon of this aion of darkness. Such an occurrence could only be due to the ignorance of babyhood in Christ.—ED.]

(Excerpt from October 1876) CENTRE POINT (Texas).— [To J. C.—A brother or sister marrying an alien places himself or herself out of fellowship, to the extent to which their own act connects them with the fellowship of the world from which brethren and sisters have come out. Whether the brethren should

withhold fellowship from them is a moot question. It is probably better to tolerate their act under protest, and leave the Lord to deal with them.—EDITOR.]

(November 1876) GLASGOW.—Brother John O'Neill, who was latterly ensnared by the Renunciationist heresy and separated from the brethren for awhile, writes: "I have made known to the brethren in George Street, my intention to come back, and of my regret and sorrow for what I have done. I have every reason for hope that they will take me into their fellowship (which they have since done.—ED.) from the kindness I met with from all at their meeting yesterday. Indeed, bro. Roberts, I have never had that peace and joy in the belief of the truth since I left them as I had before, but how could I when I renounced the truth itself? I was so cajoled and persuaded by Ellis that I did not see the deception with the many fair appearances that are coated over it, and as I said to Turney and Farmer it only requires one to be in it to see it in all its deformity. This, thank God, I have seen and by His aid have been able to cast it behind me as a thing in which there is no profit. Bro. A. Andrew's articles in the August and September *Christadelphian* have been of immense benefit to me, for which I thanked him. I have thrown up all connection with the error, and I have written to E. T., asking him as a favour to make my change of mind known through the same channel as made my Renunciation of the truth so triumphantly known, but I don't anticipate compliance with my desire (We are informed that compliance has been refused. ED.) I have written to Farmer telling him my opinion of the *Christian Lamp* and tis advocacy of Dowieism, and garbage from the writings of the apostacy. I have received a note from him, telling me I am too severe on E.T., regarding (his treatment of) you, but he says, 'I admit there were strong personal feelings on both sides.'" "

There were no personal feelings on our side whatever. We loved Edward Turney, as we do still from certain points of view. Our refusal of his "complimentary" chairmanship at Kettering, and the subsequent and consequent disclosure of our sentiments regarding his relation to the practical precepts of Christ, were a mere washing of our hands in the sight of Christ of a complicity with wrong practical teaching, the burdensomeness of which on our conscience had been growing for years. Afterwards, we did all we could to heal the breach, even to the point of submitting to the humiliation of a written retractation, and were striving by increased co-operation to remove all soreness or misapprehension of our objects—when it turned out that the truce was broken without our knowing anything about it, and that the means to which we stooped for the sake of peace were being privately made use of to destroy our influence with the brethren, and finally an attempt to subvert the truth itself. But thanks be to God, the machination, successful for a time, has proved a failure; yea, has tended to the furtherance and consolidation of the truth in its highest aspects, and has left us unhurt in the eyes of those who can discern. It would be a cause of rejoicing if even now at the eleventh hour, these erring brethren retraced their steps. We can assure them (and many of them must be convinced of it in their own hearts) that we have no personal grudge or malice against any, and that if we have stood entirely aloof, and shewn an uncompromising hostility to their proceedings, it is because of what duty to the truth of God in this dark day requires at our hands. God grant them a recovery from the snare into which they have fallen.—EDITOR.]

(Excerpt from December 1876) CARROL (La.) — He advises brethren anywhere in want of a settlement, to come to Carrol. Land, he says, in these parts is fertile and to be had at a low price. [The terms of restoration to fellowship in the case of any manner of offence is a confession of wrong-doing and repentance. If there are any doubts, give the offender the benefit of the doubt, and leave the Lord to judge at his coming. The duty of the ecclesia is done when it washes its hands of the offence. Penitent offenders are to be received and helped till the Lord come.—ED.]

(Excerpt from January 1877) SALE. — We publish the report in the hope that it signifies a retreat on the part of Sale from the unscriptural position represented by the pamphlet reviewed in another part of this number of the *Christadelphian*. We could have no interest in reporting operations conducted on a wrong

foundation. [See pamphlet named “a leaflet for meetings everywhere” under; Futher Proof / Volumes 1 to 30 compiler.]

(February 1877) DALKEITH.—Since the Renunciationist schism three years ago, Dalkeith has been in the wrong fellowship. Items of intelligence have been sent to the *Christadelphian* once or twice, but were not used till a right position should be taken. This has been to the grief of some, who now write as follow: “The brethren forming the Dalkeith ecclesia, have now learned experimentally the truth of our Lord’s saying, ‘A house divided against itself cannot stand.’ We have at last arrived at a unity of faith in regard to the nature of Christ, and wish it to be distinctly understood that we can no longer fellowship any one holding what is known as ‘Renunciationism.’ That this may be known, we hope you will take notice of it in the Feb. No. of the *Christadelphian*, and give the names of those who have assented to this, so that there will be no mistake as to who are for or against us. They are John Cunningham, Mrs. John Cunningham, James Harrison, Benjamin Reid, Janet Stokes, Robert Reid, sen., Mrs. Robert Reid, John Reid, Mrs. John Reid, Alexander Bateman, Mrs. A. Bateman, Robert Reid, jun., Elizabeth Reid and the writer, David Stokes. P.S.—Our place of meeting is now changed from Scientific Hall to New Hall, Back Street; hour of assembling, 11 a.m. Bro. Stokes reports the obedience of BENJAMIN READ, of Gilmerton, after a satisfactory confession of the faith once delivered to the saints.

(Excerpt from February 1877) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland writes: “I have the pleasure to report the return to fellowship of brother John Harrison, whose withdrawal from the Nottingham Ecclesia was noticed in the *Christadelphian* for September, 1876.

(Excerpt from March 1877) HUDDERSFIELD.— Brother Joe Heywood, who has till recently been in sympathy with No-willism, writes to say that after a careful reconsideration of the subject, he has come to the conclusion that the truth of God-manifestation has been carried to an extreme by those who advocate No-willism, with the effect of shutting the man Christ Jesus out of the question altogether. He had thought that the Editor of the *Christadelphian* had left the position set forth in “The operations of the Deity.” It was so represented to him. He now sees it is not so, and rejoices to be able to say “Yes” to the questions appearing in the article “The No-will Nullification of the Mission and Work of Christ,” on page 131 of the present number, with the definition of terms also appearing in the article. He adds: “Having misunderstood your position, I have opposed you. I am now convinced that it is possible to be so led away with one portion of the word that another portion, quite as important, may be excluded and overlookod, the result being schism in the ecclesias. We may be thankful that this is not done by yourself or the Dr. on this question. The Scriptures set forth our dear Saviour in all his weakness and yet in all the glory of the Father; and I, for one, am determined to resist all *definitions of the Christ* which cannot be understood when compared with the simple affirmations of the word.” [For article see THE NO-WILL NULLIFICATION OF CHRIST’S WORK & MISSION under; Futher Proof / Volumes 1 to 30 compiler]

(Excerpt from April 1877) HUDDERSFIELD. — The remark last month concerning brother Saunderson, of London (for the form of which the editor is responsible), seems to imply that originally he sanctioned nowillism. This is contrary to the fact. He has from the beginning taken a right position on the question. [Compiler’s Note: See March above]

(Excerpt from April 1877) SWANSEA.— At a meeting of the two sections, at the close of the last lecture, brother Roberts helping us to a proper understanding, a re-union was effected, and on the following Sunday Morning, March 4th, we met together at the Lecture Hall, Oxford Street, in union and fellowship. A very impressive service we enjoyed, being 28 in communion. In the evening we met for the proclamation of the truth, at the Agricultural Hall, where the united meetings will in future be held.



(April 1877) WARNAMBOOL.—ALEXANDER MATHESON (30), formerly Campbellite, reports his having obeyed the truth on Sunday, Dec. 3rd, 1876. He is a native of Dunning, Perthshire, Scotland. The Campbellites, both in Melbourne and Warnambool, lament his repudiation of his former faith, but will give him no opportunity of canvassing the question with them. He says his only hope of them is, that in studying to confute what they regard as Christadelphian heresies, they may find evidence that they are the truth. (To A. M.: It is not true that David King has “publicly (or privately) shewn the Christadelphians to be in gross error.” He lectured against them in his own place some time ago with the opposite effect, in the judgment of several who heard him. But as for discussion with the Editor of the *Christadelphian*, he has carefully avoided it on all occasions, though having had the opportunity given to him at least three times.—EDITOR.)

(June 1877) LIVERPOOL.—A dissolution of the ecclesia has taken place here, so far as previous organization is concerned, in consequence of the existence of differences which it was found impossible otherwise to compose. The result has been the formation of an ecclesia at Birkenhead, on the other side of the Mersey, to which several of the members of the old Liverpool ecclesia have joined themselves on a right basis. A few of the remaining members have reorganised themselves in Liverpool, professedly on the right basis, having adopted the London definition of the faith; but so far as some are concerned at all events, the statement seems to have been adopted unintelligently; for, in conversation with the Editor, two of those who have adopted it, avowed Renunciationist doctrines, while disclaiming connection or sympathy with Renunciationists. The situation is lamentable, but cannot, at present, be remedied. [Compiler’s Note: Dark gray refers to examples of members withdrawing from an ecclesia or ecclesial divisions]

(August 1877) STOCKPORT.—Brother G. Waite reports that at the Quarterly Meeting of the ecclesia, held July 1st, the whole of the brethren and sisters now constituting the Stockport ecclesia, expressed their non-approval of the Halifax-Sale no-will theory, and re-affirmed their position as defined in the London Synopsis of the Faith. Two only have identified themselves with the Sale meeting, “and of course,” says brother Waite, “they, like all who lose their hold on any element of the truth, think the step we have taken an unnecessarily harsh one. And truly I can say, that if we had no higher authority than human to consult, we should have refrained from it, because we deeply love those from whom we now stand aloof. Sympathy uncontrolled is a stronger power than reason; but we cannot let sympathy rule when the truth is at stake, and the “filthy rags” of the Orthodox wash-tub are held out for our acceptance in lieu of the “pure and white linen” characterising the faithful and true. The no-will theory will never do anything like the mischief that was wrought by the Nottingham heresy, and we now see the good results of that evil day, inasmuch as the minds of the brethren have been more fully educated on this great question, and consequently are better prepared to deal with all assaults, let them come from what quarter they may. The truth commands a good hearing at Stockport, and many are now interested. I hope to report several additions soon. Brother Ashcroft visited us for the second time on the 17th ult., and gave a course of three lectures.”

(Excerpt from September 1877) MANCHESTER. — After a time of much unrest, the ecclesia has had to take a stand against the no-will heresy which emanated from Halifax. It has adopted a resolution declaring that heresy subversive of the apostolic doctrine of Christ, and declining fellowship with those who hold it. The result has been a diminution of numbers, but a restoration of peace and union, with the prospect of a resumption of prosperity as regards those both without and within.”

(Excerpt from January 1878) HUCKNALL TORKARD.—Brother King writes:—“It is my pleasing duty to inform the brethren that the truth has found its way to this my native place in the shape of lectures by brethren Richards and Sulley, of Nottingham, who have delivered a number of lectures upon the first principles of our most holy faith.

(January 1878) LINCOLN.—Brother Richards, of Nottingham, reports an effort on behalf of the truth in this place at the cost of several brethren and sisters who have united in a joint subscription for the purpose. Lincoln, in time past, was one of the fields in which our beloved brother Dr. Thomas laboured, and in which the greater part of *Elpis Israel* was written. Three opening lectures were delivered in the Masonic Hall, on the 20th, 22nd, and 23rd November, by brother Ashcroft, to small but attentive audiences; his subjects were: 1st, Why I left the Ministry? 2nd, The Nature of Man; 3rd, The New Birth. The following criticism was inserted by the reporter of the *Stamford Mercury*—the most influential paper in the Eastern Counties—who was present at two, if not the whole, of them:

“Mr. Ashcroft, late of Birkenhead, finished his course of lectures, in the Masonic Hall, on Friday evening last, his subject then being ‘The New Birth.’ The Christadelphians, to whose sect he now belongs, and to join whom he renounced £400 a year, are firm believers in Scripture, their interpretation of which, however, leads them to reject the doctrines of the Trinity, the immortality of the soul and vicarious punishment, and to believe in the resurrection of the body at the second coming of Christ, when his kingdom will be established on earth. The lectures are to be followed by preaching in the Corn Exchange on Sunday evenings.”—*Stamford Mercury*, Friday, November 30th, 1877.

Brother Richards adds that the lectures are being continued as above stated, brethren from various ecclesias having arranged to take part in the effort; and he prays our Heavenly Father will further the work to His honour and glory, and desires the prayers of the brotherhood on their behalf. Considerable interest is awakened, and up to the present time (Dec. 10th) the prospect is very encouraging.

(May 1878) MELBOURNE.—Mention is made from this place of the formation of an ecclesia meeting in the Temperance Hall, Emerald Hill. It is said to consist of thirteen brethren and sisters, with prospects of additions. Lectures are given every Sunday night. Why are they “independent of brother Kitchen?” The body of Christ is one. True it is difficult to discern who are of it in this age of chaos.

(Excerpt from June 1878) BIRKENHEAD.—Brother Collens reports: “On the 14th of April, brother Gee, from whom this ecclesia found it necessary to withdraw in the autumn of 1876, was readmitted to fellowship. On the 8th instant, it was resolved to admit to our fellowship, without re-immersion, sister Margaret Jones, who has been for many years housekeeper to brother Croston, and who was baptized in Liverpool on the 29th of July last, her belief having been found, on examination, to be the One Faith

(Excerpt from September 1878) NOTTINGHAM.—Bro. Kirkland reports the adoption of a resolution at the last quarterly meeting of the ecclesia, condemnatory of the marriage of one of the brethren with a wife not in fellowship with the truth. The matter had been first dealt with in private in the proper manner. To the resolution, this clause was appended: “We pass this resolution, not with any desire to cut off brother Keeling from fellowship, but that we may not be partakers of his sin.” At a meeting held two weeks later, brother Keeling being present, another resolution was passed, expressing the conviction of the brethren that the brother in question ought not to be offended, but ought, if in a proper state of mind, to resume his place at the table. Brother Keeling has since withdrawn from the ecclesia. [Compiler’s Note: Mat. 18:15-18]

(October 1878) DALBEATTIE.—Brother Caven reports the obedience of MRS. MCLELLAND after making a good profession of the things which are most surely believed among us. She is mother to Samuel and Jane McLelland, aged 60 years. Brother Caven adds the following interesting information: A short time ago, there was no ecclesia in Dalbeattie. There was a meeting of the Plymouth Brethren, at which brothers McLelland and Caven (not at that time in the truth) were leaders. The truth was brought under the notice of brother McLelland by brother Hamilton. Brother McLelland introduced it to brother Caven. A curious result followed. “It is not very often,” says bro. Caven, “that a religious assembly

suspends its regular form of worship for the purpose of considering the truth.—(John 8:32.) This was the case with us. We commenced to read about the strange things, having got from brother Hamilton *Eureka, Elpis Israel, Twelve Lectures, Phanerosis, &c.* We went through them; you may guess we were pretty sober (Rev. 17:2.) by this time. Being leaders in the meeting, as light broke in it shone out, until the time came that we could break bread no longer. Having discovered the state we were in (what a discovery!) we came to the conclusion that we would break bread no more until two or more were immersed, and then that such only should do so, the others attending the meeting to learn the truth, getting immersed when each one was in a fit state. At this crisis, the news having spread, there came along some leading P. B's, and as was to be expected, there was a drafting off (Matt. 13:19.) so they went to break bread in a private house, we being left in possession of the field, and here we are to-day. We are only six in number, but that is a wonder all things considered.”

(Excerpt from November 1878) BIRMINGHAM.—During the month the following persons have obeyed the truth:—Oct. 3rd, Mrs. MARY ANN ALLCOTT (22), formerly neutral; 10th, ROBERT PHILIP HALL (17), son of brother Hall; 17th, Mrs. ROSE HANNAH LINES (40), wife of brother Lines, formerly neutral.

The Annual Meeting was held Thursday, Oct. 10th. It was reported that the ecclesia now numbers 310 brethren and sisters, and would have numbered 345 if the brethren of the Small Heath district had not formed themselves into a separate ecclesia. In addition to the routine business, the reading and adoption of the ordinary reports, the appointment of serving brethren for the year, it was resolved to make a special effort in the way of publishing the truth to the people of Birmingham.

(Excerpt from March 1879) VALLEY SPRING (Texas).—Bro. Banta, having alluded to the subsidence of former troubles, says: “There are nearly ninety members in Texas. I concluded to give you an account of them. The ecclesia at Centre Point now numbers about ten, who have renounced the heresy alluded to in my last letter to you, and we are now meeting on the basis of the truth as taught in the Bible and defined in the Birmingham Declaration of the One Faith. The Verde Creek ecclesia numbers six, among whom are brother and sister Goldie, late of Swansea, Wales. The Bandera Co. ecclesia numbers nine members, including brother J. T. and sister Maggie Benton, who removed from the Burnet ecclesia to the Bandera ecclesia in October last. The Blanco Co. ecclesia numbers about seven members; the Burnet Co. ecclesia, thirteen members; the Cold Creek ecclesia about seven; the Valley Spring ecclesia, seventeen; the Bell Co. ecclesia, seven; the Hunt Co. ecclesia, five; and the Galveston ecclesia, two. There are three or four isolated brethren and sisters in different parts of the State—in all, 87 members, all of whom are now, so far as it is known, sound in the one faith, as above specified, and striving to be found, at the coming of our Lord, ‘a peculiar people zealous of good works.’ We are scattered over an area of about 400 miles in length and 50 in breadth, and as we are all ‘the poor of this world,’ and have to devote most of our time to the support of our families, our visits to one another are few and far between.

(Excerpt from April 1879) SWANSEA.—At a meeting of the Agricultural Hall brethren, called to consider the advisability of bringing about an amalgamation between the Agricultural and Oxford Street meetings, it was decided, in order to remove all future doubts and misunderstandings, to require as a condition of such amalgamation, that every one taking part in it should besides adopting the faith as defined in the Birmingham statement, declare his entire rejection of the doctrine that Christ was free from the effects of Adam's transgression; and of the doctrine that Christ's obedience was not the result of his own voluntary will. When all are prepared to make this declaration, amalgamation may ensue.”

(June 1879) HUDDERSFIELD.—There is trouble here through a mistaken conception of duty. It is to be hoped reflection will bring rectification before the matter becomes too old for cure and makes trouble elsewhere. The ecclesia has rightly decided to respect the withdrawal from a brother, resolved on by

another ecclesia, and several in Huddersfield are standing aloof in consequence. This is a mistake. When an ecclesia withdraws from a brother, it is only right that no neighbouring or other ecclesia should receive him until at all events a properly conducted and concurrent examination of the matter have taken place by both ecclesias, if the second ecclesia sees reason to ask for it. If a concurrent investigation is asked for, it ought to be granted. If it is not asked for, the first decision ought to be respected. In any case, the first decision should be respected till it is set aside by a joint decision. The joint decision, whatever it is, should govern all. Those who disregard such evident rules of just government put themselves in the wrong with brethren everywhere else, and sow the seeds of endless difficulties for themselves and others.

(November 1879) TRANENT.—Brother Marr reports “a visit from brother Ashcroft, who arrived on the 30th September, for the purpose of delivering three lectures. The lectures duly came off on the 30th September, and 2nd and 5th October, and were given in earnest and impressive words. The audiences, though not large, were very attentive and apparently appreciative. The brethren who lately formed the Dalkeith ecclesia have thought it expedient to cease from having a meeting there, as none of the brethren are resident in the town of Dalkeith, but at considerable distances from it. Henceforth some of them will meet with the Edingburgh brethren, and the majority at Tranent.”

(September 1880) SCHOLL’S FERRY, Oregon.—There is a further communication from this place, signed by brother W. L. Skeels, “on behalf of wronged brethren who have been referred to and condemned four times or more in the letters of L. T. Nichols in the *Christadelphian*.” It consists of a series of resolutions which the Editor of the *Christadelphian* is requested to publish. If we do not comply, it is from no desire that their case should not be justly vindicated, nor from any sympathy with what may be wrong on the other side (and apparently from all the evidence, including their own printed statement, there is wrong on the other side). What we perceive is that the publication of the resolutions would not settle their controversy with those who are opposed to them, while it would lay open the *Christadelphian* to receive counter declarations and arguments from the other side, and thus inveigle us in endless squabulation which could not fail to be to the hurt of the readers. What we owe to the brethren concerned is discharged by the simple announcement that they deny the imputations of corruption of doctrine and practice. There has only been assertion on the other side, and counter assertion is all that is called for, so far as the readers of the *Christadelphian* is concerned. If we were on the spot and could probe matters to the bottom, as they only can be by *viva-voce* interrogation, we would be able to take positive ground. As it is, we do not feel justified in going further than we have gone.

The communication now transmitted says that the Scholl’s Ferry ecclesia is in a prosperous condition, all of one mind, and speaking the same thing. Would to God all wrangling might cease and the brethren unite themselves in peaceful and loving preparations for the astounding experience that awaits them all if for good or evil. The wrangling will cease then: but what about the wranglers?

(September 1880) SPRINGFIELD (Ohio).—Brother W. J. Parker writes: “I and my family came from Guelph to this city on the 10th of March last, and were most kindly received by the brethren. In looking at the account of your visit to Springfield in 1871, which I did a few days since, I find things have changed somewhat since then. Instead of between thirty and forty brethren and sisters, the ecclesia does not number more than twenty. The division that occurred some years ago having carried the others away, but indications are not wanting that this division will not be healed, if the Lord tarry. ‘Renunciation’ was the principal, but not the only cause of the evil, as I understand the matter. It is to be most devoutly wished and prayed for that a more hopeful and encouraging state of things prevail here. The ‘coloured’ brother referred to in the above account of Springfield, continues to adorn the truth by a life as holy as the best.”

(Excerpt from October 1880) DUDLEY. — There is a prospect of a considerable thinning of the Dudley ecclesia, through removal and emigration, consequent on the closing of the works established by the late

brother Blount. These works have been carried on for over twelve months past by brother Roberts, with a view to keeping the brethren together, securing a livelihood for all concerned, and redeeming matters from reproach; but the attempt has not met with a degree of success to justify the perseverance. There has been loss but no further debt. The stoppage is not a “failure” in the ordinary sense. The affair is being wound-up with the full discharge of the liabilities of the new firm. Sister Blount is provided for, and the partnership dissolved.

(Excerpt from December 1880) BIRMINGHAM.—During the month obedience has been received to the truth by the following persons: CAROLINE NEWMAN (31), formerly Wesleyan; KATE EDA NEWMAN (29), formerly Wesleyan; RICHARD KYTE (25), butcher, formerly Church of England; WILLIAM WALTER SANKEY (21), electro-plate worker. Application has been made during the month for a return to fellowship on the part of a number formerly in fellowship with those teaching that believers are born of the Spirit in the present state of existence. It was found, however, that they were not prepared to abandon that idea: consequently, their desire could not be complied with. Corruption of the truth begins in little ways: it is the beginnings that have to be watched.

The annual meeting for the appointment of serving brethren was duly held. The business was routine and satisfactory so far as satisfaction is to be attained in the present mixed state.

(Excerpt from February 1881) MUMBLES. — Brother D. Clement reports on the matters referred to last month. Space is so occupied this month with intelligence from all parts that we are obliged to curtail. The first meeting of the united ecclesias for the breaking of bread was held November 20, 1880. Many an eye was dimmed with a ear—not of sorrow but of joy. Brother Roberts agreed to give us the joy and profit of a visit from him, and I am sure that his words of warning, reproof, exhortation, and comfort will never be forgotten. He delivered a course of lectures, which was announced by placard, and commented upon by the local paper (enclosed). Already is to be seen the advantage of brethren dwelling together in unity. The Lord has added six to our number by immersion, and several by a return to fellowship. We have adopted the daily readings by the *Bible Companion* and the advantages are manifest even now, for our minds are all occupied at the same time with the same subject, and we can talk together of these things in a way we could not before. We have been employed on Sunday evenings with lectures by various brethren since brother Roberts’s visit, and the result is satisfactory so far. We are now looking out for a visit from brother Ashcroft, who has promised to give us a lecture on the Monday following his Sunday visit to Swansea, January 22nd.

The following are extracts from the newspaper notice referred to by brother Clement: “The extraordinary quiet of an extraordinary quiet time has been considerably disturbed lately at the Mumbles, by a Christadelphian muster at this village, forgive me, I should, perhaps, have said fashionable watering place). Considerable excitement has been created by the announcement of the bills that ‘Christ is coming.’ The interest was, no doubt, increased by the announcement in the placard that ‘the friends of the truth at the Mumbles are now re-united, and that the villagers are invited to come and hear their testimony.’ It appears that for some years past there has been two meeting places at the Mumbles, not on the best of terms with each other on matter of doctrine, and this fact, doubtless, somewhat hindered the progress of the work. It now is made known that for the future there will be one meeting instead of two, unity being strength, we are quite prepared to believe that considerable activity and earnestness will be seen in the carrying on of their work for the future. The Christadelphians make no secret of the fact that they consider the various religious bodies of the Mumbles have left the old faith of the Scriptures, and are now believing doctrines out of harmony with the Bible, and they contend that their mission is to call attention to what God has been pleased to reveal in his Word, as the Truth whereby men are to be saved, and we are certainly called on to respect at least their earnestness in dealing with Biblical topics. Their inaugural meeting was held in the Christadelphian Synagogue, the body of which was quite filled. I

have been told that the number of the members of this body (in Mumbles) are about 60, and that over 100 were present at the meeting we are now speaking about. At the night meeting, December 19th, the chapel was literally crammed, and it was difficult to obtain a seat. After the singing, reading, and prayer, Mr. Roberts was called on to deliver his first lecture—‘Christ is Coming.’—The lecture was a very clear and able defence of the teaching that the Lord Jesus Christ will come again in power and great glory to this earth, to reign as King. The second lecture was well attended, the subject being ‘What Christ was coming for?’ Mr. Roberts contended that it included the Resurrection—the subsequent reward of the righteous, and the reign of Christ. The last lecture was on the prophecies connected with the Turkish Empire, and the return of the Jews to Palestine.” [Compiler’s Note: See January 1881 Mumbles for history]

(May 1881) MALDON.—There is a change here. The Handley family, isolated by Renunciationism since 1874, have seen their way out of that fog and rendered submission to the truth anew. The London brethren have assisted in the transition. The change includes David Handley, the head of the family, who will probably receive immersion at the hands of the London brethren, before this meets the eye of the reader. Particulars next month.

Since the foregoing was written, the following comes to hand at the last moment from Brother J. J. Andrew, of London:—“In consequence of communications received from this place indicating a change of mind regarding the relationship of Jesus Christ to the law of sin and death, accompanied by expressions desiring a resumption of fellowship, an interview took place in London between several of the brethren there, and David Handley, Charles Handley, and Henry Howell on the 21<sup>st</sup> March. The result was satisfactory on the points embraced in what is known as Renunciationism, but not on the question of Resurrection and Judgment. Subsequently the difficulties on this subject were removed, and on April 4<sup>th</sup>, Charles Handley and Henry Howell again visited London, and, at their own request, after declaring that at their former immersion they did not rightly understand the taking away of sin, were planted, by the baptism of water, on a sound foundation. On returning home they took a stand separate from the others, and admitted to fellowship one by one such as they found to be sound in the faith.

“On April 21<sup>st</sup>, David Handley again visited London, and after giving expression to his belief in the scriptural teaching on Resurrection and Judgment, and also on the other elements of the truth, in the presence of about twenty brethren and sisters was, at his own request, in consequence of having until within the last few months held the doctrine of substitution, passed through the baptismal water with a firm conviction that by Jesus Christ’s death, sin in the flesh, or the body of sin, was destroyed in regard to himself.”

(April 1881) LEEDS.—Brother W. H. Andrew states that brother Hollings has returned to Leeds from London, but is not in fellowship with the brethren. When in London he held himself aloof in consequence of certain charges against him, and he continues to do so

(Except from August 1881) TRANMERE (Birkenhead). — Brother Parker reports that as one consequence of the re-union recently effected here, the brethren at Tranmere feel that a new impulse has been given to their operations. They have decided to exchange the passive attitude which they have maintained for some time to a certain extent, for one of vigorous and aggressive activity.

(November 1881) LEICESTER- A great shadow has fallen over the truth here through the imprisonment of Bro. Collyer for two months. A more unmerited misfortune, so far as human ways of reckoning things are concerned, never befel any man. A cruel mischance of circumstances has placed an unblemished man and a worthy brother in the hands of implacable foes. The legal cause of imprisonment is the possession of unsound meat. For the condition of the meat Bro. Collyer was no more responsible than for the state of the weather. The meat came direct from America to him, and through the change from the unusual heat on

the American side to the unusual heat on the English side, was spoiled, and arrived in that state to him. But, of course, its state was not at once fully known, the more especially as he was from home on account of weak health at the time. On his arrival and discovery of the uncertain state of the meat he went for the Inspector to see it, and though some portions of it had been cut up in the ordinary course for use, he forbade any of it to be used (in the making of pies) till it should be passed by the Inspector. He could not find the inspector as he was from home (this was on the Saturday) but immediately on Monday morning he sent two messengers to make an appointment to meet the inspector at his works at a certain hour that morning. The inspector did not come, but arrived later in the day on other business. (In the court he first denied that there had been any appointment, and then said he had forgotten it). On his arrival he found the meat and seized it, and issued a summons against Bro. Collyer for having it. At the hearing of the case no explanations were accepted. The possession of the meat was of course undeniable; the intention to use it as unsound meat was assumed; and as a similar misfortune having happened once before, a sentence of imprisonment was inflicted. Bro. Collyer appealed but being at once removed in custody there was no object in prosecuting the appeal. We are informed that a gentleman who was present in court during the hearing of the case, is taking steps to bring the case before the Home Secretary, with a view to the cancelling of the magistrates' decision. All who know Bro. Collyer thoroughly well, pray that this movement may be crowned with success. Bro. Collyer used to be a politician and a rising man in town, but on his acceptance of the Isolation which the truth brings with it, former friends became enemies, and others have become enemies who ought to be friends. The animus thus existing has rejoiced to make use of unfortunate circumstances to cast a blot on his fair name and crush him under the millstone of the law. But God rules in the kingdoms of man. He only allows the enemy to triumph over righteous men for His own ends. Bro. Collyer will come forth as gold. True hearts bleed with him and for him and cease not to pray for him. Their affection and esteem are but quickened by the successful combination of gloating Jews and Gentiles, in the presence of unfortunate circumstances which are evil in appearance only.—EDITOR. [Compiler's Note: See February 1880 Leicester for previous history]

(Excerpt from December 1881) ROCHESTER CITY (N.Y.)—Brother J. D. Tomlin reports that on Sunday, October 16th, HENRY CULROSS (21), put on the sin-covering name; and also SARAH E. CULROSS, his mother, being one of the many who were led into the unfortunate movement for a union without a unity, in August, 1878, between Christadelphians and Renunciationists, which, for the cause of truth in Rochester, is sadly deplored. Sister Culross, upon mature consideration, and on account of heretical doctrines taught at the Renunciationist meeting, and an unsatisfactory knowledge of the things of the name and the doctrine of the devil, was re-immersed, and has reunited with us in full fellowship; Lake Ontario being the typical grave out of which they rose to newness of life, by faith in Christ Jesus. At the examination we followed the "Birmingham Statement of the Faith" item by item. If brethren everywhere would adopt the "Birmingham Statement of the Faith," each new brother and sister would have it as a reference for their faith and belief when immersed, which might save many doubts and re-immersions.

(December 1881) LEICESTER- Sister Collyer and family have been much comforted in the affliction referred to last month, by the sympathy manifested towards them on the part of many. The result of the steps being taken to obtain Brother Collyer's release is not yet known at this writing: but a reaction has begun which may lead to results in Brother Collyer's favour. A gentleman well-known in the town of Leicester, yet a total stranger to Brother Collyer, was present in court during the recent trial, and he was so struck with the honest bearing of Brother Collyer, who conducted his own defence, and also the inconclusiveness of the case for the prosecution, that he made it his business to investigate the case for himself, privately, afterwards. This investigation convinced him of Brother Collyer's innocence of all intention to use the bad meat, which had spoiled on its way from America. With this conviction, he drew up a legal analysis of the evidence upon which Brother Collyer was convicted, showing that it not only failed to establish his guilt, but showed his innocence. This analysis has been submitted to several gentlemen, with the effect of convincing them that a great wrong has been done in Brother Collyer's imprisonment. Among these is one of the magistrates who tried the case, who has written a letter to

Brother Collyer's son, in which he says: "With a deep sympathy in your sorrow, I cannot see how I can help you in any way further than by *expressing (which I do most unhesitatingly) my opinion THAT YOUR FATHER HAS NOT BEEN GUILTY OF THE OFFENCE LAID TO HIS CHARGE*

Arrangements are in progress for the extensive distribution of a document setting forth these facts, and the analysis of evidence referred to, not with the hope that any remedy can be found for the disastrous effects of the injustice that has been done to him, but with the view of mitigating those effects somewhat, by producing a correct public opinion.—EDITOR.

Brother Gamble says the brethren anxiously wait for the 7th of December, the day of Brother Collyer's release; [Compiler's Note: See both February 1880; and November 1881 Leicester for previous history]

(Excerpt from January 1882) NOTTINGHAM—Since our last report, a few of the brethren who reside on the Basford side of the town have, with the consent of the brethren meeting in Peoples' Hall, formed themselves into a separate Ecclesia, and have engaged a room at Basford, in which, a few months past, we gave a course of lectures on Monday evenings. Many appeared to be interested. The brethren desiring to follow up this work are giving lectures on Sunday evenings in the same room, where they also meet in the morning to break bread.—I have great pleasure in reporting the return to fellowship of Sister Goodacre (mother of Sister Annie Goodacre, Norman Cross); also Sister Parks. Both these sisters were left at the Synagogue at the time of division. We have another addition to our number by the removal of Brother John Thomas Hawkins from Grantham to Nottingham.

(January 1882) TEWKESBURY—Brother Osborne says that the evils the Ecclesia have suffered from (referred to in Bro. Jellyman's letter last month) "are not so much due to the last 12 or 18 months as to the two years previous to that." The action reported by Bro. Jellyman relates only in a general way to J. C. Phillips. It is only since his removal from Tewkesbury 15 months ago that the Tewkesbury brethren have had definite ground of action.

(Excerpt from April 1882) GLOUCESTER— In the January number of the *Christadelphian*, the announcement appeared, from the secretary of the Gloucester ecclesia, that the brethren had, "in consequence of their disorderly walk," withdrawn from a number whose names were given. During the last month we have been threatened with legal proceedings on account of said announcement, which is alleged to be a defamatory libel. The words complained of are the words "disorderly walk." This is assumed to mean drunken and immoral behaviour, and all Gloucester is appealed to in disproof of a charge never made. The parties mentioned (Frank Forester, Geo. A. Baker, Geo. A. Thody, Sarah Thody, Emily Baker, Mary Ann Forester, and Julian Hodges) are hereby absolved of all imputation of drunkenness and immorality. What was meant was their abstention from assembly with the brethren.

One of them, Mr. Frank Forester, caused a lawyer's letter to be sent to us, demanding an apology and payment of costs, on pain of an action for libel. We wrote the lawyer to tell him there was no libel to apologise for, but the publication of a report of ambiguous wording, written and published without malice; and that any detriment arising from its uncertain terms would be remedied by the publication of his client's disclaimer, which would also be an entire satisfaction of the law of libel, as amended during the last session of Parliament. The lawyer forwarded a document written by his client for publication, which he called our "apology." We wrote him we did not publish it as an apology, but as his client's version of the case, which is as follows. With legal bludgeon in his right hand (a most disorderly attitude for anyone professing subjection to Christ.—1 Cor. 6:1–6; Matt. 5:39–45; Rom. 12:14–19; 1 Pet. 2:21–23; 1 Thess. 5:15)

Mr. Frank Forester Saith



“Mr. Frank Forrester, of Gloucester, complains of the paragraph on page 45, January number of *Christadelphian*, headed “Gloucester,” in which he is said to have been withdrawn from for disorderly walk, the same not being correct as to facts, and is a libel on his character. The facts of the case are as follows:—On January 1st, 1881, Mr. Forrester, with others (having charged the managing brethren at Gloucester with unscriptural conduct) withdrew from them and their sympathisers only, and communicated the fact, and copy of the withdrawal, to the *Christadelphian*, which paper declined to recognise the withdrawal, but stated that we had isolated ourselves from the brethren everywhere, thus judging before hearing. Mr. Forrester has never since been in fellowship with the managing brethren at Gloucester individually, because of their persistent unscriptural conduct; consequently, he was not in a position in which he could be withdrawn from by them at the time the report was sent from Gloucester; and having never been charged with disorderly walk by the brethren at Gloucester, or elsewhere, he is in fellowship with true brethren everywhere, not having withdrawn from the whole body, **nor having isolated himself**, as would be gleaned from report in the *Christadelphian*. His position, therefore, is that, not having been withdrawn from, he is in good standing, and within the ecclesia, and those withdrawn from are without; to place the matter in any other light, is untrue and unjust.”

THE EDITOR REJOINS

Mr. Forrester’s statement is only part of the truth. The omitted facts are as follows:—The managing brethren at Gloucester, after a certain time, declined to accept the services of a lecturer approved of by Mr. Forrester, on account of the reproach brought on the truth by said lecturer’s name. For this reason, Mr. Forrester and the others separated from the meeting, and sent to the Editor of the *Christadelphian* a report of their proceeding, as an act of withdrawal from the brethren. The Editor of the *Christadelphian* replied that before he could use their report, he must have the opportunity of judging whether it ought to be published, as it was open to doubt whether it was valid. This opportunity he asked in the shape of a personal interview with them and the parties affected. This they declined, consequently, there was no other course but to refuse to publish, and to accept their act as an act of self-isolation from the brethren in Gloucester and therefore from the brethren everywhere else, for the brethren are one. If this was “judging without hearing,” whose was the fault? It was in fact not judging, but accepting facts. It is Mr. Forrester who would judge in saying that the brethren in Gloucester from whom he separated, are “without.” They are not “without,” but in fellowship with the brethren everywhere as earnest, righteous, worthy men, submitting themselves to the will of God in their day and generation. Those who cannot claim such a position are those who disregard the commandments of Christ, and seek to avenge themselves by taking or threatening legal proceedings.

(March 1882) NOTTINGHAM—We are now arranging to remove into what has been known as the Christadelphian Synagogue. (This was a building put up for the service of the truth by Mr. W. H. Farmer, about ten years ago. It had only been a few months occupied by the brethren when the late Edward Turney launched the questions that led to Renunciationism, compelling about 50 of the brethren to leave the Synagogue, to meet together on the basis of the uncorrupted truth—the bulk remaining behind in the Synagogue with Mr. Farmer and Edward Turney. Since that time, there have been various changes. It has always been felt an offence and obstacle to the truth, that a building occupied by those who had departed from the truth, should bear the name Christadelphian Synagogue.—EDITOR.) We have long waited and prayed that this difficulty might be removed. Not that we knew how it was to be done, still less did we expect the building would come into our hands. However it has come to this—the building was unexpectedly put into the market for sale, and one of our brethren seized the opportunity of acquiring it. The brethren have decided to rent it off him, and, if possible, to keep it entirely devoted to the work of the truth. We hope to meet there for the first time on Sunday, March 12th (if the Lord will), when Bro. Roberts will lecture in the evening. It is proposed to call the Synagogue a hall, and give it another name, be way of marking the change.

I have pleasure also in reporting the obedience of GEORGE ROLLS (45), who put on the sin covering name by immersion on Feb. 8th, and is now numbered with the brethren in the place. About two-and-a-half years ago, he was passing the People's Hall on the Sunday evening, and seeing the lecture advertised on the bill, was moved to go in and hear. Previous to that time, he could not remember when he had last read his Bible; but now he was impressed by what he heard, and began to search the scriptures. He has continued to do so, and to attend the lectures, until he is now rejoicing in the knowledge of the truth and in the hope of the gospel. We are having very good audiences at our Sunday evening lectures, and have hope of others becoming obedient to the truth. Our Sunday school is doing well, and never was in a better condition than at the present time. The teachers have adopted the Birmingham lessons. On Jan. 4th, the children (which number about 50) with their teachers and friends, had tea together in the Peoples' Hall. Aiter tea, the children were entertained with the magic lantern, &c., after which prizes were given to those who had gained the highest number of marks during the past year. Brother and Sister Mitchell have removed from Nottingham, and since their removal, Sister Mitchell, who for many months past had been suffering from consumption, has fallen asleep. Bro. Mitchell, in writing to me, says she remained steadfast unto the end.—J. KIRKLAND.

(May 1882) CHRISTCHURCH. — Brother Challinor forwards lengthy particulars of the disagreement with Sister Williamson. It would not be prudent to publish them. Suffice it to record Bro. Challinor's contradiction of Sister Williamson's statement that continual discord characterizes the Christchurch ecclesia. "We sincerely desire," says Bro. Challinor, "that you will make it known to the brethren and sisters that this statement is altogether untrue. Ever since our ecclesia commenced its existence, peace and harmony have always prevailed amongst us."

(June 1882) SPONDON-Bro. Stevens announces the formation (with the consent of the Derby ecclesia), of an ecclesia at Spondon. The brethren will break bread on alternate Sundays at the house of Bro. W. Stevens, Spondon, and the house of Bro. Jno. Allen, at Borrowash. Bro. Stevens says, "We have no one at present able to give public addresses, so we have decided in addition to the Scripture readings for the day, to read at each meeting an address from *Seasons of Comfort*, also *Twelve Lectures*, and *Thirteen Lectures on the Apocalypse*, as occasion suits. This will be a great help to us, and more particularly to Bro. Allen and Sister Stevens who, through infirmity, have not been able to attend the Derby meetings so often as they would have liked.

(August 1882) KILMARNOCK- Through the ways of Providence five brethren and four sisters, connected with the Cumnock ecclesia, are now in the neighbourhood of Kilmarnock. Having formed ourselves into an ecclesia, we met for the first time in this town, on Sunday last, June 11th, at noon, for worship, in Hillhead Temperance Hall, Waterloo Street, which we have secured for this purpose. This is a town of considerable importance with about 23,000 inhabitants, situated in the centre of a populous district, and about 16 miles north-west of Cumnock. With the exception of three lectures promoted by the Cumnock ecclesia, and delivered by Bro. C. Smith, of Edinburgh, no public effort has been put forth in behalf of the Truth in this place, but we intend now to do the best we can in this direction. Being in full accord and thorough sympathy with the Cumnock ecclesia (now of 26 years' standing) our interests and relative position remains the same. Those who know us, and who are strict in regard to the propriety and order Scripturally enjoined, do not require to be told that they will receive a hearty welcome; and the same will be extended to all such, unknown to us personally, by a recommendation from the ecclesia with which they are in fellowship.—THOS. HAINING.

(August 1882) LONDON- During the month the following cases of obedience to the truth have occurred—on July 18, SAMUEL MARTIN, formerly neutral, warder in the Surrey County Lunatic Asylum; and on June 25, EDWARD SHERRING, formerly in fellowship with us, but re-immersed at his own request. There has also been added to our number removal—Sister George Phillips, from Dundee;

Sister Moore, from Manchester; and Brother Peplow, from Birmingham. Brother T. Turner has returned to Birmingham; and Brother Sendall has sailed for Sydney, N.S.W.

The annual out-door treat of the Sunday School and Bible Class, took place on Monday, June 26 to Fairmead Lodge, Epping Forest. We left the Upper-street Hall in vans, and enjoyed a pleasant day within the grounds of the Lodge, which is enclosed. About 90 children and over 60 adults sat down to tea in the "open," after which the children listened to an address, and sang two hymns. It is gratifying to report that we all arrived home safe without accident, for which we are deeply grateful to Our Father in Heaven.

The annual business meeting of the ecclesia was held on July 2nd, when the usual elections took place. Our number was reported to be 241. The number attending the Sunday School is 74; and at the Bible class 25 young men and women, the majority being brethren and sisters. The average attendance is 69–15 at Bible class, and 54 in the school.—W. OWLER.

Bro. P. A. Hutchinson writes that the new ecclesia, being unable to procure a hall, have, for the present, resolved to meet in the room belonging to Bro. Pittman, and will be known as the Fulham Ecclesia. He says, "We number twenty-one, one of whom has since been added to us by immersion into the name of the Christ. His name is Fermore. He was formerly connected with the Baptists. We trust that we will soon be able to report others. Our secretary, Bro. Marshall, will report progress from time to time."

(September 1882) DUNDEE—Bro. James Mortimer announces the resumption of the meeting for the breaking of bread, after an interval of painful experience, resulting in separation from several now in association with Bro. William Gill. It is unnecessary, and would be unprofitable to go into the particulars of the trouble. Suffice it only to say as much as is needful to justify that recognition which the brethren in fellowship with Bro. Mortimer have asked and obtained of neighbouring brethren. The matter goes back a little way. Bro. Gill sent to the Editor of the *Christadelphian* for publication an intimation that the ecclesia had withdrawn from Bro. Mortimer and others for disorderly behaviour. But the same post brought a protest from Bro. Mortimer, stating that they had been withdrawn from without just cause, and without a hearing; and earnestly requesting that their cause might be heard by neutral brethren, in the presence of those who accused them. The Editor wrote to Bro. Gill, stating the request, and advising consent. Bro. Gill answered with a refusal, stating that what had been done had been done in the exercise of their Scriptural right as an ecclesia; and that they could not consent to any interference from without. The Editor replied that it was not interference, but merely the giving an opportunity to other brethren of deciding in a doubtful case, whether they should continue or not the countenance heretofore accorded to brethren said to have been guilty of behaviour unworthy of fellowship. Bro. Gill contended that brethren elsewhere were bound by the decision of the ecclesia. The Editor replied that this would be a matter of course in all cases where the case was clear and the exercise of the right of the majority free from doubt; but here was a case in which a charge was denied, and in which a hearing had not been granted prior to condemnation, and a decision to which several intelligent brethren demurred. As these brethren had previously been in fellowship with the brethren elsewhere, and as their accusers now asked the brethren elsewhere to withhold that fellowship the brethren elsewhere were undoubtedly justified in the doubtful position of the case in asking for an investigation before complying with the proposal made to them.—The Editor pressed on Bro. Gill the advisability of allowing the request, since if it were refused, the refusal would leave the brethren elsewhere no alternative but to believe the representations of the accused, while if it were conceded, there was the certainty, if the action of their accusers were defensible, that that action would be confirmed as the result of the investigation. Brother Gill remained unalterable in his decision, and the Editor then apprised the brethren with Brother Mortimer of the result, and stating that their only course was to meet by themselves, but before commencing to do so, to make known the matter to neighbouring brethren, that their action might be legitimatised in the eyes of the brethren generally. Accordingly, Brother Mortimer and those with him (Brother Young and Brother Moodie, &c.), put

themselves in communication with the Edinburgh brethren. The Edinburgh brethren, desiring peace, in common with all rightminded men, wrote to Brother Gill, to induce him to consent to an open hearing of the matter before all; but they met with no better success than the Editor of the *Christadelphian*. Consequently, they adopted the only alternative open to them. They sent over two brethren (Brethren W. Grant and Blackhall) to hear their statement of the case. Hearing it and examining it thoroughly so far as was possible with the accusing side absent, they came to the conclusion that the action of those with Brother Gill was unjustifiable, and that those with Brother Mortimer were entitled to recognition and fellowship as the Dundee ecclesia. With this conviction, they gave to them the right hand of fellowship at their first meeting, on Sunday, July 30th. [Compiler's Note: Dark gray rule 35 each ecclesia is to individually to investigate member(s) applying for fellowship based on why they withdrew for other ecclesias]

January 1883) MELBOURNE.—Brother Gamble reports: “The Melbourne ecclesia has experienced one of its most important changes since its organisation, inasmuch as we have agreed to divide and thus form two separate ecclesias, one in Melbourne, and the other in Windsor, four miles distant. This was agreed upon at a special meeting of the ecclesia, held Sept. 11, 1882. The two ecclesias are to be one in the advocacy of the truth; both are to work together, with this object in view. Arrangements are made to exchange lecturing brethren, so that we hope by these means to double the work we have been doing in the past. The address of the Windsor ecclesia is Oddfellows' Hall, Albert-street, which will be more convenient for brethren living in the immediate neighbourhood, where a good deal has already been done for the proclamation of the truth. At present they number 19.

(Excerpt from February 1883) GLASGOW—Brother Paterson, sen., whose resignation was reported last month, writes:—“By not having the spirit, I mean that what they (the Glasgow ecclesia) are pleased to call exhortation, was not the result of the Deity dwelling in them by His Spirit, and operating upon their hearts, shedding abroad His love and comforting and strengthening them in the new life.” He does not contend for the possession of the gifts as in the apostolic age.

(February 1883) LIVERPOOL—The immersions during the past month have been—December 30th, ROBERT HEPWORTH (19), painter, formerly Primitive Methodist; and on January 7th, EMMA EDWARDS, and J. BIRKMYRE ROBERTSON (18), Wesleyan Methodist, brother in the flesh to Brother James U. Robertson; and we have received back to fellowship Brother Peter Whitfield, from whom we had to withdraw in November, 1881.

It is our painful duty to report that we have been compelled to declare to the ecclesia in Birkenhead that we cannot, as it is now constituted, recognize it as in our fellowship. The roots of the matter extend back a few years. Some four years and-a-half ago, when Brother Roberts, of Birmingham, was lecturing in different parts of the country against the fables of Mr. Hine, Brother R. D. Robertson raised the question in our ecclesia, to which he demanded an answer, whether any brother could hold, as a matter of open and pronounced opinion, a different interpretation of the prophecies concerning the House of Israel from that entertained by the brotherhood throughout the world. The answer that we gave to that demand was in effect that no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation, and that we must all speak the same things and be of the same mind and judgment. This caused the separation from us of himself and some others who went out, they affirmed from sympathy with Brother R. D. Robertson but not with his doctrine. They formed a meeting and remained separate and distinct from us for some three years when they sought our fellowship again and submitted their case to Brethren Charles Smith, of Edinburgh, and Henry Sulley, of Nottingham, who were mutually chosen by us to make the necessary examination. This proved satisfactory, and on the 13th of June, 1881, they were able to report to us that they were of “opinion that no cause now exists why the two meetings should not be united,” and they recommended that the union should at once take place. The brethren of the Tranmere ecclesia, however, did not care to

become one with us, and so there have been, since then, two meetings in this place; the Tranmere ecclesia meeting on the Cheshire side of the river Mersey, and the Liverpool ecclesia which now meets in the Temperance Hall, Hardman Street, Liverpool.

Shortly after their re-admission to our fellowship they organized a series of lectures, and we gave them assistance in this matter in common with brethren from other parts of the country. They obtained good audiences, and, as a result, added very considerably to their numbers. Among those whom they baptized was a Mr. Burton. This gentleman had previously attended a number of our lectures in Liverpool, and at their close had warmly contended with some of our brethren for the truth of Mr. Hine's Anglo-Israel "Identifications," quoting largely from the Bible for proof. He was, in fact, the most ardent advocate of these "senseless conceits" that we had ever personally encountered, both in public and in private interviews. Furthermore, he had applied for admission among us, and was neither case was the examination proceeded with, because of his incoherent and illogical applications of prophecies, concerning the children of Israel to the English nation. This was some five or six months ago. After this he applied to the Tranmere ecclesia for immersion and was not at first received; but being present on the occasion of his wife's baptism, which took place privately, at the house of Brother R. D. Robertson, he was there re-examined and immersed. This was on Thursday evening, August 24th, and on the following Sunday morning, August 27th, he was received into their fellowship, at which time their brethren generally became aware of what had taken place, and they made numerous enquiries whether Mr. Burton had changed his mind. The answers they received were unsatisfactory. They then sought Mr. Burton himself and were convinced that no change whatever had taken place in his belief, and that he still held that "when Israel are wanted they will be found in the English and Welsh." The result of the agitation ensuing was a special meeting of the Tranmere ecclesia on the 3rd September to settle Mr. Burton's case, at which Mr. Burton declared his belief that Queen Victoria was a lineal descendant of King David. Brother R. D. Robertson suggested to Mr. Burton that there was a difference between matters of faith and of opinion; upon which Mr. Burton said it was his opinion. Some seven of the brethren who were present at the meeting and who witnessed this severe strain on the truth, and some three who, although not present, were well acquainted with Mr. Burton's real mind (in all ten, namely, Ezra Roberts, Emily Roberts, A. R. McKay, Richard Gee, Ellen Gee, D. W. Gee, D. Munnerley, A. J. Gee, Elizabeth Munnerley, and Alfred Stephenson), decided that they could not countenance such insincerity, and consequently they forsook their communion and made application to us for fellowship. We pointed out to them that before we could consider their application, they must first notify the brethren from whom they had decided to separate, of the proposed step, so that they might have an opportunity of preventing the threatened breach. This they did, but no notice was taken of their letter. So after waiting a week, they sent another note, formally advising them of their withdrawal, and, nothing being heard to reply to it, we decided to receive the applicants into our fellowship, after examination. This was done in due course, when we apprised the Tranmere ecclesia by letter of our action, and stated that our knowledge of Mr. Burton's belief was sufficient to enable us to endorse what the brethren who had left them had done, and at the same time it led us to declare that they had by his admission become corrupt in the things of the truth, and we desired them to shew cause why we should, under the circumstances, continue to regard them as in our fellowship; the date of our letter was October 14. Ten days afterwards the majority of our brethren were surprised to receive, by post, a printed copy of our letter, and a long reply to the same by the Tranmere ecclesia. Their reply was disappointing. We wrote them, acknowledging its receipt, and desired some information on several points which we could not understand, if Mr. Burton had given up the beliefs which conflict with the Gospel of the Kingdom when they baptized him. The answer was entirely unsatisfactory. We were compelled to conclude that their letters completely confirmed the evidence which the brethren who came out from them furnished, that Mr. Burton still believed that Englishmen were the lost ten tribes of Israel, upon which we had rejected his application for our fellowship, and that the Tranmere ecclesia, who had received him, in defending their action, had virtually endorsed his views. Our charge therefore against them stood confirmed, and we consequently were compelled to stand apart from them, and to declare that we could have no fellowship.

Since then, on the 29th November last, a special meeting of both ecclesias was held, in the presence of Brother Roberts, of Birmingham, who had received a protest from the Tranmere brethren against the publication of the report of our withdrawal in *The Christadelphian*, and who requested such a meeting that he might be enabled to decide whether the intelligence ought to be published or not. The result of that meeting was to publicly manifest the grounds of our action in separating ourselves from the Tranmere ecclesia, for both Mr. Burton himself, in answer to questions addressed to him, admitted that he still held the opinion that the English and Welsh “might be” the lost ten tribes; and Brother R. D. Robertson declared that he baptised Mr. Burton with the distinct understanding that he held that opinion, and that he would baptise any one holding the same. On Brother Roberts expressing himself satisfied that the Liverpool ecclesia had sufficient ground for their action, Brother Parker, of the Tranmere ecclesia, requested delay for re-consideration. It was then resolved, on motion properly made and seconded, that the action of the Liverpool ecclesia be suspended for one month, to allow the Birkenhead and Tranmere ecclesia to consider whether they could endorse the position assumed on their behalf, by Brother R. D. Robertson. The month expired on the 29th December, without satisfactory result. We conclude, therefore, for the present, that we have no other course open to us but to publish the matter. The following have joined us, since the 29th November, from the Tranmere ecclesia, viz., Annie Allen, F. A. Robertson, and R. S. Baldock, while we have had to withdraw ourselves from Brother R. G. Rees, who declared he could endorse Mr. Burton’s opinions.—HENRY COLLENS.

In connection with the foregoing, Brother Parker, secretary to the Birkenhead ecclesia, transmits a resolution of which the following is the kernel:—“That this ecclesia cannot see it to be their duty to separate from Brother Burton on account of his holding the opinion that an Englishman might be an Israelite, admitting at the same time that an Englishman might not be an Israelite.” Brother Parker hopes and prays the matter may not be published, as he considers the point unimportant. It looks unimportant; especially put in the form of a “might be.” The way to estimate its importance is to judge it, not as a might be, but as a thing affirmatively maintained. Is it compatible with the truth to affirm that this British nation is the lost ten tribes? Because if it is not, then a “might be” is out of the question. If a might be is admissible here, why not in other elements of the truth? Why not receive people holding that the Church of Rome might be the Church of Christ or might not be; that sprinkling might be apostolic baptism, or might not be; that immortal-soulism might be true; that the land of promise might be heaven; that the kingdom might be beyond the realms of time and space, and so on with every item of truth. No earnest man could reconcile himself to such ambiguities on the verities of the holy oracles of God. A “might be” is equivalent to uncertainty, and uncertainty is incompatible with faith; and the faith certainly embraces the identity of the house of Israel, for the hope of the gospel is the hope of Israel. It is far from immaterial what view we take of the community in which we dwell. One of the most important bearings of the gospel in its individual application relates to the attitudes we observe to said community. We are to be strangers and sojourners. An Israelitish “might be” concerning the Anglo-Saxons must logically unhinge this position. If a might be is to be countenanced, then an “is” cannot be objected to, and in that case. The opinion considered so innocuous must lead to brethren taking part in British political and ecclesiastical movements. It must lead to identification and friendship with the world around us—(a friendship which we cultivate at the expense of the friendship of God), for if powerful Britannia is Ephraim, it must be Ephraim blessed, as the Anglo-Israelites contend, and what more natural in that case than for saints (the true sons of Israel) to join in the patriotism that glories in the lying strains of “Rule Britannia.” It will be impossible on a full view of the bearings of the case, for earnest brethren to dissent from the action of the Liverpool brethren.—EDITOR.

(March 1883) DEVONPORT-Brother Baser reports the immersion on Sunday, February 11th, into the all-saving name, of THOMAS POPE (67), who was formerly a wanderer from sect to sect in the hope of

discovering a place of rest. He thanks God that He brought him into contact with Brother Locke, who made known to him the hope of the Gospel, which removed the darkness in which our brother was walking, and made the light to shine upon him to the putting on of Christ. (It is impossible, without a more exact knowledge than a letter can give, to express an opinion upon the righteousness or otherwise of separation from what is believed to be disorder. The law of Christ requires union; doubtless there are times when withdrawal is a duty.—ED.)

(Excerpt from March 1883) GLASGOW—(The Glasgow brethren wish it stated that Brother Paterson’s explanation last month, as to the cause of his withdrawal, is not correct; that the real cause lies in his doctrine that the spirit operates separately from the word in the enlightenment of believers: in proof of which, they submit correspondence. There the matter must be left.—ED.) [Compiler’s Note: See February 1883 Glasgow]

(Exerpt from April 1883) BALMAIN.—Sister Wood writes as follows:—“We are desirous of acquainting you with the fact that we have formed an ecclesia in Balmain, composed of the following brethren and sisters:—Brethren W. H. Payne. Archer, O’Toole, F. R. Wood; Sisters S. A. Bower, L. S. Bower, A. Wood, and Brother and Sister Cook, of Rockhampon (when they are in the colony). We are at present giving lectures in the Temperance Hall, Montague Street, Balmain.

(May 1883) KILMARNOCK—All true brethren will sympathise with the scriptural zeal of the little company that here and at Auchinlech are striving to keep themselves unspotted from the world. But there is a wise, and an unwise

way of trying to reform the erring. We must be patient with other ecclesias, and not “stand aloof” where there is a professed conformity with the will of Christ, and some endeavour to carry out that profession. Consider the universal weakness and misfortune, and have compassion one of another. Without patience and forbearance, we shall fail to get at the little good that is possible in “the present evil world.” EDITOR.

(Excerpt from May 1883) NORTH LONDON (*Wellington Hall, Wellington Street, Islington, Sundays 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays and Fridays, Upper Street Hall, 8 p.m.*)—The brethren assembled on Bank Holiday (March 26), for mutual up-building, and were joined by others from the Westminster and Fulham meetings, who gave assistance in exhortation and doctrine.

(May 1883) PIETERMARITZBURGH (NATAL).—Letters from this place from several contending parties reveal a state of things in which it becomes necessary to shut the pages of the *Christadelphian* until the spirit of the truth returns to the ascendancy. Friends of the truth elsewhere can only feel sorrow and shame while the present state of things lasts. We cannot make the *Christadelphian* a ring for the fighting out of quarrels. Wherein intelligence may be made subservient to the interests of the truth, we are glad to use it—entire or abridged, unaltered or modified, as the case may call for. But it is the time to be silent when nothing but harm can come of publication. We are not a newspaper; we confess to a total partisanship on the side of the truth and all its interests. If this policy is sometimes irksome to those concerned, we must endure their dissatisfaction, in the conviction that even they, in the end, will justify a policy which is inspired by a regard to the highest ends and objects—not always visible to those who are warmly enlisted in some local or personal issue.

(May 1883) HUDDERSFIELD—There are honest men here, but they have got on to a rough road, in which keeping company is difficult. It is well to say nothing more, in hope that things will mend, or, at all events, till the situation become defined.

(June 1883) VALLEY SPRING (TEX.), S. H. O.—We make it a rule not to publish withdrawals where they are thrown in doubt by demur on the other side

(July 1883) HUDDERSFIELD—The division referred to in the May number of the *Christadelphian* is now at an end. Brother Roberts, having conferred with the separatists, saw both parties together, with the result of certain modifications of procedure which allowed of the letters of resignation being withdrawn.

(August 1883) HUDDERSFIELD—Brother Drake thinks the intimation last month, as to the termination of the division, a little misleading. “Certain modifications of procedure” conveys the idea of larger alterations than took place. He thinks it would be more correct to say “a certain modification of procedure,” in which we agree, if the promise to adopt a basis of faith is not to be considered as included in last month’s phrase.

(August 1883) WOLVERHAMPTON—Sister Picken announces the fact that the brethren at Bilston have decided to amalgamate with the ecclesia here, which arrangement increases the number of the faithful in Wolverhampton to 23. There is a fair, and on the whole, encouraging attendance at the lectures.

(September 1883) NORTH LONDON (*Sundays, Wellington Hall, Wellington Street, Islington, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesday and Friday, Lecture Hall, 69, Upper Street, Islington, at 8 p.m.*)—Brother Owlter reports that during the month, the following have put on Christ in the appointed way.—On July 15, JOHN STEVENS (formerly Wesleyan); July 18, MARY ANN KEAN (formerly neutral); and on August 8, ARTHUR JOHN BURRIDGE, eldest son of brother and sister Burridge. Brother and sister Moore have gone to reside at Sheffield; sister Hephzibah Ware has returned to London from New York. In reference to the remarks in the American intelligence in the August number, respecting brother Ware, I am requested to state that our brethren here were entirely ignorant of anything amiss, until after he had crossed the Atlantic. A letter of explanation is now on its way to the New Jersey brethren. Brother S. S. Osborne and sister Alice Austin have been united in marriage, and have gone to reside at Fulham. Brother William Skeats and sister Kean have been united in marriage. The lectures at Bow continue to be well attended, and our brethren are greatly encouraged thereby.

(October 1883) LIVERPOOL—On the 17th of August we immersed JOHN ASHCROFT (15), son of brother Jabez Ashcroft, and nephew of brother Robert Ashcroft. His early reception of the truth has been a source of comfort to his parents and a matter for rejoicing to us all. The brethren and sister who are named below have, with the full concurrence and the best wishes of this ecclesia, formed themselves into an ecclesia at Wigan, viz.—James Cadman, William Grounds, A. W. Longbottom, T. H. Russell, Thos. Rylance, junr., William Taberner, and Ann Ashurst. On the 26th August, brother Richard Gee, his wife and his two sons; also brother Daniel Munnerley and his wife Elizabeth, who are all in fellowship with us, left for Plymouth *en route* for Brisbane, amidst the regrets of the brethren. The theory of no eternal life under the law has drawn away four more of our number, viz.—Charles Barber, Sarah Jane Barber, G. W. Griffiths, and Ety S. Griffiths.—HY. COLLENS.

(October 1883) PARMA, N.Y.—Brother J. D. Tomlin, of Rochester, N.Y., appeals on behalf of sister Ingraham, of Parma. He says she has been obliged to leave her husband on account of drunkenness and repeated threats of murder. The family consists of eight children, the youngest at the breast and the oldest about seventeen; winter will soon be here, and they are in not only need but distress, and anything sent to my address for them will be forwarded and very thankfully received

(Excerpt from November 1883) CINDERFORD—Bro. Lander reports withdrawal from Benjamin Beard, on account of continued absence from the table; also from Geo. Vincent Hammonds and John Hodgins, the latter having entered the army. This reduces the number of the brethren to 19, but more candidates for



eternal life are expected shortly. The lectures, which have been continuous for some months, have probably opened many eyes.

(January 1884) BARROW-IN-FURNESS—We are glad to report that another son of Adam's race has rendered obedience to the command of Christ, by being baptised into his name. Our new brother is James Marriott, blacksmith, who previously attended the New Connexion. He was immersed on the 6th inst., and received into fellowship on the Sunday morning following. We are also pleased to state that brother and sister Paynter, who have been away from us for about two years, have again been received into fellowship.—E. BUTLER.

(February 1884) LIVERPOOL— There have been two immersions here since the date of the last report—viz., on December 15th JAMES MCKNIGHT (26), baker by trade, formerly connected with the Plymouth Brethren; and on January 11th RICHARD EDWARD WILLIAMS (40), storesman, neutral. The names of the following brethren have been removed from the ecclesia's books for the reasons stated—viz., brother and sister William Butler, who now meet with the Manchester ecclesia; brother W. B. Randles, who went to sea, and is, we hear, joined to the brethren at Barrow; brother W. S. Schofield, whose membership has lapsed in consequence of his absence from the table for thirteen months; and brother Robert Herworth, who appears, to have taken on the name of Christ without counting the cost, and has only broken bread with us on two occasions since his immersion in December, 1882. We have received the painful intelligence that sister Ellen Gee, who emigrated with her husband and family in August last (as already reported) died during the passage to Brisbane, and was buried at sea shortly before the ship arrived at its destination.—HENRY COLLENS.

(April 1884) WINDSOR.—Bro. Hardinge writes:—"The brethren of Christ in Windsor have noticed with pain the letter published in the *Christadelphian* for September last: And, while we desire to thank you for not having judged us harshly, as your correspondent has done, we consider that it would not be right on our part to allow the matter to pass unnoticed. For years we have allowed certain 'called brethren' to grossly misrepresent us to you and others, and have kept silent because we did not wish to take up your time with vexatious disputes, and we knew that the distance between us would make it difficult for you to discern who was in the right and who in the wrong; we also hoped that *time* would remedy these things, when writing would be no longer necessary. Such, however, has not been the case, and therefore we think that now it is 'a time to speak,' and to place before you a few facts concerning the position of the truth in this neighbourhood." (Facts of a personal character it would serve no good purpose to publish. We withhold them in sorrow for all concerned. We give place to the following): "We shall be much weakened by bro. W.'s withdrawal, especially so, as we have lost bro. J. C. Gamble, who with his sister-wife has removed to Ballarat, Bro. G. was a zealous worker, and his place will be difficult to fill; the Lord bless him and make him useful in his new sphere. Also bro. Osbourne (a promising young brother), has gone to reside with bro. Matherson, at Trafalgar, Gippsland. (May the Lord bless and keep him). We are, however, determined to do what we can to strengthen and build up each other in our most holy faith, and to proclaim the Word to those around us. Any worthy brethren coming this way will be heartily welcomed. . . . We have hopes that, ere long, a satisfactory understanding may be arrived at. We in Windsor, continue to have public lectures on Sunday evenings, which are advertised in the papers, and also by 500 hand bills (as enclosed), which we distribute weekly. We have done this for several months. The average attendance of alien has been 16, a few of whom are interested. We have a systematic distribution of *Finger Posts* (about 1,200 monthly). We are also endeavouring to build up each other in the truth, by means of Sunday morning and Wednesday Bible meetings, and meet for worship on Sundays, at 5 p.m. Our average attendance at the Lord's table, for the past six months, has been 22. Our income and expenditure for the same time (six months) has been about £45. We get brief notices of our lectures in the local paper every week (as per paper sent); we supply them for insertion. From the foregoing, you will see that we are trying to do our duty, and we trust that, even in Windsor, our Lord

may find 'a few names who have not defiled their garments,' and who may be worthy of a place (however humble) in His kingdom.

(May 1884) WHITBY-Brother Clegg writes:—"It affords me much pleasure to forward to you the report of the obedience of ALBERT MALLANDER, decorator (19); also LUCY MALLANDER (17), who were baptised into Christ April 3rd. They are son and daughter of brother and sister Mallander. Their examination made manifest how much easier a thing it is to acquire a knowledge of the truth, when the mind has not been previously befogged with orthodoxy. Children of the brethren have a great advantage in this respect. Might I also request you to insert in the *Christadelphian* the following letter, the contents of which will explain itself:—"Ruswarp, 26th March, 1884. *To the brethren and sisters assembling at 14, Silver Street, Whitby.* DEAR BRETHREN AND SISTERS, —Having had an interview this evening with brother Clegg and brother Mankin touching the matters of misunderstanding between them which has so long separated brother Mankin from your fellowship, I am able to say, with their concurrence, that the misunderstanding has been founded on mutual misapprehension of facts. Bro. Mankin withdraws his charges against brother Clegg, and brother Clegg consents to the resumption of fellowship between them. The object of this note is to ask you to allow brother Mankin to resume the place among you which he left seven or eight years ago, in which request the two brothers hereby join. Faithfully your brother, ROBERT ROBERTS. Signed also by THOMAS MANKIN, THOMAS EDWARDS CLEGG."

(May 1884) BALACLAVA.—Bro. Walker reports the formation of a new ecclesia, styled the Balaclava ecclesia, composed of brethren heretofore meeting at Melbourne and Windsor. All who consent to the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus, and willing to conform their minds and dispositions thereunto, are welcome, and none others. The new ecclesia is composed of the following brethren and sisters:—John Joseph Schneider, John Betts, Jane Betts, Helen Schneider, Henry Robertson, James Buchanan, Elizabeth Buchanan, Frederick C. Arnold, Chas. C. Walker, Edith Walker, Ellen Sutcliffe.

(August 1884) SYDNEY.—Bro. Bayliss and bro. Burton, referring to the intelligence from this place, published and commented on in the *Christadelphian* for April last, state that the discussion had lasted for three months; a continuation of the proceedings would have been destructive of the unity and peace that ought to prevail in every ecclesia: hence the action, which proceeded from no animus, but from a simple desire for a Scriptural state of things, and to maintain the wholesome rule of responsibility laid down by the Lord, that "Light having come into the world," if men knowingly refuse subjection, they come under its condemnation. The Editor regrets it has weakened the hands of those whose paramount aim is to be faithful to the truth and its obligations: such a result was unwitting and unintentional. He only sought to deprecate what seemed a going too far. It is always difficult to judge at a distance. We always wish to be on the side of those who are on the side of the truth and zealous for the maintenance of order, harmony and love in the body of Christ. The number mentioned (75) was, it seems, the total number of names on the roll and did not include several absentees nor those withdrawn from.

(Excerpt from October 1884) BIRMINGHAM- Details of Birmingham intelligence will henceforward be found in the *Visitor* department of the *Christadelphian*.

(February 1885) Halifax.—Bro. Skelton reports a visit from bro. F. Hodgkinson, of Norman Cross, on Sunday, Dec 7th, who delivered two lectures to good audiences, on "Joab, Captain of the Host, "Ghosts: a belief in them unscriptural." The annual meeting was held on Christmas Day, in the Oddfellows' Hall, St. James's Road, when there was a large muster. A new ecclesia has been formed at Sowerby Bridge, which takes 22 brethren and sisters from Halifax, including bro. and sister Briggs, "whom," says bro. Skelton, "we shall greatly miss."— [The Editor was under engagement to lecture at Halifax on Sunday, Feb. 15th, but the arrangement has been unhinged by the action of the managing brethren who wrote to him, asking him, on the occasion of his visit to be silent on the subject of inspiration. The Editor replied that the best

way would be for him to postpone his visit till he could be invited without conditions as to the way in which he should serve the truth. The Editor will co-operate in fellowship with no man who has reservations on the subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures, or who would for any reason gag his mouth in the faithful declaration of the truth of God.—EDITOR.]

(Excerpt from March 1885)Liverpool. — (Brother Babbage sends a printed circular which he has issued. If it were not too late, we should say “withhold it.” It is an unnecessary defence, so far as we are concerned: and it may work harm in other directions. However, there it is. It was natural, perhaps, for the brethren to publish it. The short paragraph on which brother Ashcroft founds a serious charge against us, was a descriptive report of the effect of the resolution passed, and not a professed citation of it. Stating the effect of a resolution, and quoting its *ipsissima verba* are two different things. No one knows the difference better than brother Ashcroft, and we should think that his conscience will not ultimately be comfortable in trying thus to make a man an offender for a word. We had to get the paragraph into so many lines, which compelled us for purposes of condensation, to state the effect, rather than the terms of the resolution. If any one will compare our paraphrase of the resolution, with the resolution itself, he will see there is no difference of meaning, and the meaning is everything. The Scriptures are the Scriptures in whatever language. The authorship of a book is the same, whether we have it in the language in which the author produced it, or in a translation into another language. It is the original authorship that is everything in this controversy—of God or of man?—ED.)

(Excerpt from March 1885) FULHAM- [Bro. Pegg wishes to say that he and sister Pegg went into the country for the benefit of sister Pegg’s health; and that there could be no ground for the ecclesia withdrawing from him. We publish the disclaimer merely as a matter of right, having no knowledge of the matter one way or other.—ED.]

(Excerpt from April 1885) FULHAM- [Bro. Hutchinson, referring to bro. Pegg’s disclaimer last month, says, “We are at a loss to understand his statement, as he is perfectly well acquainted with our reasons for disfellowshipping him. Should he make application to any of the ecclesias for fellowship, we will be pleased to furnish them with all particulars and correspondence on the matter leaving it to them to act as they may think best.]

(May 1885) Nottingham.—Brother Kirkland reports that bro. P. H. Horsman (of Nottingham), and sister Tourle (of London), have been united in marriage. Sister Tourle (now sister Horsman) will be numbered with the Nottingham ecclesia. He further reports the all but unanimous adoption of the resolution appearing below, after several special meetings, adjourned from time to time. The final meeting took place at the beginning of April. The matter to which it refers has been under consideration in Nottingham for several months, and bears more or less on all the brethren. “It will be necessary to explain,” says bro. Kirkland, “that for several years past brother Ashcroft has been intimately connected with the public proclamation of the truth in Nottingham, lecturing once every few weeks for the past two years. On Dec. 11th, within a week of his usual appointment we received a letter from him, in which he said:—‘The scandalous treatment, I have received through the *Light-stand* and the *Christadelphian*, makes it simply impossible for me to co-operate with the editors of these prints in any form of religious work. This decision, of course, will require you to arrange with someone else for the supply of your platform on Sunday week. The responsibility attached to it, is solely theirs whose shameful behaviour has made it necessary and unalterable.’ We saw at once that bro. Ashcroft was taking an unscriptural attitude towards brethren Roberts and Shuttleworth, and that, whatever might be the cause of offence, it was his duty to first try and gain them in the way of Christ commands in Matt. 18. This was pointed out to bro. Ashcroft (in a personal visit) by the brother to whom the letter had been addressed, and subsequently, by two of our brethren, who pressed on him the importance of obeying the command. Their efforts were unsuccessful. (Bro. Ashcroft would neither go and see bro. Roberts nor would he consent to bro. Roberts coming to see

him, which bro. Roberts had expressed his willingness to do.) Bro. Ashcroft's letter was then laid before the managing brethren, who instructed the secretary to write to bro. A. as follows:—"We, the managing brethren of the Nottingham ecclesia, having heard from brethren Sulley and Kirkland, the result of several interviews, are convinced you ought, in obedience to the command of Christ (Matt. 18.), to go and see bro. Roberts." The following was also sent to bro. Roberts:—"The managing brethren of the Nottingham ecclesia, having heard the report of brethren Sulley and Kirkland, believe it would be in harmony with the mind of Christ for bro. Roberts to go and see bro. Ashcroft, although the latter has refused to see him." On Feb. 26th, bro. Roberts sent word that he had been to Liverpool to see bro. Ashcroft, but that bro. Ashcroft refused to see him." The matter was then laid before the whole ecclesia, which, after careful consideration, passed the following resolution, a copy of which has been sent to bro. Ashcroft:—"Having heard read the letter addressed to Bro. Kirkland, in which Bro. Ashcroft refuses to lecture in connection with us while our platform is open to Bro. Roberts, and having heard and considered the report of brethren Kirkland and Sulley of the steps unsuccessfully taken by them to induce bro. Ashcroft to adopt the course prescribed by Christ, in Matthew 18:15,17. we are convinced that bro. Ashcroft is in a state of disobedience towards that commandment, and that his attitude, especially in refusing to see bro. Roberts when visited by him at the request of the managing brethren, is contrary to the precepts of Christ. Believing this, we regard it as our duty, if brother Ashcroft persist in his present attitude, to dissociate ourselves from him, as Christ commands in such cases. In passing this resolution, the brethren desire to say that they express no opinion on anything which has been said or written which may be of an unscriptural nature, as the only point we now condemn is the refusal to seek reconciliation in the way Christ commands." At the same meeting, a resolution was adopted declaring belief in the entire inspiration of all parts of the Scriptures, and refusing fellowship to any who hold there is in their composition a human element liable to err."

Brother Sulley writes in reference to bro. Ashcroft's description of the foregoing resolution as a "threat":—"Our resolution is not a threat, as anyone may see who discerningly reads. We find to our regret that bro. Ashcroft maintains his attitude of disobedience to the command of Christ. Such a course must of necessity cause a separation between us if persisted in; for Christ by his own words and by the mouth of Peter, Paul, and John commands it. While stating this to him, we do so in deep reverence and fear, knowing well that this is our only course if we are not to be partakers with him in his attitude. He says the Nottingham ecclesia has no jurisdiction in his case. (It certainly has jurisdiction over its own attitude towards him, as a brother in co-operation with them for a long time past.) Did he not virtually *appeal* to that jurisdiction when he wrote refusing to co-operate with us while our platform is open to those objectionable to him? Was not this an invitation to decide whom we would and whom we would not fellowship? Surely we have jurisdiction over our own acts? Yea, verily, and we must act, and cannot remain neutral in such a case as this."

[Bro. Sulley encloses a circular distributed at one of the ecclesial meetings referred to in the foregoing, in which bro. Ashcroft says the ecclesia will have to withdraw from bro. Kirkland because he refuses to "sell that he has and give alms" as commanded in Luke 12:33. This, of course, is not intended seriously by bro. Ashcroft, because he neither does himself nor recommend his neighbours to do in the literal sense what is expressed in the command. It is a mere *tu quoque* repartee which is inadmissible in such a serious matter. Even if Christ had literally meant what bro. Ashcroft suggests, bro. Kirkland's disobedience would be no justification of bro. Ashcroft's disobedience. Many of Christ's commandments are conveyed in a figurative form (e. g. "Let your loins be girded and your lights burning;" "if thy right eye offend thee pluck it out;" "if smitten on one cheek turn the other;" "lay up treasure in heaven," &c.). That the command to "sell" is of this character is evident by what is associated with it: "Provide bags that wax not old." It is not a question of literal selling or literal providing of bags, but of abandoning an avaricious policy and giving to the poor even to the extent of personal sacrifice. If it were a literal command, Jesus would have recognised no exception. Every disciple must necessarily have parted with everything and had nothing. But it was not so. A cluster of noble women, whose names are mentioned, "ministered to

him (Christ) *of their substance*" (Luke 8:3). Zaccheus, while giving "the half of his goods" to the poor, kept the other half, and was "rich" with the Lord's expressed approbation (19:2,8). So there were "rich" among the saints with apostolic recognition (1 Tim. 6:18). This shows that the command to "sell that ye have and give alms" was never intended in the sense by implication contended for. But can a figurative application be contended for, or even suggested, for Matt. 18:15: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone?"—ED.]

(July 1885) Bournemouth.—Bro. Jarvis (lately removed from Swansea) reports the formation of an *ecclesia here*. A few months back, sister HARVEY, of London, came to reside. She was at that time the only Christadelphian in the place. Feeling it her duty to spread the truth, she wrote to Birmingham for some tracts, at the same time stating her position. This appearing in the *Intelligence of the Christadelphian*, attracted brother Jarvis's attention, who had previously lived at Bournemouth some nine months. He wrote her, directing her attention to one whom he had interested in the truth during his stay. Shortly after this, two other sisters came to reside at Bournemouth, and latterly, brother Jarvis himself made arrangements to return to that place, which he would not have done had there been none of "like precious faith" in it. Bro. Jarvis says: "We are now progressing very favourably in the truth. We meet together every first day of the week for breaking of bread. Our place of meeting, till very recently, had been the Talbot Woods, where, under the blue vault of heaven, we sat upon the trunk of a fallen pine, and kept in remembrance the death of our beloved Lord. We have now been successful in obtaining a room for our meetings, capable of seating 100 people, the Liberal Club Room, situate two miles from Bournemouth, at a village called Winton, where we can not only meet to break bread, but proclaim the truth as well. Whitsunday was our first day for meeting in the room. We had the pleasure of the company of Sister Akers, of London, at the breaking of bread; also Brother Robinson, of Bradford-on-Avon, who gave us a very comforting exhortation, and lectured in the evening to a very interested audience. By the weekly distribution of hand-bills and finger-posts, we get a very fair audience. Being the only brother yet, I have to lecture every Sunday. We should be very glad of the assistance or company of any brother or sister who may be coming this way. Perhaps some, when reading this, may make it their business to come and give a helping hand, and thereby strengthen our hands, in the efforts we are putting forth, for the furtherance of the gospel.—But we expressly wish it to be understood that we have no sympathy with a belief in a *partially-inspired Bible*, and refuse to fellowship all who hold it."

(Excerpt from July 1885) Brighton.—(*Odd Fellows' Hall, Queen's Road; Sunday, Breaking of Bread, etc., 11 a.m.; Lecture, 7 p.m.*)—Brother Walter Jannaway reports that the brethren and sisters in this town have formed themselves into an *ecclesia*

(July 1885) Burton-on-Trent.—Sister Dalton, in writing, says:—"We are so pleased to state that we have now a small *ecclesia*, numbering nine. After so long a time, we are thankful that the truth is spreading so far."

(July 1885) Melbourne.—Bro. Whalley writes:—"A little company of 17 believers (in the bonds of love and truth of the Anointed Jesus) still meet each first day of the week in the Oddfellows' Hall, Windsor, to celebrate the Lord's memorial, and publicly proclaim the glorious tidings of God's fast approaching Kingdom, and the immortality and blessings revealed in the Lord's Christ. For some time past, no fruit has our labour brought forth, although two or three have advanced nigh the birth of water, which marks the line for the putting on of the name of Christ. We fight against fearful odds. The only public effort put forth at the present time, in all the colony of Victoria, is the sound of three small voices from amongst our assembly, who every Sunday evening bid the people 'Come.' We have endeavoured in every way the Lord commands, to keep ourselves pure and unspotted from the world, and nigh the line of truth and righteousness, and with the Lord's help and guidance will so struggle to the end of our days. There are

some brethren in and around Melbourne who would be lights and examples unto the household in any part of the earth; pure in the fellowship and doctrine of the Anointed One.”

[The letter speaks of ecclesial trouble of which it is best at this distance to say nothing. We publish the foregoing without personal knowledge and “without prejudice” as the apparent communication of earnest and honest men. If in any sense, or as bearing in any direction, we make a mistake in doing so, we hope any affected will pardon us. We do the best we can at all times: but all are liable to err in the absence of authority or the open guidance of the spirit.—ED.]

(July 1885) Jersey City (N.J.)—Bro. Walter Andrew reports with sorrow, the death of bro. Miller, after about two years probation. Bro. Miller died May 4th, and was buried at Staten Island, on May 7th. Bro. Vredenburgh conducting the proceedings at the grave side as well as at the house, where, besides the presence of a few brethren and sisters, there were a number of the alien who listened attentively to bro. Vredenburgh’s address on our brother’s hope of being raised from the dead to life through our dear Lord. [As to ecclesial withdrawals, it is a rule not to publish them, if they are seriously disputed, unless there is opportunity of investigation. Perhaps the cause in this case may be removed by-and-bye. Human rules are inevitable in ecclesial association in the absence of the Spirit.—ED.]

(August 1885) Glasgow.—We hope the brethren in Glasgow will see their way to avow the conviction, formerly expressed by one of their number, that the words of Scripture were “in their original form, the *ipsissima verba* of Deity,” and further, that these words were not, and cannot be erring words, and that they are resolved to maintain this truth as a first principle in their basis of fellowship. Their doing so would cause gladness in removing the barrier which the ventilation of the doctrine of partial inspiration has created. The necessity for awaiting this arises from the prominence in their intelligence of the name of the editor of the *Aeon*, who maintains that “inspiration, securing infallibility, has been given *only* WHERE *it claims to have been given*,” and that the writing of the other parts has been left to “the ordinary vicissitudes of literature.” The *Christadelphian* cannot be partaker with this evil doctrine.

(Excerpt from August 1885) Newport (Mon).—Bro. Lander (removed to this place from Cinderford) writes: The brethren and sisters here have formed themselves into an Ecclesia.

(August 1885) Nottingham.—Brother Kirkland reports another addition by the immersion on June 14th of EMMA WALKER (20), second daughter of brother and sister Walker, and the addition of another to the Nottingham Ecclesia by the removal (from London) of sister Tourle, mother of sister Horsman. Brother Kirkland further says:—At the quarterly meeting of the Ecclesia held July 1st, the following resolution was passed:—“This meeting hears with regret that brothers Richards, senr., Pepper and Kerry (whose formal resignations from this Ecclesia we have received) have invited others to co-operate with them on the following understanding, viz., that they differ from the attitude taken by this Ecclesia in April last, and also from certain brethren who form part of this Ecclesia. As to the first reason we hereby declare that we cannot alter from the position already taken, and expressed in the resolution passed at the final meeting, when brother Ashcroft’s case was considered; and as to the second reason, we deem it a matter of extreme regret that brethren should disfellowship individual members without first taking those steps prescribed by Christ in Matt. 18:15-17. And we believe the brethren who so act are in a state of disobedience to that commandment, and our heartfelt desire is that they may see their way out of the error in which they walk. This meeting is also of opinion that those who associate themselves with the brethren who have withdrawn from us are partakers with them in their deeds: therefore they cannot be at the same time in fellowship with us.” In addition to those named in the resolution, about 13 others have left us, and formed themselves into another meeting. Their names are as follows:—Sister Kerry, brother and sister Rose, brother and sister Hind, two sisters Ellis, brother Berry, brother Harris, brother Leverton, brother Tudor, brother Harrison, and brother Mabbott.

(September 1885) Walker-on-Tyne.—Brother Fox reports the formation of an ecclesia here, consisting of the previous members of the Newcastle ecclesia. Time of meeting, every first day, for breaking of bread 2 30 p.m., in the Mechanics' Institute. The new ecclesia will be glad to receive a visit from any brother or sister who may be visiting the locality.

(October 1885) East Invercargill.—The following letter has been sent out by the ecclesia here:—“*To the brethren of Christ in Auckland and neighbourhood*—GREETING—“In view of the troubled state of political affairs in Britian, and the enrollments under the Militia Act now taking place in this country, it seemed good to the brethren in Christchurch, Dunedin, Invercargill, and Riverton that this was the right time to forward a petition to Parliament, asking exemption from military service, and it was also resolved at our special meeting to forward copies of the petition to as many ecclesias and brethren as we can procure the addresses of. The petition sent herewith, with only such alterations to suit circumstances and country, is the one drawn up by brother Roberts, to be found in March number of *Christadelphian*, 1878. It will be necessary: 1, that all copies of petition be exactly alike, to avoid confusion with any other petition; 2, *each sheet must be printed* as per specimen; when filled with signatures the number carried forward to the next *sheet* and so on, then all attached together; 3, the petition must be forwarded to the M.H.R, with whom you may arrange to present it, not later than seven days after Parliament assembles. As all the Southern members gladly consented to use their best endeavours on our behalf, we do not think you will have any difficulty (may I suggest Sir G. Grey for you?) If you are acquainted with any other, they could co-operate.

“We shall be rejoiced to hear from you at any time, and to know of your spiritual welfare. Owing to circumstances, such as employment failing, &c., &c., our numbers here are few comparatively, but there are no divisions amongst us—‘all speak the same thing,’ and heartily and thankfully accept the *whole Bible as the inspired word of God*.

“With our united love to you all, in the hope of a joyful meeting in the Kingdom of the Deity, *through His favour*, affectionately your brethren and sisters for the Invercargill ecclesia,

“W. G.MACKAY, Secretary.”

The following is the Petition:—

TO THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER, AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF NEW ZEALAND IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

*Praying the Exemption of the Petitioners (Christadelphians) from Conscription for Military Service:*

SHEWETH:—

1. That your petitioners are a body of religious people known as *Christadelphians*, who are looking for the early personal advent of *Christ* to set up a divine government over all the earth, and to give an immortal nature to His friends who will be associated with Him in the Government.
2. That they are conscientiously opposed to the bearing of arms, on the ground that the Bible (which they believe to be the Word of God) commands them not to kill, nor even to be angry with their fellow men without a cause; not to resist evil; to love their enemies; to bless them that curse them; to do good to them that hate them; to pray for those that despitefully use them and persecute them; and to do to men as they would that men should do to them. Consequently, your petitioners entertain the conviction that they are debarred from taking any part in the conflicts that arise between nations. They recognise and discharge

the duty of submitting to the laws enacted by the Governments, where these laws do not conflict with the laws delivered by the Deity to His servants in His Word; but where human laws conflict with those that are divine, they feel themselves compelled to follow the example of their brother Peter, who, before a judicial tribunal in such a case, declared he must obey God rather than man.

3. That in view of the troubled state of foreign affairs, and the enrolment under the “Militia Act,” now taking place in this country, your petitioners pray your Honourable House to grant them a legal exemption from military service, to such conditions as your Honourable House may think fit to impose.

4. That conscientious objection to military service has been a peculiarity of your petitioners since the beginning of their existence as a body, and is not an opinion professed to suit an emergency.

5. That your petitioners have proof of this last allegation in their procession in the shape of writings current among them for many years, advocating these principles; and further, in the shape of documents going to show that a similar petition was granted to their brethren in Richmond, Lunenburg, and King William Counties, Va., and Jefferson County, Miss., by the Confederate Congress during the American War of 1860–64, and was also presented by their brethren in the Northern States to the United States Congress at the close of that struggle, when conscription came into force.

6. That your petitioners are few in number, and, for various reasons, are not likely to be rapidly increased. That the granting of their petition will, therefore, in no degree, embarrass the military measures which your Honourable House may be called upon to take.

7. That your petitioners humbly beseech your honourable House to grant their prayer, and that they may live quiet and peaceable lives, in the obedience to God, to whom they will pray for the guidance of your Honourable House in the conduct of public affairs.

(October 1885) Mercer (Waikata).—Brother Clarke, referring to the petition set forth above, says: “The threatening aspect if things in the East has aroused the New Zealand Government to the danger of a Russian invasion, and the whole country is in a ferment. Volunteer companies are forming on every hand, and assuming almost every name. Those who do not join the volunteers are to be forced into the militia. The Brethren of Christ have petitioned the House of Representatives for exemption from conscription. After considering our petition, the House stated they had no recommendation to make, so that the responsibility falls upon us individually to refuse to bear arms. This we shall firmly adhere to (God helping us.) Same as the Auckland brethren, we have been rather savagely assailed by the papers. We have been called some rather hard names, all of which we endure with patience, knowing that it is not for ever. On the last Sunday in May, I paid a visit to brother Jones at Himitz, a place higher up the Waikata. I found a young man there, Mr. Wortley, late of Liverpool, who having heard brother Jones speak of the things revealed in the Scriptures, and having been brought up a Freethinker, called on brother Jones. Many interviews followed with result of his making application for immersion. He gave a most satisfactory evidence of his understanding of those things most surely valued amongst us; and brother Jones immersed him in my presence in the Waikata River; also my own daughter, ELIZABETH MAY CLARKE, was immersed by the brethren in Auckland. Sister Clarke and I are truly thankful for this.

(November 1885) Toronto.—Brother M. McNeillie writes:—“It has been thought advisable by some of the brethren here to acquaint you with our position in Toronto. As you must, of course, be ignorant of the true state of affairs everywhere at a distance, and as all who communicate with the “Christadelphian” are supposed to aim at standing well with the brethren generally, it is not in your power to judge of the merits of all claiming true brotherhood. Since the falling away of brother Coombe, brother Jas. Hale is the oldest believer now among the brethren here. Amidst many and great discouragements, he has remained faithful



to the truth as expounded by Dr. Thomas, with whom he became personally acquainted during his frequent visits to this city. Although without education in the popular sense, yet, with a clear, incisive, and logical mind, he has grasped, in a wonderful measure, the whole field of saving truth, as unfolded in the Scriptures. Notwithstanding his lack of artificial accomplishments he is able to brush away all unworthy speculations, theories and crotchets that float themselves among the brethren from time to time. I mention his case for the purpose of making known to you, and the brethren through you, that any communication emanating from those in fellowship with him may be depended on as a *bona fide* communication. This information is absolutely necessary from the fact that in this city is another body claiming the name Christadelphian, and who are neither in sympathy nor fellowship with our body. They have adopted *broad* and *liberal* ideas as to fellowship. They “agree to differ” in many things which we deem of vital importance in matters of faith. The immortal emergence theory is strongly held and advocated by some of them, as also the Turney doctrine on the nature and work of Christ. I am not aware that the modern theory of partial inspiration is held by any of them, but the doctrine of “no judgment for the saints,” lately and strongly enunciated in “the Truth,” is hailed by some of them with enthusiasm. In making this known I do not wish to speak to the prejudice of any one. Some of them are amiable and worthy men; and I lament greatly that we are unable to enjoy their confidence and fellowship . . . I am fully persuaded that the winnowing process, which has been going on, is necessary, and that it will ultimately tend to the purification and edification of the one body. Much, in past times, has been done too loosely, and with an undue desire to extend the household, for extension’s sake. This will make true brethren more jealous and more careful as to material gathered from the world without . . . I may state that our numbers are at present about twenty-eight. We meet in the Temperance Hall, Temperance Street. All true brethren from a distance we are happy to meet with, when they come our way. This information we deem necessary for brethren who come here from a distance. I may say, also, that all true brethren here are much pleased with your able and faithful stand towards the latest apostacy from a wholly inspired and reliable Bible.”

(January 1886) Irvine.—Brother Spence writes to deny that those who meet with him believe in fallible inspiration or in partial inspiration. He explains that the reason why brother Mitchell and the other brethren have gone away is, that those who remain cannot see their way to “wash their hands clean” (as he words it), of those who teach partial inspiration. This will seem a sufficient reason in the eyes of those who recognise that Christ holds an ecclesia responsible for false doctrine tolerated in their midst. Brother Mitchell and those with him had no other remedy.

(January 1886) London. — ISLINGTON. — A special meeting of the Ecclesia was held on Oct. 19 to consider the inspiration question, notice having been previously given that the following propositions would be moved:—1. “We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the divine authorship, and consequent infallibility, of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship.” 2. “We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it.” Brother J. J. Andrew moved the first of these, which, however, was not voted upon, as at the close of the meeting a proposition by brother H. H. Horsman to adjourn the question for 12 months was carried by 43 to 36, many not voting. As this amounted to a refusal, either to reject the “fallible authorship” theory or to repudiate the fellowship of those holding it, the supporters of the proposition at once withdrew from fellowship, and to the number of nearly 100 have since been meeting at 69, Upper Street, for the breaking of bread. The brethren at Wellington Hall then met (Oct. 25) and passed the following resolution:—“That this meeting, whilst refusing to countenance an unnecessary agitation, maintains its old position of confidence in the divine authorship, inspiration, and consequent infallibility of the Bible; and will continue to deal with cases of departure from the Truth in accordance with the rules.” This we refused to accept, as it did not define the “fallible authorship” theory to be a “departure from the truth,” nor did it repudiate those who might hold such a belief outside the ecclesia. A meeting was then held between seven brethren on either side, at

which it was agreed the first proposition should be accepted by those at Wellington Hall, and that a meeting should be held to discuss the *second*—i.e. upon the question of fellowship. This meeting was held on Nov. 9th (the adjournment motion having been previously rescinded), but was without result, and at a subsequent meeting of the Wellington Hall ecclesia, our second proposition was put to the vote and rejected by a large majority. Until after that meeting, we had taken no definite action towards forming a new ecclesia, having no desire to make the separation complete, if it could, without compromising any principle, be avoided, but in view of the absolute rejection of the second proposition we at once formed ourselves into an ecclesia on the same basis of fellowship as hitherto with the addition of the two propositions given above. The Wellington Hall brethren have since amended their proposition of Oct. 25 as follows:—“That this ecclesia whilst refusing to countenance an unnecessary agitation maintains its old position of confidence in the divine authorship and consequent infallibility of the Bible; and deeming a belief in the fallible authorship of any part of the Bible to be a departure from the truth, declines the fellowship of those who so believe, and will deal with such in accordance with the rules.” This it will be seen concedes the principle that we are contending for, and we hope (subject to some necessary preliminary arrangements) will shortly lead to a re-union.—WM. OWLER, Secretary.

(January 1886) WESTMINSTER.—Brother F. W. Porter writes:—“The controversy on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, has at length terminated amongst the South London brethren and sisters, so far as the Westminster ecclesia is concerned. The matter has been under discussion for a considerable time, four ecclesial meetings having been held for the purpose. The ecclesia was asked to re-affirm their old position, and their belief in a wholly inspired and infallible Bible, and their determination to fellowship those only who so believed in the following propositions:—Prop. I.—“We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the Divine Authorship, and consequent infallibility of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship.” Prop. II.—“We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it.” To these, however, the following amendment was moved:—“That the Bible, as we now have it, is a reliable record of God’s dealings with men in the past, and an infallible revelation of the way of salvation and of His future purpose; a belief of which, in conjunction with obedience to the precepts of Christ and the apostles, we hold to be necessary to salvation. We shall therefore continue (as heretofore) to fellowship only those who so believe and teach.” On the first proposition and amendment being put to the vote of the meeting, the former was rejected and the latter carried by a large majority. Under these circumstances, about 60 brethren and sisters (including the writer of this report) have felt it their duty to withdraw from the ecclesia, it being impossible to endorse the amendment, which not only evades the point at issue, namely, the character of the autographs, but directly affirms that while certain parts of ‘the Bible as we now have it are infallible,’ other portions are merely ‘reliable.’ Moreover, it is manifest that it will admit into fellowship those believing in a partially inspired Bible. The brethren and sisters who have withdrawn from membership have constituted themselves a separate ecclesia meeting at the Hanover Assembly Rooms, 334, Kennington Park Road, S. E., having adopted the two resolutions first mentioned as a basis of fellowship.”

(December 1885) Manchester.—Brother J. Holland writes: “A wholly-inspired Bible, forming a part of that whole counsel which Paul did not shun to declare, and the Manchester ecclesia having amongst them those who advocate a partly-inspired Bible, and declining to make known its position in regard to the matter, eight of us have withdrawn, and are meeting for breaking of bread at sister Holland’s, 32, Gledden Street, Ancoats, until we can obtain a suitable meeting-room.” [See January 1886 Manchester below]

(January 1886) Manchester.—Brother Carr demurs to the statement published last month; he says, “There are none in our midst who call in question the inspiration of any portion of the original Scriptures—fresh from the hands of the divine penman. Neither would we fellowship or co-operate with any who denied the

inspiration of any part of God's Word." There must be a reason for the secession of the brethren who spoke last month. An inspiration has been confessed that errs: "God's Word" has not been allowed to apply to all the Bible. If this is the case at Manchester, there is no occasion for the foregoing demurrer.

(January 1886) Mumbles.—Brother D. Clement reports the determination of the brethren in the Assembly Rooms for the future, to require at the hands of all claiming their fellowship, the repudiation of every ecclesia failing to comply with what they consider the urgent necessity of the hour, viz., an individual standing aside from all who hesitate to confess the infallibility of the Bible, or who are willing to say God-speed to those who hesitate. They feel it must come to this, and the sooner the better, that we may get back to peace, edification, and progress. During the month, a week-night lecture was delivered by brother Shuttleworth, subject, "The Bible prospect for men and nations." It would have been well if some had heard brother Shuttleworth's admonition that saints should not soil their hands with Gentile politics. What has the King of the coming age of glory to do with the wretched political tinkering of this godless Æon?

(January 1886) Springfield (O).—Brother Parker, referring to the unhappy posture of things here, says:—"We are, indeed, in an evil case—evil all around—and the saddest element in the evil situation is our own unchristliness. To be sound in doctrine is most important, but what will this do for us if we lack the Christ character? I like one of your closing sentences in *Christendom Astray*. 'Let us not make the great mistake of following popular disobedience, while discarding popular doctrines. If we are to continue in the disobedience which the world practices (though called Christendom) we had better hold on to their superstitions and theological monstrosities; for, the abandonment of the latter, while holding on to the former, will only expose us to all the inconveniences of the Faith of Christ, while securing for us none of its glorious benefits.' This teaching need to be emphasized among us to-day more than ever."

(January 1886) Pietermaritzburg (Natal).—Brother T. Rees writes:—"Our little ecclesia in Pietermaritzburg think that it may be a bit of comfort to you in your fight for the truth, to know that the brethren in this far corner of the earth are at one with you on the question of the Bible being the Word of God. No one in this city who has noted the effect of the late Bishop of Natal's teaching upon his followers, can come to any other conclusion than that there is ultimately no choice between a wholly-inspired Bible and unbelief. Dr. Colenso only gave up certain parts of the book, but his followers, more logical, gave up the whole of it. It was a work of time, but the end is always the same. If one part is given up as untrustworthy, all the rest follows bit by bit. The idea of a 'human element' in the Bible, gradually ends in people thinking it is all human work. May God help you to fight the battle.

(February 1886) Aberdare.—Brother Pugh explains that Cwmamon and Aberdare are two separate places, two or three miles apart. The brethren in Cwmamon meet separately from those of Aberdare. On behalf of the latter, brother Pugh some time ago, reported withdrawals, which for want of understanding did not appear. Perhaps the necessity for speaking of them may pass away. It is much better when such announcements can be avoided.

(February 1886) Elland.—We must draw attention to the introductory paragraph of the Intelligence department, appearing last month on page 37 ;(see INTELLIGENCE (Ecclesial Notes) (the christadelphian pg 37) also to several paragraphs appearing this month in "Chat with Correspondents." [Compiler's Note: Also, see (*Excerpt from The Christadelphian 1886 pg. 66, the ones with a box around them*) under; Futher Proof / Volumes 1 to 30]

(March 1886) High Blantyre.—Brother Brown writes to say that, in addition to their declaration on the subject of inspiration already published (which they thought sufficient at the time), the brethren here find

it necessary to say that visitors, or others claiming their fellowship, must not only believe in a wholly-inspired and infallible Bible, but must be prepared to wash their hands of those who do not.

(March 1886) London.—ISLINGTON.—In my last communication, a hope was expressed that the differences subsisting between the North London ecclesia, at Wellington Hall, and the brethren at Upper Street Hall were on the point of removal. Two propositions (much similar to those we placed before the ecclesia for consideration on October 19th) have since been passed by the brethren at Wellington Hall, but the question of fellowshiping those who believe or tolerate false theories bars the way to reunion. It is unnecessary for me to enter into details, as these appeared in a circular dated December 28th, signed by three brethren appointed to represent us, which has since been published in the *Light-stand* for January 23rd, page 32. As a matter of fact, “the Upper Street Hall brethren approve of the action of about 60 brethren, who withdrew from Westminster ecclesia. We received the seceding brethren into our fellowship until they opened a room at Kennington, and in doing so, we practically withdrew from the Westminster ecclesia. As a practical matter, therefore, it becomes necessary, before reunion can take place, that the position of the Wellington Hall meeting toward Westminster ecclesia should be clearly defined. If the brethren at Wellington Hall intend to continue in fellowship with Westminster, we, by uniting with them, should be brought into fellowship with those from whom we have withdrawn, who countenance the fallible authorship doctrine and any believers thereof whom they fellowship. This is the very thing we object to.” These sentences from the circular alluded to contain the pith of the matter. We meet in the Lecture Hall, 69, Upper Street, Islington, for the breaking of bread at 11 a.m., and in the evening at 7 p.m., for the proclamation of the truth. We also hold a bible class on Wednesday night in the same hall at 8 p.m. The subjects discoursed upon during January and February are appended.

(April 1886) Lanesville (King Wm. Co.).—Brother L. Edwards writes: “You may, perhaps, be surprised to learn that Sister Edwards and myself retired from the Lanesville “Church” about the first of January, and have since been quietly breaking bread at our home. Like yourself, I have been under great trial in what I have hitherto regarded as our *Ecclesia*, but am now reluctantly forced to regard as a mere Gentile Protestant “*Church*.” It has been, for some time, a sad and perplexing problem to me which did not reach a full and satisfactory solution until I was present at a Call Meeting held on the 15th inst. to consider the questions profounded in the paper I herein enclose, and which will give you an idea of the trouble. Strange to say, but fraught with significance, the “Inspiration” wedge seemed to bring the hollow-hearted Christianity of the body into full view. I was prohibited from taking an active part in the proceedings, and for the most part, sat a silent observer. . . . A division, I think, is inevitable. There is some good material in the body, out of which an *ecclesia* may be formed, and, with the Lord’s help, I trust it will be done. “There must needs be heresies among you, that the approved may be made manifest.” The *ecclesia*, as well as the “*Churches*.” To me, it seems the greatest conflict and trial to “keep under the body, lest, while we preach to others, we ourselves may be castaways.” The *flesh* is the great enemy of the *spirit*, and here is the heat of the battle. My impression is strong that the “Exchange brethren,” and others have taken the idea that brother Roberts wishes to ‘lord it over God’s heritage.’” (The idea is a pure invention. It has been created and fostered by men whose feelings unfit them to understand our course. Men who love the truth before themselves, have no such difficulty. We exercise no lordship but the lordship of argument, and would most gladly sink even this in the presence of a pure and capable championship of the truth. Whenever we have thought we have discovered this, we have given place-with what results, now appears. ED.)—His attitude, for the last 25 years, makes him a target for their arrows of suspicion, else denying, as they do, that they believe in partial inspiration, it would be the easiest matter possible to take his position in this controversy. They should be no less jealous than he, of the purity and integrity of the Holy Scriptures, and would not suffer “The Word of God” to be touched by even the semblance of human authorship and error. This is the ground that I prefer to take, as the safest as well as the most invulnerable. I trust I shall never be in sympathy and fellowship with any one who may presume to challenge, *in the very least degree*, that BOOK which even all civilised nations regard as the *Word of the Living God*.

(Excerpt from June 1886) Belfast.—“A Run to Ireland”-- Finding on his removal that there was no body in Belfast taking its stand upon the whole truth, unadulterated by the crotchets and speculations which have sprung up with a thick luxuriance since Dr. Thomas first called attention to the law and to the testimony, he set to work to make the most of the situation he found. He attended the meetings of the Conditional Immortalists, who comprised some men of honest and thoughtful mind, to whom, in his intercourse, he gradually introduced “the way of God more perfectly,” conversing and giving books to read. In the end a few received the truth (and in some cases were baptised) but without dissociating themselves from the religious organizations to which they belonged. There were one or two exceptions,—men who recognised and accepted the obligation of thorough going identification with the cause of the truth. With these, brother Maxwell organised a small ecclesia on the basis of the *Guide*.

(June 1886) Lewisham.—Brother Guest reports: “I have left Bexley, not without great regret. My association there with brother Lewin, in the work of the truth, has been one of unalloyed love and esteem, such as is only enjoyed by those who labour together with one object in view. That object has not been self-glorification, but for the honour and glory of our Heavenly Father, who has blessed our feeble efforts to make known His truth, beyond our utmost expectation, the having had no public room in which to preach the ‘glad tidings of the Kingdom of God’ has been no hindrance. We have recognised that our homes are, in reality, not our’s, but God’s, and we have devoted them to His service, and He has smiled upon our work and given us the increase. In thus working and holding forth ‘the Word of Life,’ we have been cheered, edified, and built up. In teaching others, we have ourselves been taught. What has been done in Bexley should be an incentive to isolated brethren in similar position—not to refrain from work on account of there being no public room. Let them throw open their own houses for the work of the truth, and invite the perishing to come. I feel convinced that much more might be done than is done if there was only a little more courage and self sacrifice on the part of the brethren. Now with respect to the inspiration question, I wish you would publish a list of ecclesias down to present date, who have decided, by resolution, to stand on the basis of a wholly inspired Bible as a first principle. The publication of such a list would be very useful, and would be the means, I think, of several ecclesias that now hesitate of coming to a decision. We should then know who we could fellowship. Ecclesias too would see that there is not such a thing as a neutral position, which some are trying to assume, but would recognise the truth of the axiom ‘He who is not for us is against us,’ and declare themselves one way or the other.”

(Excerpt from June 1886)Pemberton (near Wigan).—The little company here are doing their best for the spread of the truth in the district, but like their brethren elsewhere, they find it hard work to make headway. The community is divided into two classes—one too bigoted to search and see if these things be so, and the other too ignorant and careless. One or two, however, seem interested.

(June 1886) Lanesville(W. Va.)—Brother Strickler of Buffalo, N. Y., demurs to the intelligence from brother Edwards, of this place, appearing in the April *Christadelphian*. He says he knows the parties, and he considers the statements unjust in their bearings upon some referred to. In confirmation of his statement, he encloses two letters from brother J. A. Robins. We should fear to do injustice to any. We can only say we published the statements of brother Edwards in good faith, having no personal knowledge of the matters testified, but having confidence in brother Edwards’s integrity on the strength of a very long acquaintance by post, strengthened by brief personal intercourse, and commencing with a recommendation by Dr. Thomas. We cannot, from the statements submitted, decide whether the intelligence published is inconsistent with this confidence or not. We know from experience the impossibility of forming a judgment in personal matters from statements submitted in writing. Such statements cannot be interrogated; and without interrogation, the picture they exhibit is not complete. They may not be false, but they may be deficient in particulars that require to be known in order to have a just view. So far as the *Christadelphian* is concerned, we simply suspend judgment, and recommend all parties in patience to commit their way to God, reminding them of the apostolic axiom: “It is better, if the

will of God be so, that ye suffer for well-doing than for evil doing.” The true children of God are able to submit to this, in recollection of that other statement of Peter, that “if we do well and suffer for it and take it patiently, this is acceptable with God.” Those who cannot take unjust affliction in this spirit have yet to learn the spirit of Christ, without which no man is his.—EDITOR.

(July 1886) Cardiff.—Bro. G. A. Birkenhead demurs to the statement appearing in the Newport intelligence last week to the effect that the Cardiff brethren “fellowship brethren who do not believe that the scriptures are wholly inspired.” He says it is a grievous calumny. We cannot understand this unless it be that the demur applies to brethren actually in Cardiff, while the statement demurred to applies to brethren elsewhere and anywhere. In this case, the demur is misleading, because locality makes no difference to fellowship. There may not be any in Cardiff, but there may be a few elsewhere with whom they are in fellowship. It is all the same whether it is Cardiff, Birkenhead, Edinburgh, or London. If the Cardiff brethren are prepared to refuse fellowship to partial or erring inspiration, or to those anywhere who make themselves responsible for that evil doctrine by tolerating it in their fellowship, it is in their power to put an end to all misunderstanding by saying so in unequivocal terms. If this is not their mind, they should not speak of calumny in reference to those who only say the truth. If it is their mind, they should not appear to refuse to make it known by objecting to the statement of it as an “extreme resolution,” and by holding fast to a form of words that would allow partial inspirationists to honestly unite in their position. We extremely regret the issue: but the issue exists, and it cannot be settled by reference to the worthiness of brethren on one side or other. We must shut our eyes to persons when the truth is in question. “Worthy men,” so considered, are to be found among the sects. We cannot safely judge by such a rule, but we can judge if the truth is denied and tampered with.—ED.

(July 1886) Newcastle-on-Tyne.—Brother Little (14, Sycamore Street) writes:—“At a special meeting held on May 30th, we were asked to rescind the resolution affirming our belief in a wholly inspired Bible. This the under mentioned brethren and sisters refused to do: Brethren J. Morris, J. Leadbitter, J. Leadbitter, jun., A. G. Little, and J. Little; sisters E. Leadbitter and A. Young. Those who have given up the faithful attitude which they took twelve months ago have left us in possession of the meeting room. We have resolved to discontinue the lectures for the summer months, but will meet as usual at 2.30 p.m to break bread, when we shall be very glad to see any brother passing this way, who, with us, believes in the infallibility of the Scriptures.”

(July 1886) Melbourne (Balaclava).—Brother C. C. Walker writes: “After prolonged silence concerning the Balaclava Ecclesia (the last report appearing in the *Christadelphian* for 1884, p. 239), I again write concerning our state. During the year 1884 we had the following additions and subtractions:—On 8th April, brother and sister G. F. Walker were admitted to fellowship. On the 17th April, brother J. Buchanan denied the truth by embracing the doctrine that Joseph was the father of Jesus, and by discarding the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke. He has since rejected the entire Bible as ‘a fraud.’ Sister Buchanan, his wife, has also followed in the way of death. On the 3rd June brother and sister G. C. Hodgson were admitted to fellowship, both having been immersed some time ago, but not having previously met with any of the brethren here. On the 15th June JANET MCGALLAN (24) and AGNES MARIAN MCGALLAN (19) were baptised into Christ. On the 16th September, brother E. OSBORNE and sister E. MARRIAGE were admitted to fellowship. On the 21st October, sisters M. E. TAYLOR and L. E. GUNNER were admitted to fellowship; and on the 28th, Mrs. SARAH ANN LANSDELL, at the advanced age of 71 years, obeyed the truth in baptism. On the 1st November, brother EDWARD HALL was admitted to fellowship; and on the 31st December, THEODORE VAN DER GRIENT and his wife, MARY JANE VAN DER GRIENT, were baptised into Christ.

“During 1885, our history has been as follows:—On the 24th February, we withdrew from brother J. J. Schneider for behaviour unworthy of the name of Christ. This has caused us much trouble. Sister

Schneider absented herself in consequence, and on 10th April, we had to withdraw from brother and sister G. C. Hodgson, and brother and sister Van der Grient, who sympathised with brother Schneider in a wrong course. On the 12th May, we had to withdraw from brother E. Hall for refusing obedience to Christ's law of offences in Matt 18:15. On 25th July JOSEPH ALFRED LOVELL (26), from Pietermaritzburg, South Africa, obeyed the truth in baptism. He had learned the truth in South Africa. On the 22nd Sept. brother E. Osborne, and sister Osborne his wife (formerly sister E. Marriage) left our fellowship for the Melbourne Ecclesia; and on 25th Nov. brother F. C. Arnold did the same. Some attempts towards a reunion among the ecclesias here have been made, but without success, and our attitude remains the same. Since last writing, we have advertised *Christendom Astray* freely, both by a standing advertisement in the paper and by house-to-house distribution of over 25,000 handbills (reprints of the one you issued). The visible results, however, of this and other work are almost inappreciable. But that is to be expected."

(August 1886) Liverpool.—It having been stated by some in our meeting that the resolution of the 26th of January, 1885, relating to the inspiration of the Scriptures, was hastily passed and has not now the full concurrence of the brethren, a letter was addressed to each member of the Ecclesia asking all of them who could do so to express their concurrence therewith. About fifteen of our number, though in perfect accord with the first paragraph of the resolution respecting inspiration, have not been able to endorse the second which relates to fellowship, and so have acquiesced in our desire that they should take a consistent attitude and stand aside until they can heartily agree with the resolution as a whole. We are more than decimated twice over, but we have hope that we are pleasing God in what we have done. Brother Charles Wilson, whose removal from Newcastle-on-Tyne was noticed in the February intelligence, has been meeting with us for about four months.—HENRY COLLENS.

(August 1886) London (WELLINGTON HALL).—We have a communication from brother Rae, on behalf of those brethren meeting here, from whom brother J. J. Andrew and others separated some time back on the subject of inspiration. They wish to "drop the subject," and to resume the publication of intelligence in the *Christadelphian*, in which nothing has appeared from them since October last. It will be a pure satisfaction to comply with their wishes, if they will first come to an understanding with the brethren in association with brother J. J. Andrew. They say they are "unanimous that the Scriptures are of Divine origin, in harmony with the scriptural declaration that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." If so, it ought to be easy for them to come into agreement with those who are at present apart from them because they require a recognition of the wholly inspired character of the Bible as a basis of fellowship. If the Wellington Hall brethren are prepared to consent to the attitude they take on the question, there is no barrier, so far as we know. If not, the condition of re-union is awaiting, for the question of fellowship will not be compromised by faithful men. It is as vital as the question of the truth itself. If it is not so, why not admit to our fellowship immortal soulism, or any other doctrine in contradiction to the truth? Why not go back to church and chapel if it is sufficient to hold the truth individually? The settlement of the matter rests between them and brother J. J. Andrew. We know the difficulty of persons at a distance correctly judging local action.—Judging by a multigraphed series of five argumentative propositions enclosed in the letter, the difficulty concerns the necessity for defining their position. The propositions argue that it is superfluous. Surely, it is a sufficient answer to all arguments on this subject to say that it cannot be "superfluous" to do that which will restore peace and union. A superfluity that will banish discord cannot be a superfluity. It is not a superfluity. The introduction of the doctrine of partial inspiration has made it a necessity. This doctrine has tarnished many, with the result of sowing the seeds of spiritual decay hereafter. A section of the brotherhood will make no compromise with it. Its repudiation has become a necessity for the continuance of peace. In these circumstances, it seems as if earnest men ought to have no difficulty in throwing to the winds all objections to a course of action which might be superfluous in times of faithfulness and peace, but is far from being so at a time when the brotherhood have been tacitly invited to consent to corrupt doctrines about the Word of God.

(August 1886) Oldham.—On the morning of the 20th June, after a full and clear statement of his belief, JOSEPH KERRY (37), of Bolton (late of Newark) was united to Christ in the appointed way, and partook of the memorial supper with us shortly afterwards. He is the only brother living in Bolton, but will be able to break bread every Sunday with brother and sister Finch, of Moses Gate, which is but a few miles away. The nearest ecclesia is Pemberton (Wigan), and, no doubt, our brother will occasionally go over there. The brethren in Newark will be pleased to learn that they have not laboured in vain, nor spent their strength for nought. For some months past we have been considering the position of Christ's brethren with relation to sick clubs, insurance societies, trades unions, oddfellows, foresters, rechabites, town councils, &c., &c.; and at our quarterly meeting, held June 16, it was *unanimously* resolved to adopt and place on record the resolution and addendum appearing under Stockport intelligence in the *Christadelphian* for May, 1886, pages 238–9. This is, we feel, the only safe position for brethren to take. In withdrawing from the world, we are but obeying the Master, whilst in mixing up with the world in its various social, political, and other movements, we are doing great violence to the express commands of him who said, "Ye are my friends *if ye do whatsoever* I command you," and again, "If ye love me, *keep my commandments.*" Although we passed no resolution, we had arrived at exactly the same conclusion, before we saw what the Stockport ecclesia had done. I have also to report the formation of a Sunday School on July 4th. The want of one has been felt for some time past, and now that it has been commenced we trust it will be a success, and that, as a result of the efforts put forth, many may be eventually added to the ecclesia.

(August 1886) Lanesville (Va.)—"I have just read in the June number of the *Christadelphian* that brother Strickler, of Buffalo, N.Y., demurs to the intelligence I sent from this place. He says he knows the parties, and he considers the statements unjust in their bearings on some referred to." I knew from the first that the statement I made was a serious one, and more sad and sorrowful to me than any statement of the kind I have ever made in a life of nearly 69 years. I espoused the Christadelphian cause from its very inception, because I believed it in my heart and soul to be the cause of God, the cause of Christ, and necessarily the *cause of Truth*. God forbid that I should ever so depart from its pure and holy doctrines as to do any injustice to His human, or even brute creatures in whom he has breathed his breath of life. "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God," is a precept of the Spirit which I have tried to write with a pen of iron on my mind and heart. If I have violated these pure, holy, and everlasting first-principles of truth, may God, for Christ's sake, forgive me. "Brother Strickler says *he knows the parties,*" but I would kindly remind him that I am one of the parties, and a personal interview of only two or three hours, with the absence of all letter correspondence, would afford a very meagre knowledge of a party whose statements he considers unjust. And I would hear say that he would have been more in harmony with the 18th of Matthew had he sent me the two letters from Bro. J. A. Robins instead of sending them to Bro. Roberts. Injustice may be done unadvisedly, or with a scanty knowledge of facts. This may be excused, but when I made an unjust statement after two years deliberation and with a full knowledge of facts, my offence is more serious. Were Bro. Strickler personally cognizant of the inside workings of an ecclesia for forty years, he might demur with some authority; but I submit that two letters from one individual, multiplied by any sum, although he might have partaken of the individuals hospitality several days, would not very much enlarge his knowledge of all parties concerned."

"I can only say now that the interests of the truth should be maintained at the expense of the downfall of every human *personal* interest under the sun. In other words, let God be true if every other man is a liar. I thank Bro. Roberts for his confidence in my integrity, and I humbly trust it never has, and never will be misplaced. It is against my judgment to blot the pages of *The Christadelphian*, even though they were freely open to me, with the details of such gospel-nullifying and soul-chilling intelligence; but convince me that the *interests of The Truth* require it, and I will engage, through Christ, who I believe will strengthen me, to publish a pamphlet in verification of what I have said in the April Number of the *Christadelphian*. No, I will rather suffer loss myself, if loss it be, than that the Truth should suffer by any



personal vindication of dust and ashes. And please excuse me for saying that this lesson was taught me in a private letter sent me from Bro. Thomas nearly forty years ago, and, thank God, I have never forgotten it. It may be proper to say that the Lanesville body is now permanently divided, and so far there are 14 members in harmony with me with a good prospect of others who seem to be standing off, awaiting further developments. One thing is certain, if they understand and believe from the heart the true apostolic and prophetic foundations upon which the Christadelphians stand, they will not be slow in placing their feet upon the Rock of Ages. If they do not understand and believe, their union would not be “unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace,” but a mockery in themselves, and a gin and a snare, and an apple of discord and strife in the body, to the destruction of the weak and the distress of the strong.

. . . Publish as much of this letter as you think useful for good, and if the Lord will, I will write you again when matters settle down on a more permanent and satisfactory basis.

Trusting, dear brother, that our trials and conflicts will soon end by the coming of the Lord Jesus, the Great Deliverer, As ever yours in the blessed hope,

L. EDWARDS.

Lanesville, King William Co., Va., U.S.A.

June 26<sup>th</sup>, 1886.

DEAR BRO. ROBERTS,—I send you enclosed a paper which you will much oblige me to place in the columns of the *Christadelphian* if you can find room for it.

In the troubles at Lanesville I am placed in a trying position. In the absence of special divine guidance in this day of evil I scarcely know how to act. I am, however, just beginning to see my error in not having followed the Apostolic precept to “know no man after the flesh,” and I trust that the mercy and providence of God will work well in due time. . . .

If I have done or said wrong, may the Lord at his judgment seat forgive me! All things are open to him, and he knows us better than we know ourselves, and though this was intended as a private letter, I know “there is nothing hid that shall not be revealed,” and you are at perfect liberty to use it as you please, because I would prefer that it come out to my shame *now*, than it should appear *then*, to my “shame and confusion of face,” and *infinitely worse*, the loss of *that life* which is the sum of all losses. You may hear from me again, but I think I hear you say “I hope not,” unless something more pleasant can be written. But evil and good are mixed—the one develop the other, and our glorious heavenly Father does all things right.

In *His love*, dear brother, believe me yours

L. EDWARDS.

(September 1886) Neath.—Writing from Mumbles, brother Gregory says the recent action of the brethren here,—(in standing apart from all who will not take unequivocal ground on the subject of fellowshipping loose ideas on the inspiration of the Scriptures)—has been attributed to any and every cause except the right one. They take comfort in the reflection that He who knows the hearts and thoughts knows that to do otherwise than they have done was impossible in the circumstances. Their only regret is that the action was not taken earlier, when it would not have affected so many. To prevent mistake or misapprehension, the brethren desire it to be known that those now in fellowship are the following:—*Brethren*: David

Jones, Peter Tucker, Jos. Tucker, Henry Dabbs, and W. Gregory. *Sisters*: Fanny Gregory, Miss Jones, Martha Bailey, and Mrs. Reed.

(We have also received a letter from brother Samuel Heard, in defence of those who refused to sanction the proposition submitted to them by brother Gregory. He asserts they believe in the entire inspiration of the Scriptures and will fellowship none who believe in partial inspiration, or who fellowship those who do. It is enough that we publish this allegation, regretting that they should in that case have made a difficulty about the proposition, which would have put all straight.—EDITOR.)

(October 1886) Peterborough.—Brother Bruce reports a communication from sister Goodacre, of Norman Cross, announcing her intention to unite herself with those everywhere who have made a stand on behalf of the complete inspiration of the Scriptures. She considers the attitude they have taken the right one, both in relation to the inspiration of the Scriptures and the refusal of fellowship to those who hold the doctrine of partial inspiration, or who tolerate in their midst those who do. He also reports a visit from sister Mayes, of Barrowden, near Stamford. She broke bread with the brethren in the morning, and stayed to the evening lecture. Several brethren have visited and lectured from time to time, greatly to the encouragement of the brethren. “We cannot,” he says, “describe the sweet comfort we receive from the morning exhortation.”

(October 1886) Lanesville (Va.)—Voluminous documents are to hand from Dr. J. T. Edwards, son of brother L. Edwards, with reference to the unfavourable things that have been published concerning those now in fellowship with Dr. L. Edwards. The communications are frank, lucid, earnest, and specific, going into details in a way calculated to leave a favourable impression on minds free from bias one way or other. The *Christadelphian* is not the place for the discussion of personal matters; we therefore refrain from entering upon them. We would not have referred to the matter at all were it not for the ventilation of previous doubts and reflections which seem to call for some offset. Justice requires us to record the conviction, acquired from the perusal of these letters, that there is an answer to the unfavourable things that have been said, and that there has not been enough in recent occurrences to interfere with the confidence that was reposed in Dr. Edwards by Dr. Thomas before he died, and which brethren everywhere are justified in continuing.—ED.

(November 1886) Caulfield (Victoria).—Brother G. C. Barlow reports that before leaving Adelaide, there was a general conversation about a lecture delivered by a Presbyterian “Rev.” on “Hell.” A gentleman connected with one of the banks said he waited to congratulate the “Rev.” on his boldness in attacking popular error, and, to his surprise, he found another gentleman there for the same purpose. “But,” said the latter, “have you not been reading Roberts?” The “Rev.” admitted that he had. “I got into conversation afterwards with the bank clerk, and it turned out that, having borrowed of a friend the *Twelve Lectures*, he (the “Rev.”) was so taken up with it that he copied the whole in MSS. It gave me encouragement in isolation to find that the works of the truth were so appreciated by others. I could not but compare the change in this now world-wide spread of the truth with the cheerless benches and the heart-achings of your earlier labours. I have received two letters from T. Baker, of Napier, New Zealand, formerly of Stockport. To his great joy he found excellent people there diving into the works of the truth—some of whom have since put on the saving name. Ecclesiastically here things have for years been in a bad state. I believe the worst is over, and still hope for union on a better basis. I live within two miles of brother C. C. Walker, an estimable brother with whom I have enjoyed profitable companionship in the Truth. . . I read with sorrow the intelligence in the May Number of the *Christadelphian* sent from Williamstown, and as inferentially it charges Melbourne with unsoundness, I would like to say that at the last annual meeting I was presiding, and as the rules were being revised I thought it my duty to point out to the brethren the position respecting “Inspiration.” A resolution was passed, “acknowledging our belief and basis of the ‘one Faith’ as defined in the statement known as ‘the Declaration of the Truth,’ and that we hereby

express our belief in the Inspiration of the Original Scriptures.” The mind of the meeting was unanimous on this point. And although some differed as to their opinions of the course taken in Birmingham in the absence of further information, no decision was sought on this point, but a general agreement and decision as to the Scriptures of Truth.

(November 1886) Pleasant Valley (PA.)—Bro. Mackay writes—“I have been distributing tracts I had with me. It has caused a little stir among the so-called Christian leaders of this place. They are warning their hearers to beware of the false doctrines that is brought among them. But I hope that the truth will take hold on some honest heart. I am surrounded by the most wicked men I ever came across. I am very lonely with no brother to speak a kindly word or to meet on the first day of the week to celebrate the death of our absent Lord. I am hoping for the time when we shall all meet in the kingdom with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the righteous of the past ages who shall awake to eternal life.”

(December 1886) Bristol.—The truth has never had an encouraging history here, and the indications are that matters are not to mend. Some time ago, several went over to open infidelity. A step is now taken which paves the way in the same direction. Bro. Coles reports thus:—“We have been many months endeavouring to bring the ecclesia to a decision upon the inspiration question. First, we wrote to the editor of the *Æon* asking him if he still adhered to his endorsement of the views of the editor of the *Exegetist* upon the subject; to which he replied in the affirmative, expressing surprise that we should ask such a question. Then we wrote the secretary of the Exchange ecclesia, enquiring if they endorsed the articles in the *Æon* on the same subject; and if they would receive the editor at the Lord’s table if he presented himself. The reply to this letter—and one or two subsequent ones—was so ambiguous as not to satisfy brother Stainforth, myself, and two or three others. But *the majority* voted it “perfectly satisfactory:” upon which brother S. intimated that he should withdraw from the ecclesia unless a more satisfactory state of things ensued. Another meeting was called after that, and a resolution made and carried unanimously, to the effect that the divine inspiration of the Bible was recognised in all its parts; and that fellowship would be refused to anyone holding contrary views. Subsequently brother S., myself, and perhaps one or two others, were uneasy because some brethren were being received at the Lord’s table unquestioned as to their views. And lastly, it was agreed to invite the Exchange ecclesia to send some one to represent them to state their views and answer such interrogatories as might be put, so that we might finally decide whether we should fellowship them, as representing the partial inspiration theory, or otherwise. The result was a visit, yesterday week, from brother Bishop, who made a long statement of wrongs—real or imaginary—inflicted upon them as an ecclesia, and was closely questioned by brother Stainforth, who had prepared a voluminous list of extracts from the *Æon* and the *Fraternal Visitor*, sufficient as bro. B. said, to last a week in order to explain. After his departure, a meeting was held to finally decide the matter. While the matter was under consideration I called upon brother Stainforth, and was not a little surprised to find that after opposing the views contained in the *Æon*, as well as some of the articles in the *Visitor*, and condemning the editors of the latter for their sympathy and patronage with and of the editor of the former,—he had changed his mind, believing “brother Bishop to be right, and brother Roberts wrong” and, as chairman yesterday, he put the resolution to the meeting; so far as I can glean, the chief points of brother Bishop’s contention that have influenced brother Stainforth, are:—1st.—The discrepancy in the record of the inscription on the cross by the three Evangelists; 2nd.—The differing accounts as to the “voice at the transfiguration”; and 3rd.—The differings of the words spoken by Jesus and Paul with reference to the Lord’s supper, all which matters—and many others, such as Paul asking for his cloak, and not knowing how many he baptized—were gone into by brother Bishop. I wish it to be known that I took no part whatever in regard to the resolution adopted, beyond objecting to vote for it. Brother Bradley and myself were the two dissentients. I do not think there were any more.”

The resolution adopted has also been forwarded from another source in a communication not signed. It thanks brother Bishop for his satisfactory answers, and declares the conviction that the Exchange brethren

are sound in the faith, and requests brother Roberts to discontinue a course of conduct that looks too much like lording it over God's heritage, that peace and harmony may be restored. Brother Roberts would be delighted to have peace and harmony restored. The very idea of it makes him glad. But wishing to have a thing is one thing; getting it is another. Getting it is a thing of conditions. The Bristol brethren have a right in the Lord's absence to come to any decision that may commend itself to their judgment, but they ought not to forbid a similar right to others. They do this by implication. They stigmatise a contention for a recognition of the unerring character of God's word as a basis of fellowship, as a "lording it over God's heritage," or a looking like it. They have come to the conclusion that it is not unerring because of the so-called "discrepancies" and "differing accounts" submitted to their consideration. They have a right to come to this conclusion if they cannot see their way out of it, but let them not profess to be of the same mind with those who strenuously reject their conclusion as either a denial of inspiration or an insult to it, and logically in the long run, a displacing of the Bible from its position of supremacy. Let them openly say: "We believe the Bible to be only partly inspired because of the variations in the inscriptions on the cross, or if we don't like to say that, we will say that we believe it to be all inspired, but we do not believe that inspiration keeps a writer from error." They will then at least earn the respect of those who are sorrowfully obliged to disagree with them, but when they say "We believe the Bible to be wholly inspired, and that there are no errors in it; yet we cannot reconcile the discrepancies with the idea that inspiration really guarded the writers in all they wrote"—they needlessly embitter an unfortunate divergence of view by an endeavour in words to maintain two incompatible positions. It would be far more satisfactory to openly and frankly accept the issue than to deny that there is an issue, and all the time keep that issue open by their arguments. We regret it is not in our power to compromise the issue, and we can only try and submit with patience to the gratuitous and humiliating personal imputations arising out of a painful course of duty. The Lord will shortly give his verdict, and for this we wait with confidence—not doubting that many who are now antagonising the right way will submit gladly to his manifested mind, and become friendly where they are now hostile—if he permit. It will be a terrible time for the unbelieving world and all who dally with its blasphemous sophistries.—EDITOR).

(December 1886) Manchester. — Brother Holland writes:—"We have got back to our old meeting room, the Co-operative Hall, 398, Oldham Road. This is the third time we have occupied the room. Shall be pleased to see any of the Lord's people who may be passing through the town, but deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who attribute to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship. Meeting for breaking of bread in the afternoon 2.30, evening 6.30. We have been cheered by the addition to our number of brother and sister Hollings, of Leeds, who have come to reside in Manchester; also by the addition of sister Poulton, and brother and sisters Johnstone, who have seen it to be their duty to stand aside from the Downing Street meeting, on the inspiration question. We now number fourteen, striving together that we may be accounted worthy of a participation in the glory and honour of the age to come. The Oldham brethren have kindly consented to give us all the help they possibly can in putting the truth before the alien. We commenced operations October 17th. The attendance at the lectures has so far exceeded our anticipation in regard to numbers and interest manifested.

(December 1886) Lanesville (Va.)—Brother L. Edwards writes: I have thought of writing a pamphlet giving a history in detail of the troubles in the Lanesville Church. Another thought of a condensed statement of facts from which the reader might fill in details, and draw his own conclusions—and yet another, that two or three columns of the *Christadelphian*, with your leave, might furnish all that is necessary to be said. The *first* I shrink from on account of the labour to me, in my old age, with necessary daily cares of a family of 8. The expense of *printing*, which in *results*, would be a waste of the Lord's money—and the *sadness of the story*, if faithfully told. The *second* would be less labour and expense, but not so conclusive. The *third* could not be as satisfactory as desired, if undertaken at all. These drawbacks make me hesitate, but there is still another, stronger than all:—This matter is of the Lord, *as a trial or test of duty* for all concerned. That feature in David's history in the matter of Shimei and Abishai (2. Sam 16.) is suggestive. "Let him alone; let him curse, for the Lord hath bidden him." Hezekiah spread the letter of

Sennacherib before the Lord (2. Kings 19:14.) The Psalmist says:—"Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in him, and he shall bring it to pass." "Rest in the Lord, and *wait patiently* for him." These examples have decided me to *wait*—at least for the present—wait further developments the Lord may bring to pass. With me it is the "quarrel of his covenant" and he only has the right to avenge it. (Lev. 26.) May He forbid that I should have any other quarrel or fight, but that which is in the interest of His Truth!—(The Editor has written brother Edwards recommending the last course as the best.)

(January 1887) Falmouth.—"We continue to keep open our meeting room for the breaking of bread, and also the instruction of the alien, but very seldom get a visit from the latter. Our position here remains the same as at the first. We fellowship those only who believe in a wholly-inspired Bible."—W. WARN.

(March 1887) Adelaide.—Brother Funnell writes to report the formation of an ecclesia at Adelaide. Several persons resident in the city and suburbs of Adelaide having become dissatisfied with the sects with which they had been identified, and believing that the teachings of the people known among men as Christadelphians or brethren of Christ to be in accordance with the Scriptures of truth, communicated with brother James Mansfield, who with his wife were in fellowship with the ecclesia meeting at Goolwa, and with brother Joseph Brown who with his wife were in fellowship with the ecclesia meeting in the Protestant Hall, Melbourne, Victoria, but now resident in South Australia. The communication was with a view to the formation of Christadelphian ecclesia to meet in the city or suburbs of Adelaide as may from time to time be determined for the worship of Almighty God, the observance of His Son Jesus Christ our Saviour, and for the mutual help, comfort, and edification in the Scriptures of themselves and all who may in the future join their fellowship. A preliminary meeting was held on Wednesday, Dec. 1st, in response to an invitation by brother Brown. The following friends met him and sister Brown at their residence, Park Street, Hyde Park, viz., brothers Mansfield, Funnell (late Wesleyan), Hopkins (late Primitive Methodist), who with sister Hopkins were baptised by Mr. Colbourne, of Park Street Chapel (he not endorsing their views of the kingdom and name of Jesus Christ; brother W. Parsons, of Bentham Street Chapel (Baptist), who stated that when baptised he was a believer in the kingdom and the name; and Mr. J. Ellis (Baptist), who desired reimmersion. After some time spent in conversation upon the truth, it was decided that brothers Brown and Mansfield, who expressed their confidence in Mr. J. Ellis as a believer in the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, should meet him on Friday evening at the house of brother Mansfield for baptism. This was accordingly done after the reading of the 6th of Romans. On the following Sunday evening, December 5th, the first meeting for the breaking of bread in remembrance of the Lord's death and for the edification of the brethren, was held at the house of brother and sister Hopkins, there being present sister Brown, brothers Mansfield (presiding), Funnell, Parsons, and Ellis. At the close of the meeting it was decided to meet on Wednesday at the house of brother Hopkins. On Sunday, the 12th, the brethren again met at brother Hopkins' to break bread. On Tuesday, the 22nd, Mr. J. Stephens was examined, and reported to be a fit subject for baptism, and on Wednesday, the 23rd, they met for the purpose of baptising brother STEPHENS, which was done by brother Mansfield. We have continued to meet on Sundays and Wednesdays since our foundation, and have engaged a hall in the city for the proclamation of the truth. We trust that our efforts may be blessed by turning many to the only gospel. We have founded a Sunday School in connection with our ecclesia, the first attendance being eleven children. We have hopes that we shall have a very much larger attendance when we commence in our new hall. Should anyone that you know be coming to South Australia please give them credentials so that we may admit them to fellowship.—Our presiding brethren are Bros. Brown, Ellis and Mansfield. Managing brethren, Bro. Brown, Ellis, and Hopkins. Treasurer, Bro. Ellis. Secretary H. B. Funnell. May the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob sustain us in our battle for the faith once delivered to the Saints, and may we be kept till our Master appears in all good conscience. Greeting to our Brethren in Birmingham.

(May 1887) Bournemouth.—Brother Geo. Sherry writes:—“We are still holding forth the word of life amid much opposition. The strangers continue to attend our meetings and evince great interest in the things set forth in our lectures. We hope shortly to assist some to put on the sin-covering name of Christ. We have the presence of brother Powell, of Birmingham, who has greatly strengthened us with his words of exhortation and comfort. We held a tea meeting on Good Friday, to which we invited our school children and the interested strangers. Thirty-three sat down to tea. After tea a very pleasant evening was spent. Brother Powell and brother Morris addressed the meeting to the edification of the brethren, and laid before the strangers their dangerous position of being out of Christ. The weighty words of brother Powell will not soon be forgotten.”

(May 1887) Keighley.—Brother Roe, after reporting withdrawal from brother Elias Greystone, on account of absence from the table, says:—“The town of Keighley has been somewhat exercised lately by a controversy between the Spiritualists and a Mr. T. Ashcroft, and as the Christadelphians have been freely referred to, and as usual very much misrepresented, we have felt it our duty to make an effort to counteract as far as possible the misrepresentation, and have made arrangements for a series of discourses as follow:—Sunday, April 3rd, ‘Some of the things most surely believed among us’ (brother Walker, of Preston); and on Sunday, April 10th, ‘Angel visits to the earth no proof whatever of modern spiritualism (by brother Wadsworth); and on April 17th, ‘Spirit gifts *versus* Spiritualism,’ by brother Barraclough, of Heckmondwike. We are expecting to have two discourses by brother Roberts, of Birmingham, on May 4th and 5th. 1. ‘What the Bible has to say for itself, and the proof that what it says is true.’ 2. ‘What the Bible has to say about the constitution of man, the state of the dead, and the prospects of the human race.’”

(May 1887) Rochester (N.Y.) — Brother Tomlin reports the removal to England of brother and sister W. Wall, consequent on the death of brother Wall’s mother at Birmingham. Brother Tomlin says the Rochester ecclesia lose two very highly esteemed members, whom they cordially recommend to the fellowship of brethren and sisters of any ecclesia who refuse fellowship of partial inspiration, renunciationism, or any other “wind of doctrine” that has disturbed the unity of the one faith.

(June 1887) Kidderminster.—Brother Braginton, who had made arrangements to emigrate, writes to say that he has abandoned the idea in consequence of being able to receive the embarkation order from London. Brother Perrigo has left the brethren on inspirational grounds. Brother Sterry, who left soon after the separation, and returned to the brethren in Worcester Street, states he now gives up the Bible altogether, as he can have no faith in a partly inspired Bible.

Brother Braginton further reports that an unsuccessful attempt has been made to effect a reconciliation between the two meetings here. The attempt arose out of the fact that the time had come for the brethren associated with brother Braginton to engage a public room. Up till now, they have met in a private house, but being now on the look out for a public room, they thought it would be as well to let brethren in Worcester Street know their intentions, as it had been said there was no difference between them, and that the public existence of a second meeting would be to the detriment of the truth. So a correspondence ensued from which the following are extracts:—

Woodfield Crescent, Kidderminster,

13th April, 1887.

“DEAR BROTHER WINBURY, —At our quarterly meeting, of April 6th, it was agreed to secure a public room as early as possible, for the proclamation of the ‘truth.’ But before doing so, it was

decided unanimously, to lay the matter, through you, before the brethren and sisters meeting in Worcester Street, with a view to bring a reconciliation if possible. . . .”

If a reconciliation can be brought about we shall only be too glad to work with you for a furtherance of the “Truth.” Our position, briefly, is as follows:—

“That we believe in the infallibility of the Scriptures in all parts, as originally written, and therefore free from error.”

This is brief but sufficient to cover our case. If you can see your way clear to endorse it, or any other form of words embodying the same meaning, we shall be glad to enter into fellowship with you and thus put an end to the controversy, as far as Kidderminster is concerned.

Hoping you will lay this before the brethren and sisters, and let us know the result as early as possible, I remain yours truly, A. H. BRAGINTON.

7, Summer Place, Kidderminster,

April 19, 1887.

Dear BROTHER BRAGINTON, —Your (BROTHER WINBURY’S) letter of the 13th inst. to hand. I have laid the matter before the Managing Brethren, who, one and all, receive your letter with pleasure. It is extremely gratifying to us to learn there is a desire on the part of the members of your Ecclesia for a reconciliation between our meetings. . . . Before laying the matter before the whole Ecclesia we desire you to accept our invitation to a conference, in order for us to obtain fuller information, and so be able to place the case before the Ecclesia in the fullest light possible. We propose you should select three of your own members to meet our Brethren Barker and Thatcher in company with myself, at either of your homes on Monday evening next—or any other suitable evening,—we leave time with you. Trusting a reconciliation may be effected, I remain fraternally yours, [Dark gray Rule 35 compiler]

A. WINBURY, Sec.

Kidderminster, April 21, 1887.

Dear BROTHER WINBURY,—I laid your letter before the brethren and sisters last night, and they decided not to hold a conference. They think the matter has been long enough before both parties to enable them to understand their respective positions; and that no conference will throw any more light on the matter, or make our position any clearer than what it is in the proposition submitted in our first note. Our position is the same now as when we left, and we cannot move from it. . . . We (Kidderminster ecclesia) know what will be the result if two meetings are held in the town; and for this reason we thought it would be best to let you know our intention. We don’t want to enter into a long correspondence, because it is unnecessary. Give us an answer in the affirmative or otherwise, so that we can move in the matter. Yours truly,

A. H. BRAGINTON.

Summer Place, Kidderminster,

April 29, 1887.

Dear BRETHREN and SISTERS,—In reply to your communication per Bro. Braginton, we have to say that we are glad you recognize there would be an evil in having two meetings in Kidderminster to advocate the same truths, and organized practically upon the same basis. We (Kidderminster ecclesia) repudiate, however, altogether the responsibility of any division in the town. It rests, we believe, entirely with those who—in an unscriptural manner, and without a Scriptural reason separated themselves from that portion of the Ecclesia of Christ meeting in Kidderminster.

We decline to pass any further resolutions, having NO practical bearing upon our work—resolutions which cannot be demonstrated, and which do not at all affect the Bible “as we now have it.”

We should be glad indeed for unity of thought and feeling to be restored. We (Kidderminster ecclesia) are on the same foundation as when those of you left us, first connected yourselves with the Truth; but we believe such resolutions as you propose to be unprofitable, and that those who cause divisions over them, act contrary to the Truth and to the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Desiring constantly to be led by him and walk in accordance with his word.

We remain the Brethren of Christ assembling in Worcester Street. Signed on their behalf, A. WINBURY, Secretary

Woodfield Crescent, Kidderminster,

May 5, 1887.

DEAR BRETHREN,—Your letter was laid before the Brethren and Sisters last Sunday morning; and they . . . requested me (much against my wish) to write you again and deny, emphatically, your assertion that we separated ourselves in an unscriptural manner. The facts are these: When the theory of “Partial Inspiration” was put forth, it was accepted and warmly defended, and we requested the Managing Brethren to convene a meeting to consider the matter, but they refused; and matters got worse. It was said openly, “Now, we can meet the Infidel.” “This is just what we want,” &c. There was only one course open for us, and that was to withdraw.

We are sorry you cannot see your way clear to declare for a wholly inspired Bible . . . There have been times in the history of the “Truth” when sharp and decisive action had to be taken (Num. 16. 20 to 35, and Num. 25. 1 to 9) and so in this matter of inspiration.

Your repudiation (of responsibility) amounts to nothing; the fact remains that the responsibility falls on you for two meetings being held in the town. We have done our duty, and more than our duty, in letting you know our intentions . . .

To say that “such resolutions as we propose,” &c., “are contrary to the truth, and to the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. . . . You fail to catch the spirit of Christ; there were times when he was angry (John 2, 15, Mark 3, 5), and opposed to error (Matt. 24, 4, and he never sacrificed truth for the sake of peace, Yours truly, A. H. BRAGINTON.

(June 1887) Nottingham.—Brother W. H. Kirkland reports: “We have had one addition to our number by the return to fellowship of brother Dakin, who has been away from us for some years. Brother J. Stones and sister Jane Dabell have been united in marriage; as have also brother W. Reddan and sister Florence Lovett. A difficulty has occurred once or twice recently in connection with brethren visiting Nottingham who are unknown to any members of our meeting. To avoid a recurrence of this, we desire all such



brethren to bring a note of introduction from the secretary of their ecclesia, or from some brother known to us.”

(July 1887) Kidderminster.—Sister Braginton writes:—“The brethren will be pleased to learn that we have secured a room in which to set forth the truth, right in the midst of the working classes. We have been enabled to do more than we anticipated in the way of advertising and furnishing, for which the brethren and sisters are thankful. The room will hold about seventy or eighty persons, plenty of ventilation, lofty, and suitable in ‘every way for the truth.’ The address is ‘Lark Hill Chapel, New Inns. Breaking of bread, 11 a.m.; lectures in the evening, 6.30.” [Referring to the correspondence that appeared last month, brother Winbury, on behalf of those in Kidderminster who refuse to affirm the infallibility of the Bible, forwards for publication a letter written by them, after brother Braginton had sent the correspondence for publication. The letter does not alter the facts, or throw new light on the situation in any way. It is a mere retort, and not the “retort courteous,” and is better left unpublished, so far as the *Christadelphian* is concerned.—ED.]

(July 1887) Lincoln.—Brother F. J. Roberts, referring to the report appearing last month, that the brethren had withdrawn from him for intemperance, while not denying the report, wishes to declare for himself that he is not an inebriate or a lover of intoxicants, but has yielded to a weak point in his constitution through mental and financial stress. He hopes to be delivered from the infirmity, and to hate intoxicants as much as he does tobacco, to which he was once a slave. Meanwhile, though separated from the brethren, realising the brevity of life, he means to do all he can in service of the truth, and appeals to the forbearance of the brethren elsewhere.

(August 1887) Cumnock.—The few in number who attend the meeting in this place have been endeavouring to effect a re-union with those who have gone out from among us. In June of last year, an effort was made in this direction with those who have separated over the matter of marriage in which effort we did all that the law of Christ and conscience would allow us to do to attain our object, but all to no purpose. A professed recognition of Christ’s law upon marriage is full of hypocrisy where a liberty is contended for which sets aside that law and its operations among men. It is a *first* and very important principle of divine truth that those who have been called to the Kingdom of God should marry only in the Lord. Last June, we were again brought together upon the “fast day”; this time at the instance of Brother Haining of the Kilmarnock ecclesia. Brother Haining was with us at the time of our separation and has been interested in our affairs since. Ever ready to promote the interests of the truth, and unsparing in its service in the midst of physical weakness, he gathered us together upon the “fast day” this time not only with those in dispute about marriage but also with those who more recently left us over disputed affairs at Pietermaritzburg... No progress was made in the shape of re-union. For this we are sorry but not responsible... Sister Gemmel from Ochiltree who was immersed by brothers Robertson and Robb was present at our meeting and being at one with us, has been admitted to our fellowship. On Sunday, 3rd July, a number of the brethren and sisters of the Kilmarnock ecclesia together with sisters Murdoch and Gemmel from Ochiltree were present with us at the breaking of bread. Though it is our day of small things, we were glad to see old faces in our little room and spend the day together in praise and thanksgiving. As to our ecclesial troubles, *the time has now come* for us to forget the things that are behind and press onward towards the mark for the prize, plodding along ourselves and trying to keep the narrow way that leadeth unto life looking unto Him who is the author and finisher of our faith.—ALLAN MACDOUGALL.

(September 1887) Elmira (N.Y.)—“We believe in the totally inspired character of the Bible. We have been accused of following brother Roberts in an unscriptural and unrighteous course; but we see it to be our duty to make it known through the *Christadelphian* what camp we belong to, and that we will fellowship none who remain undecided as to the inspired and unerring character of the Scriptures, or who

countenance those who say that they believe the whole of the Scriptures themselves, and yet extend fellowship to those who do not. The idea that brother Roberts has exercised lordship over God's heritage is a pure invention. It has been created and lostered by men whose feelings unit them to understand the course he has taken. Is it not strange that the stone should find fault with the hammer, which has been acknowledged by them in former days to be in the hand of God? After our withdrawal from some here, some of those remaining requested another meeting, but this we declined as useless, seeing it was said, "All you want us to do is to fall into line and worship brother Roberts." One has since asked to be forgiven all his hard sayings against us, saying, "Now I see brother Roberts to be right in his defence of a wholly-inspired Bible, and the course that he took in separating from the unclean thing. We will be pleased to receive a visit from any brother or sister passing this way, who are free from crotchets, sound in the faith, and decided as to the entire perfection of the Bible as the Word of God. We meet for the breaking of bread in the parlour of the Oddfellows' Hall, West Water Street. Richardson's Block, at 11 a.m. Sundays"—GEORGE WALKER, GEORGE M. SWAINSON, Mrs. KATTY SHARP, Mrs. GEORGE WALKER, Mrs. SUTTLIF.

(December 1887) Leicester.—Brother Gamble writes: "It has been decided by this Ecclesia to purchase six copies of the *Christadelphian* for circulation among those of our brethren and sisters who are not able to buy one themselves. Will you therefore please forward six copies for 1888 to Brother John Dodge, Red Cross Square, Leicester, who will undertake the management of the circulation. Its value is so strongly felt that we should like to see it in the hands of all the brethren and sisters. Brother and Sister Jones, of Syston (five miles from Leicester), have been alone for a long time, but now have cause to rejoice that their labours in trying to teach others the truth, have borne some fruit. Isaac Priestley (tin plate worker), interested through their conversation, has witnessed a good confession, and was immersed by us into the saving name of Jesus anointed, on Sunday morning, October 23rd. Brother and Sister Cant, late of Swanwick, have also removed to Syston. The Swanwick Ecclesia had taken no action respecting the inspiration question, but upon the position of the Leicester Ecclesia being placed before Brother Cant, he decided to take the same stand, in which his sister wife has joined him. This makes the number now living at Syston, five. They break bread at Brother Jones's house in the afternoon, and frequently attend our lectures in the evening.—We are pleased to report further additions to our own meeting: AGNES SKETCHLEY (daughter of Brother Sketchley) and ALFRED EDWARD THORNELOE, were both immersed into Christ Jesus, on October 19th, making our number 75. We are truly thankful for so bountiful a harvest, and trust that all the fruit may be unto eternal life.

(February 1888) LANESVILLE, (Va.)—After particulars lengthily set forth, bro. L. EDWARDS says, "The conflict at Lanesville on our part, has been for the *Unity and Purity* of 'the Church of Christ which is his body.' (1 Cor. 5.,6.-12. And Eph. 1:23; Col. 1:24, &c.) and affords a useful lesson to all in every place who read and reverence the word of God. Could we have accepted a loose fellowship, there would have been no 'troubles in the Lanesville Church,' however many *outside*. But brother Roberts tells us on inside cover of the *Christadelphian* for August, 1887, that 'There is nothing to be done in the way of successful ecclesial organization under present circumstances. It would save much disappointment if men would not look for it, but simply look round for opportunities of doing all the good they can individually. Making thus the best of the materials and the circumstances (carefully restraining the tongue concerning the evil doings of others), we may at least save ourselves from this untoward generation.' This, without modification, I am unwilling to accept. It would be a complete abrogation of the *Ecclesial Guide* but the author himself cannot set aside the scriptural doctrines of that production. No, there was an ecclesia in the wilderness in the days of Moses, and has ever been since, if not before, in some shape, form and place, more conspicuously since the utterance of Jesus 'when two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them;' and further illustrated in the cause of Aquilla and Priscilla, Nymphas, &c. To set aside the facts and precepts concerning the ecclesia of Christ as the pillar and ground of the Truth, would be doing great violence to the Holy Scriptures. If there can be no 'successful ecclesial organization,' there can be none at all, *it is only because there is no material to construct it*. Any two,

three, or more persons of the right material can form an organization as the ecclesia of Christ, and the means of its unity and purity are neither difficult of comprehension nor doubtful in execution. If we are always ‘careful to restrain the tongue concerning the evil deeds of others,’ we could not ‘cry aloud and spare not.’ We could neither reprove nor rebuke. He that sins, we could not ‘rebuke before all, that others might fear,’ nor obey the command in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to ‘withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly;’ nor could we ever ‘purge out leaven which leavens the whole lump.’ All things, however, should be said and done lovingly, and judgment rendered with ‘righteous judgment.’ These are not so hard to do under the discipline, and in the school of Christ. ‘Single file’ in the work of the truth is a necessity when material cannot be found for ‘two and two’ to walk abroad; but it may be admitted that the jewels of Christ are so rare in latter day perilous times, that it suggests the saying, ‘nevertheless, when the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith in the earth?’ Yet, it is to be hoped that in many places on this broad earth, two or three may be found walking together in the unity and purity of the Spirit, which is the narrow way that leads to life. They are ever found battling against the flesh, instead of making excuses for it. They are never found widening the narrow way with a loose fellowship to gratify their personal ambition or vanity by seeking the honours which men ‘seek one of another.’ They are not found compassing sea and land to make proselytes to increase the numbers of their ‘ecclesial organizations,’ nor add to the cargoes of their worldly craft. They know that the religious Broadway to destruction is the most dangerous because it is the most enticing, the most self-satisfying, the most popular, the most deceptive, and, therefore, the most insidious and dangerous. Enlightened by the truth, they come out from the world, and are separate, that they may be received as the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. That there are some such in many localities, who are the chosen few ‘which have not defiled their garments, and shall walk with Him in white,’ is the hope of your brother in Christ, L. EDWARDS.”— [Brother Edwards has somewhat misapprehended the sense of the cover “note” which he quotes. It was not intended to discourage ecclesial effort. Its pith lies in the word “successful”—by which we meant successful in the fullest, the ideal, sense — the success for which a righteous man longs—in which there would be no failure, no flaw, no trouble; any man looking for and insisting on this will never do any good. The remark in this sense remains true, while not interfering or intended to interfere, with those other truths or duties to which brother Edwards refers. Brother Edwards’ experience proves its truth. Universal experience does the same. Any degree of success that has been attained anywhere, has been attained by the policy indicated — a policy of reticence as to individual shortcoming, and painfully trying to make the best of a situation of which little can be made in the absence of authority, and which can only be used with any satisfaction as a probation in the sight of God for His Kingdom. Many men agree where they seem to differ.—ED.]

(February 1888) PORTLAND (Ogn.)—Brother Snashall referring to the reported withdrawal from him (*Christadelphian*, July, 1887), denies its justice. He says:—“I consider a plain denial sufficient now, without any particulars relative to the case. I am as sorry as I am glad that the case has two sides. I am glad that the charge implied is not true, and sorry for my accusers that they have stooped to misrepresentation and calumny to sustain their disaffection, alienation, and opposition, but which the naked truth and reason would not for a moment uphold.”

(July 1888) BEDFORD—Brother Smither reports that Mrs. SUGARS has obeyed the truth during the past month. She lives at Shefford, some eight miles from Bedford, having heard of the glad news through sister Dawson, who resides there. She will meet with us as often as possible. We have formed ourselves into an ecclesia, and have adopted, with a few alterations to suit our case, the “Birmingham Constitution.” We now number nine, composed of—

Brother            MATHER  
                         MARTIN  
                         SMITHER

Sister DAWSON  
KILLICK  
MATHER  
SHELTON  
SMITHER  
SUGARS.

(July 1888) STADHAMPTON-I do not think you have received any intelligence from this place since the correspondence (you will remember being published a few years since in the *Christadelphian*) entitled, "A Rev. and ex-Rev. in the polemics of the truth." Sister Wells and myself, at that time, were the only ones who had "the hope of Israel," but I am pleased to say we have, by the help of our Father, been instruments in His hand, of showing others the way to eternal life. Sister JORDAN, the schoolmistress here, was immersed about two years ago, and on Friday last, July 13th, I had the pleasure of immersing another candidate for eternal life in the River Thame, JAMES DEACON, formerly neutral. This makes four in this small agricultural village, all believing in a wholly inspired Bible, from which foundation we have never wavered. Sister Jordan is schoolmistress at the Board School here, where one of the "Rev." gentleman is at the head of affairs, and we often feel the necessity of Paul's advice to be "wise as serpents, and harmless as doves." Brother Deacon is working in the same office as myself, and we hope to be a mutual comfort to each other, amidst the many irritations and troubles that necessarily arise in these days of competition and "running to and fro."—JAMES WELLS.

(July 1888) RIVERTON.—Sister Wood forwards some intelligence which she says ought to have appeared about a year ago, but the sending of it was overlooked. It is the report of the obedience to the faith, on June 12th, 1887, of ADELINA ROBERTS (22), daughter of brother and sister Roberts; also CATHERINE GUISE (19), daughter of sister Guise. Sister Wood adds, "We are not making much progress as regards numbers, but are all of one mind doctrinally, remaining close to a wholly-inspired Bible." Holy Land prospects are regarded with interest in Riverton

(July 1889) GRIMSBY- Brother Feiary writes, reporting the removal of brother and sister Bann from London to Grimsby, where they are heartily welcomed, as being able and willing to render needed help in ecclesial matters. Brother and sister Welley have removed to Helsey, about 35 miles from Grimsby, where they are quite in isolation. The brethren have constituted themselves an ecclesia meeting, upon the basis of a wholly-inspired and infallible Bible.

(Excerpt from May 1883) SYDNEY.—Bro. J. J. Hawkins reports the immersion of CAROLINE GORDON (25), wife of Bro. F. D. Gordon. He adds:—"With the idea of establishing a closer degree of intimacy between the different ecclesias scattered in these colonies we have sent a circular letter to ten ecclesias. Giving them the basis of our fellowship contained in the statement of the faith, and our rules, informing them of our status as an ecclesia, and giving them all information as to our method of conducting our meetings.

(February 1891) BOURNEMOUTH -There must be division sometimes; but when personal misunderstandings prevail, there is nothing healthy in it. Blessed are the peacemakers in such a case.

(March 1891) *Amersham Hall, New Cross, S.E.*—An ecclesia has now been formed here, which hitherto has been the seat of a Sunday evening effort under the direction of the Camberwell ecclesia. The majority of the brethren and sisters attending these meetings resided much nearer New Cross than Camberwell, and resolved, accordingly, to form an ecclesia. To that end a memorial was drawn up, signed by nineteen members, and formally submitted to the Camberwell ecclesia. The reception it met with was by no means discouraging to the deputation, quite the contrary. Some objected, but the sentiments of the brethren and

sisters generally were expressive of most sincere regard for our success and welfare, accompanied by very generous offers of assistance should it be required. With brethren Meakin, Guest, and Lewin, as our presiding brethren, we have started, and intend, with the help of Him who has been the support and mainstay of ecclesias far short of nineteen, to hold our own, and, if possible, spread the truth more effectually than heretofore in this neighbourhood. I need scarcely add that any and all brethren and sisters who may be visiting anywhere in the vicinity will meet a hearty welcome.—JOHN HOLT.

(April 1891) LINCOLN -Faithful men will have nothing to do with the “basis of fellowship,” upon which a reorganisation is reported from this place. [See remarks in editorial column, page 149.](#)

(April 1891) TORONTO.—There are changes going on here that are not yet ripe for report. We hope that no genuine friends of the truth will be inveigled into a false position. Mr. Robert Ashcroft has presented himself in Toronto as a speaker and writer under auspices best understood as “Dowieite:” namely, a diluted, compromising, and uncertain form of the truth, from which the brethren in England had to break away years ago. Would to God that we could rejoice at a circumstance that may, on the face of it, to inexperienced believers seem to justify gladness. There is such a thing under the heavens as reformation, truly; and ungracious would the man be who would place the least obstacle in the way of a return to righteous ways. But have we here the reformation? The past repudiated? On the contrary, the abandonment of the fellowship of the truth and the acceptance of the wages of error is extenuated on the plea of “dire necessity,” under the pressure of which an enlightened “would” is suggested to have been subordinated to a time-serving “must.” It would be impossible to consent to such a position without making ourselves responsible for the doctrine that a man may act unfaithfully when temporal interests call for it. Those who choose to accept such a responsibility will not have the company of those who desire to be faithful in this brief probation. In the reign of Diocletian, thousands of professors gave up the bible to save their lives, and when the storm passed they wanted to be re-instated. The faithful in the empire objected, and there arose such a feud as left its mark on the European economy for over 12 centuries. The same principles are operative now under different conditions. “Blessed is the man that *endureth temptation* (or trial), for when he is tried (if he overcome) he shall receive the crown of life.” This is the apostolic rule in this case, and it is reasonable, and it is inconsistent with the supposition that a man may deliberately sin against the light, because of “dire necessity,” and apologise for the crime, and expect mercy.

We should have remained silent had the unhappy subject of these aberrations been content with the passive and private part becoming his past and present career. But there is a time to speak, *at whatever hazard*: and this is such a time. Here is a man who, after professing the truth for about ten years, publicly espouses Congregationalism; authorises the subscription of his name to the Congregationalist standard; is publicly received back as an erring sheep into the fold; fills a Congregationalist pulpit, and is saluted by word and placard as “Rev.” Then he makes up his mind to leave them, and receives a public purse at a farewell meeting from Congregationalist friends, who are left under the impression that he is going to America to “labour” in the same cause. Immediately he is publicly received without scruple by the Partial Inspirationists of Birmingham, and re-admitted to their communion. Then he goes to America, and finding no permanent way of living among the Dowieite friends who take him in hand, he joins the Baptist denomination—not receiving a call among whom, he suddenly comes in sight again in a new guise, under the circumstance of a new friend opening his purse. Is it possible for reasonable men to consider this a case of repentance and reformation? If it had been truly such, would there not have been a return to the true and thorough position abandoned in the first instance, instead of an identification with the compromising uncertainties of Dowieism, whose “auspices” he proclaims “encouraging,” because of “the reasonable guarantee of permanence?” Dowieism congratulates itself at “such” a “flourishing condition”—“greatly strengthened by the arrival of brother Ashcroft,” who (it is proclaimed—with reservation surely)—“is not the man to sacrifice any item of essential truth!” Why, he sacrificed it all,

when his name was inserted by his authority in the Congregationalist register, and when he stood in the re-occupied pulpit, retailing the colourless inanities of a man-pleasing “theology” to a congregation of unjustified sinners at so much per annum.

When he embraced the truth and gave up the pulpit in the first instance, 14 years ago, we were told by those who knew him that it was fickleness and not principle that was the cause: that he was weary of the dictation of deacons, and that he would perform a similar somersault with us by-and-bye. We did not believe this statement, supposing it to be the insinuation of envy and chagrin. But what can we think in the light of the sequel? We doubt not the episode is of divine origination, as many other evil episodes have been. It has and is fulfilling a part in the spiritual evolutions of our century. This conviction, however, does not interfere with the duty which we thus sorrowfully perform. The elegant tongue of even angelic oratory Paul teaches us to despise, when divorced from ways of righteousness and truth. We implore true men in Canada to take care. A flattering tongue is powerful to lead men into ways of destruction.—EDITOR.

(August 1891) TORONTO.—From a variety of quarters, we are informed that the ex-pastor of Rock Ferry Congregationalist Chapel is circulating defamatory statements concerning the editor of the *Christadelphian*. It may not be true that he is doing so; we hope it is not. But if it is true, we request every one hearing these statements to withhold judgment on them till they have an opportunity of hearing the other side. We have been applied to by brother Renshaw, of Berlin, for a statement of the facts; and we have sent the same to him. If necessary, in the interests of the truth, we are willing to come over to Toronto, and stand trial before accusers, and answer all questions touching matters of accusation. We unreservedly deny the statements made, and declare them to be gross calumniations which no man of probity would repeat in the absence of knowledge. The best method of disposing of the calumny, if the law of Christ allowed it, would be to put the calumniators on their defence before the legal tribunals; but as that cannot be, we are prepared to face accusers and disprove, by document and otherwise, all their statements in the presence of those to whom the same may be of importance as affecting the reputation of the work we have in hand. It may be of some assistance to friends to say that, concerning the chief counts in the horrible indictment preferred, we submitted 3½ years ago to the humiliation of an investigation in answer to mere rumour, at the hands of a London committee chosen by a slanderous surmiser, and that they drew up and signed a report, of which the following is the ending:—

“Having heard in detail these accusations and replies, we have unhesitatingly arrived at the conclusion—

- “1. That brother and sister Roberts have been grievously wronged, and
- “2. That the said accusations, being untrue, ought to be unreservedly withdrawn.”

We are prepared to furnish the names and addresses of the committee of investigation.—EDITOR.

Brethren and sisters, whose names are as follow:—W. Smallwood, J. B. Hinch, Isabella Iles, K. E. Clare, Geo. Ambury, Edwin Hill, Elizabeth Hall, Margaret Hall, Alice Hill, Charlotte Gregory, Louisa Sturdy, M. Crozier, A. Scott, John Hinch, Annie A. Hinch, Sarah Edwards, M. McNeillie, Mary McNeillie, Isabella McNeillie, J. Donovan, E. Donovan—unite in a written document to which they have signed their names, and of which the following are the principal portions:—

“We, the Christadelphians of Toronto, meeting at the present date in Room 17, otherwise known as Beaver Hall, Yonge Street Market, Corner Gerrard and Yonge Streets, in consideration of the unfortunately mixed state of affairs among the brotherhood in these parts in matters of faith, many ecclesias being leavened with doctrines subversive of the truth, do hereby resolve to put on record for

convenience of future reference, and the information of such as may at any time temporarily or permanently seek our association and fellowship

“That we are determined to stand by those fundamental doctrines of the Gospel which have been propounded and elaborated from the Scriptures by our deceased brother Dr. Thomas, and so ably and faithfully advocated and defended by brother R. Roberts.

“We believe that the books currently known as the Bible, consisting of the Scriptures of Moses, the Prophets, and the Apostles, are the only source of knowledge concerning God and His purpose at present extant or available on the earth, and that the same were wholly given by inspiration of God in the writers, and are consequently without error in all parts of them, except such as may be due to errors of transcription or translation.

“We endorse the statement of the doctrines forming the Christadelphian Basis of Fellowship to be found in the ‘Ecclesial Guide,’ pages 45 to 48; looking upon the truths expressed in them as, in their entirety, the Rock of Eternal Truth on which we stand, from which we are determined, God helping us, never to be moved.

“Also, we assent to and cordially endorse the thirty-two definitions of Doctrines to be Rejected, as found in the same publication (page 48 to 49); and we further strengthen the position defined in the foregoing statement by the following seven definitions (drawn up by brother R. Roberts on the occasion of his last visit to Toronto) in relation to the Doctrines of Resurrection and Judgment, unscriptural views thereon having been much agitated among the brethren, and especially in this city.

1. That Jesus is the appointed Judge of the living and the dead.
2. That as such he is the dispenser of life and death at his second appearing.
3. That in order, to the exercise of this office of Judge, the dead and the living will all be assembled before him to give account at his coming.
4. That therefore they—all of them, living and dead, are (when they come before him) in the unjudged state, and, therefore, not immortal—not incorruptible since immortality is the chief award of his Judgment seat.
5. That therefore at the moment of resuscitation to renewed life, the dead are not immortal, and that the contention that they are so is inconsistent with the appointed function and honour which God has conferred upon Christ as the supreme arbiter of life and death.
6. That the recognition of this truth is one of the essential conditions of fellowship among the brethren of Christ.
7. That fellowship with those who deny this truth is an offence against the truth, even on the part of a brother holding the truth.

“To all of the above we have confessed, and hereby subscribe our names in attestation thereof.”

(September 1891) QUINCY (Mass.).—It is my pleasant duty to report the formation of an ecclesia in Quincy, Mass. It is composed of a number of brethren and sisters who were formerly members of the Boston ecclesia, meeting at 12, Kneeland Street, but were residents of Quincy and vicinity. It is a matter of much surprise to many, the manner in which the truth has progressed here in the past few years. About four years ago there were only two believers in this city: one, brother E. W. Adams, had been a resident here for a number of years, but was looked upon by many to whom he spoke the truth as a “religious crank.” At last, however, he found one or two who listened and accepted the truth, and by whose untiring proclamation of the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God, with the co-operation of the Boston ecclesia, an ecclesia has just been formed, numbering twenty-five. We were sorry to part with our brethren and sisters

of Boston, to whom we had become attached with that feeling of love which can only be fully realised by those who know the truth, and who are striving to know their Master's will. However, we believe it to be the best thing we could do under the circumstances, principally on account of our steadily increasing in numbers, and the inability of some to attend ecclesial meetings in Boston on account of old age or the expenses attached thereto. However, we rejoice in the knowledge that, although two ecclesias, we are of the one body and meet upon the same basis of fellowship, viz., that which is contained in the "Guide" to the formation and conduct of Christadelphian Ecclesias, published by brother R. Roberts, of Birmingham, England. This we believe to be the only basis of fellowship upon which all true Christadelphians meet throughout the world. We extend a cordial invitation to all true brethren and sisters, who may be journeying this way, to make us a visit, and all such will be given a hearty welcome. Our place of meeting is 86, Washington Street; our hours of meeting are as follows: Sunday School, 10 a.m.; breaking of bread, 11 a.m.; lecture, 7–30 p.m., and on Wednesday evening of each week at 7–45.—CHARLES MCLACHLAN (90, Granite Street, Quincy, Mass.)

(December 1891) GREENOCK—Brother Maxwell reports the obedience of Mathew Steel (47), engraver, and his wife Ellen Steel (37), formerly Dowieites; they were immersed on the 3rd of November. A meeting has been commenced again in Greenock with the following as members:—Brother Robert Mitchell and his wife, sister Mary Mitchell, sister Eliza McMillan, brother Mathew Steel, and his wife sister Ellen Steel, making, with the writer, six at present, with a prospect of further additions.

(January 1892) GREENOCK—With regard to the intelligence from this place in last month's *Christadelphian*, I consider it my duty to state that a part of the new meeting was also a part of the meeting from which we separated ourselves about four years ago, on account of their holding the views of Renunciationism. They then believed, and still believe, that the teachings, in the *Two Sons of God*, are the true teachings concerning Christ's nature. My address is 32, St. Lawrence Street, Greenock.—ARTHUR HALL.

(FEBRUARY 1892) PITTSBURG (PA.)—"We are pleased to say there is an Ecclesia in this city to the number of eleven, who meet in a brother's house every first day for worship, breaking of bread, and exhortation; striving in our humble way to edify, comfort, and strengthen one another in the way that leadeth unto life. On Sunday evenings, we hold a Bible class from 6.30 to 8 o'clock. It is our endeavour to instruct one another in some of the many things to be found in the Word of Truth. We are considering the life, word, and sayings of Christ as recorded in the Gospel by Matthew. We are sorry to say brother Cornman met with an accident on July 4th, breaking his leg in two places and his collar bone. He met with us on December 6th, for the first time since. During the year, the following sisters and brother paid us a visit:—Sister Trinick, of Homestead, Pa., brother and sister Hardy, of Toronto, Canada, and sister Vandergrift, of Washington, Pa.—CHAS. W. HARDY.

(MARCH 1892) PITTSBURG (PA.)—Brother Mosley, of West Brom-which, writes:—"In this month's *Christadelphian* (February) I notice a communication from 'Pittsburg (Pa.), U.S.A.' I am personally acquainted with five of those referred to. They went from the separated meeting, the secretary, Chas. W. Hardy, being one of them. One of the five took a determined stand in opposition to the Temperance Hall position on inspiration. It would greatly please me to hear of their having altered in this respect."

(April 1892) GLASGOW—The visit of brother Roberts to Glasgow is now a matter of history. Brother Roberts delivered three lectures here, the first on "The Russo-Jewish Persecutions"; the second on "The Inspiration of the Bible"; and the third on "The History of Error." The attendance was fair on the occasion of the first lecture, but diminished on the subsequent evenings. Great attention was shown, however, by those present, and good has been done, certainly to the brethren, if to no other class of persons. Many brethren from a distance attended the lectures, and were privileged to hear brother Roberts at about his



best. We continue our regular lectures in the Clydesdale Masonic Hall, and although the results are apparently unsatisfactory so far as may be judged by the attendance vouchsafed, yet we steadily grow in numbers, and are striving to grow, also, in the knowledge and fear of God.—D. CAMPBELL.

“Old sister Paul asks me to write you to let you know that her husband died last Thursday, aged 79.”—THOMAS NISBET. [This was the Mr. Daniel Paul that presided at the Long debate. He was very friendly towards the truth and the brethren, but never saw his way to uniting with them. It is said he was hindered by the Inspiration division. Very likely. The responsibility rests with those who rendered that division necessary, not with those whom the advocacy of error left no choice but withdrawal.—EDITOR.]

(April 1892) SYDNEY.—We have much pleasure in recording the obedience of FLORENCE E. YARDLEY, daughter of brother Yardley (Brisbane), after a satisfactory confession of the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.—A. E. BENNETT.

Brother and sister Hooley, brother Porritt, brother Whitten, sister Leake, sister Cooper have retired from the Redfern Hall ecclesia because of the decision of that ecclesia to league themselves with those who refuse to admit believers into the name of Christ if they are under 20 years of age, and who forbid interested strangers being present at the Sunday morning meetings for the breaking of bread.

(November 1892) PITTSBURGH (Pa.)—“Will you please insert the following in the *Christadelphian*:—‘There is a notice in the March number of the *Christadelphian* from brother Mosley, of West Bromwich, referring to intelligence in the February number from the Pittsburgh (Pa.) U.S.A. Ecclesia. There is a mistake or two in brother Mosley’s communication I wish to rectify. At the time of the division at Great Bridge I, Charles W. Hardy, had not obeyed the truth, and therefore cannot be included in the five referred to. Secondly, the other four did not go from the separated meeting. It was brother Mosley and those who followed him who separated themselves from the old original ecclesia at Great Bridge. Thirdly, the four referred to believe now as they did then and always have done, that the Bible is the Word of God, and is the only book given by God to men that contains the will and purpose of the Deity in regard to this earth and mankind. That in this Book alone is shown the way to life eternal. This position I endorse myself.—CHAS. W. HARDY.’”

[This is satisfactory so far, but not entirely so, We insert it merely because the persons affected have been called in question in the *Christadelphian*, and might feel they have a right of reply, which they have under the circumstances. The reply leaves matters where they were. Brother Mosley separated himself from a body that refused to avow belief in the wholly-inspired character of the Scriptures as a condition of fellowship, and who, therefore, made themselves parties to the great wrong that was being done by the advocacy in our midst of partial inspiration. The said body is in fellowship with those in Birmingham and elsewhere who befriended partial inspiration. Brother Mosley had, therefore cause to impugn the intelligence from Pittsburgh in the way he did, and the foregoing answer does not dispose of his objection.—ED.]

(January 1893) SYDNEY.—The members of the Albert Hall Ecclesia (per brother A. T. C. Dalvey), take exception to the intelligence appearing in the September number of the *Christadelphian*, signed “H. Howell.” on the ground that an age limit for believers is still maintained by those whom that communication represents. The writers hold that the pages of the *Christadelphian* should be for setting forth the Truth, and advising those who are in fellowship therewith. This is what the editor of the *Christadelphian* desires, and strives to attain. The special difficulties in the way in this case he has endeavoured to indicate in previous comments. Wherein he fails, readers must forgive.

(May 1893) IRVINE—Brother Thomas Mullin reports that brother William Matthewson and sister Matthewson are now in fellowship with the brethren here on the basis of a wholly-inspired Bible and marriage only in the Lord.

(May 1893) SYDNEY.—*Leichhardt ecclesia*.—We have to report the baptism of HARRIETT BURNS (29), formerly Methodist, after having made the good confession. We have also received into our fellowship sister Bower (of Redfern ecclesia), brother A. Butler (of Gordon ecclesia), who were both formerly of Birmingham, and brother and sister J. Parkinson (of Temperance Hall ecclesia). On Saturday, the 7th January, the Sunday School had their out-door gathering up the Parramatta River, spending a very pleasant day; and on the 26th January (Anniversary Day) both the Leichhardt and Fairfield ecclesias were invited to the residences of brothers Barton and E. Killip, at Fairfield, to which invitation nearly all responded by their presence, and an enjoyable day was spent, reading, singing, and short addresses forming part of the proceedings. Brother and sister Barton are expecting to sail for England in the month of March on a visit. It was when on a previous visit that the brother was immersed by the Birmingham ecclesia. We still continue the lectures regularly on Sunday evenings, and they are fairly attended, increasing interest being evinced.—F. J. MUMBY.

Brother H. Howell writes to contradict the allegations of brother Dalvey appearing in the *Christadelphian* for January last under the heading of “Sydney”; another brother writes that the Albert Hall brethren are alone entitled to the fellowship of brethren elsewhere, and that the Truth will never prosper in Sydney until the *Christadelphian* is closed against all but Albert Hall. **We are weary of these dissensions, and feel helpless in dealing with them. We cannot know the exact state of matters without personal investigation on the spot; and as this is out of the question, we have to consider what to do. Are we to publish intelligence from all, or to publish intelligence from none of the bodies professing the truth in Sydney? There seems no middle course. If some denied and some professed the truth as understood among us, we should know what to do exactly, and should do it without hesitation or fear. But when all profess the same truth and all object to each other’s communications appearing, we are simply paralysed. To publish communications from none would be a simple method, but there is a feeling that such a course must necessarily involve injustice to the Lord’s faithful servants, of whom there must surely be some among so many professors in Sydney. To publish from all, if they could each bear it, might be the lesser evil. But even here there is a difficulty. It would be an apparent countenance of a Scriptural wrong, for it is a Scriptural wrong that the friends of Christ should meet in separate and hostile bodies; and what are visitors to Sydney to do when they find themselves in the midst of warring camps? There’s something terribly wrong somewhere. It is questionable if Christ will have any word of commendation for a community so given up to mutual devouring. One thing is certain, there ought to be no compromise with this presumptuous exclusion from fellowship of obedient lovers of God who happen to be under 20 years of age. If this is the leaven that is working the confusion, cast it out. It ought to be easy to make a clearly drawn line here. Let as many rationally-minded and Godly men and women come together as can agree on a basis of fellowship that excludes this absurdity; and friends elsewhere would know what to do. At present, the Sydney brethren are not only afflicting themselves, but are discouraging brethren everywhere, and bringing reproach on the Truth to the ends of the earth by their chronic strifes, and diversions, and hatred, and evil speakings. Let the true men and women among them arise and deliver themselves from this carnal quagmire in which they are in danger of sinking to perdition. One thing we are on the point of resolving on, and that is to close the pages of the *Christadelphian* against all further communications until an Apostolic basis of union and peace has been arrived at. We have not reached a final decision. We shall wait a little longer. We fear to interpose obstacles in the way of any man sincerely endeavouring to do the will of God in his day and generation. At the same time the fruits of the Spirit (love, joy, union and peace) are of as paramount importance as the elementary things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of**

**Jesus Christ. Where these are absent, the spirit of Christ is absent: and we all know what is written, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."—EDITOR.**

(May 1893) AUCKLAND.—“I am sorry to inform you that eleven brethren and sisters with myself had to separate from the Auckland ecclesia, owing to their alteration of basis, by cutting out the negative aspects and a belief in partial inspiration of the Scriptures. We meet each first day of the week at brother and sister Walker’s residence, Arch Hill, to remember the death of our Lord. Brother Matthews, originally of Birmingham, is one with us, but has left for Invercargill.”—S. HARRISON.

(June 1893) SYDNEY.—A lengthy communication, signed by brother Bell and brother Dulvey, on behalf of the Albert Hall ecclesia reports, and seems to justify withdrawal from brother Bayliss. Presumably, matters will finally settle down in Sydney on a Scriptural and fraternal basis.

(August 1893) BLACKBURN—Brother C. Bullock, on behalf of a company of six or eight brethren and sisters in this place, expresses their desire to be in union with the brethren and sisters who co-operate with the *Christadelphian*. They have hitherto been in a somewhat indefinite position through omission to take a declared position on the subject of inspiration. They now unequivocally affirm their recognition of the true character of the Scriptures, and refuse identification with the mixed and uncertain people represented by the *Fraternal Visitor*.

(August 1893) SYDNEY.—Good news from this place (of re-union and the restoration of a good understanding, as regards three bodies at least—Leichhardt, Albert Hall, and Fairfield), we are reluctantly compelled to leave over till next month.

(September 1893) KENDAL—I am very pleased to inform you on the 20th of last month I immersed into Christ a young woman named ANNIE MOUNSEY (28), formerly a member of the Church of England. She was interested in the truth by a fellow servant. I never had such pleasure in examining a candidate before, for she seemed to drink in truth like a child its mother’s milk. We are four now in fellowship in Kendal—three sisters and myself. We meet at the Temperance Hall, Stricklandgate, every Sunday, at 11 in the morning, for breaking bread, and on Tuesday evenings at seven for reading. One of the sisters is the daughter of the woman who keeps the Temperance Hotel. It was in a most providential way that I came to find this sister. Last summer, shortly after I came to Kendal, two ladies called upon my daughter for a subscription for Wesleyan missionaries, and in the absence of my daughter for a few minutes I brought the truth before them, and one of them said, “This gentleman talks just like my Polly.” I asked of what religion her daughter was. She said she could not recollect the name of the people her daughter belonged to. I asked her if they were called “Christadelphians.” She said, “Oh, yes, that’s the name.” I told her I should be very pleased to make her acquaintance, and she gave me her address. Now, dear brother, I must thank you for the parcel you sent me. I distributed the contents as follows:—Some of the pamphlets I laid on the table in the Working Man’s Institute, and the leaflets I gave away one Sunday morning to a Salvation Army meeting, and put some into the Young Men’s Christian Association room. I also took “The Twelve Lectures” and presented them to a new Public Library here. With the last lot you sent I am going to put the name of our meeting place on, and give them away at the doors of the different places of worship. I must apologise for writing you so long a letter, but I feel that you will be pleased to have such an account. I can do very little in the way of forwarding the truth now, as I am in my seventy-fifth year, but thank God, the older I get the more I enjoy the truth. I hope we shall soon be summoned to meet the Lord and be acceptable in His sight.—B. LOWE.

(November 1893) NEWPORT (MON.) -We have during the month received a very pleasing communication from Abergavenny, in which brother H. C. Edwards, solicitor (who has been appointed as recording brother, *pro tem.*), informed us that slightly more than half the Ecclesia, which hitherto has

been in fellowship with “Partial Inspirationists,” have now cut themselves off from their old associates, and decided in favour of fellowship only with those who maintain “the complete Divine Inspiration, and consequent infallibility of the scriptures as originally written by God’s prophets and apostles.” They have always held the scriptures to be wholly inspired and infallible, but have heretofore maintained a neutral position in reference to the division caused some years ago by the agitation of the doctrine of partial inspiration. They have asked for help in the lecturing department, and we have arranged to send brother J. Lander for Oct. 15th, when a free discussion upon “Our Unity and Welfare, and the Interests of the Truth” has been decided upon by our brethren there. We hope to hear a good report from our brother when he returns. We have had an addition to our numbers, in Sister Goodchild, who has removed from London, in all probability to reside permanently in Newport.—Our lectures have been as follows: Sept. 17th, “If a Man Die shall he Live Again?” (brother T. J. Cross); 24th, “Christ, the future King of the whole Earth” (brother C. W. Heath); Oct. 1st., “Felix Trembled! Why?” (brother J. Lauder); 8th, “Destruction cometh! and they shall seek peace and find none” (brother E. S. Schofield).—W. COLLARD.

(July 1893) CANADA-HAMILTON.—We are pleased to report that brother and sister Brown and their family have safely arrived from Dunfermlin, Scotland, and will reside in this city. Brother Brown’s utterances on Sunday last seemed to come from a heart in love with spiritual things, and we believe we shall be strengthened and encouraged by their presence.—ROBERT WELSHMAN.

(Sorry to hear of renewed division without apparent necessity. These things ought not so to be.—ED.) Brother Parkin reports the safe arrival of sister Styles and family from Birmingham, after a rough voyage.

(February 1894) DERBY -On January 12th ROBERT BROWN (46), put on the saving name of Christ by baptism, and was received into fellowship on the 13th. The Lord help him to overcome.—Our annual business meeting has been held, at which the annual (ecclesial) appointments were made. It was decided to hold a tea meeting, which duly came off on the 9th instant. The theme of the speeches ran principally in the direction of greater zeal for the things of the truth. It was resolved that we have four tea meetings in the year in future, in the belief that they will have a good effect on the brethren generally.—It is thought by some of our brethren that a constitution by which to regulate the workings of our ecclesia would be a benefit, by others it is thought unnecessary. The matter is referred to a future arranging meetings.—An application for re-fellowship by brother and sister Fitchett (who were withdrawn from some three months ago) is accepted.—It was resolved to hold a Eureka Class on Saturday evenings, in addition to the usual Wednesday evening meeting.—THOMAS STURGESS.

(March 1894) BOSTON (Mass.).—We still continue the proclamation of God’s blessed truth to the Boston public. The audiences, as far as numbers go, are satisfactory enough, but, alas! how few care to accept the invitation to God’s glorious kingdom. A few honest hearts are interested, and are earnest students of the Word. Lectures for December have been as follows:—3rd, “This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise” (brother A. Pinel); 10th. “A glorious age near at hand” (brother Joseph McKellar); 17th, “God the Creator of evil as well as good” (brother E. F. Mitchell); 24th, “The war of the great day of God Almighty” (brother A. Pinel); 31st, “The binding of Satan for one thousand years” (brother C. Fairbrother). I am sorry to report our withdrawal from sister Agnes Rose, who maintains the Renunciationist position with regard to Christ; also that quite a number of our brethren and sisters have separated themselves on a question which we do not consider of sufficient importance to cause a separation, namely, the right or wrong of asking or warning (but unwithdrawn from) a brother who is a transgressor, to refrain from partaking of the bread and wine while in an unrepentant state. They claim that to do so would be a violation of the law of Christ in Matt. 18:15–17. — H. J. MCKELLAR.—**[A transgressing unrepentant brother should be withdrawn from. He ought not to be asked to refrain from the breaking of bread until the rule of Matt. 18:15–17 has been carried out; otherwise, the door is open for condemnation without investigation. The precepts of Matt. 5:23 and 1 Cor. 11:27 are for self-**

**application. A man may judge himself when others are not at liberty to judge him. There is no conflict between any of the precepts when rightly applied.—ED.]**

(April 1894) MELBOURNE.—“The following persons have united themselves with Christ in the appointed way, after an intelligent attestation of their faith:—Mrs. ALICE MIDDLETON (23), formerly Baptist, on 23rd January; JAMES R. S. GARLAND (27), formerly Wesleyan, on the 27th, and ALICE M. PEERS (31), on the 2nd February. The lectures to date have been ‘The Disciples of Christ in the First and Nineteenth Centuries,’ ‘Watchnight Services,’ ‘Man Historic and Prophetic, his subjection to Sin and Death; the Deliverance and its nature’ ‘From Euphrates to the Nile,’ ‘Earth or Sky.’—We would warn the Colonial brethren and sisters against the doctrines promulgated by Mr. George Cornish, late of Bristol, England, but now resident in Melbourne. The report of ecclesial withdrawal from him will be found on page 73 *Christadelphian* for February, 1891. Some of the doctrines enumerated there he professes to have abandoned, but his doctrines still are negations of the Truth. They are the echoes of Renunciationism.—[ED.] [Refer to February 1891 Bristol]

(May 1894) LONDON (NORTH) -After a long series of controversial meetings on the new doctrine introduced by brother Andrew, the ecclesia was invited to re-affirm the basis of fellowship heretofore in vogue [popular] among them, in which the doctrine of light being the basis of resurrectional responsibility was avowed [accepted]. A majority refused to do so, in consequence of which, brother Lake issued a circular, of which the following is the principal portion:—

“Dear Brethren and Sisters,—You are aware that at the business meeting on Sunday last, when the Ecclesia was asked to re-affirm its basis of fellowship **against the false theories** introduced by brother Andrew, it refused to do so. **We, therefore, who maintain the truth as it has always hitherto been held and taught in the London meeting, have withdrawn from the meeting at Barnsbury Hall. We invite you to meet with us upon the old basis of fellowship.** Our first meeting will be held on Sunday morning next, at the Temperance Hall, Church Passage, Islington (entrance by the Church in Upper Street, or from Cross Street). We meet at 11 o’clock for the breaking of bread, when all who uphold the truth in its purity, as hitherto taught among us, are cordially invited to attend.”

**[The refusal to affirm a doctrine is equivalent to its repudiation; which is a much more serious thing than inability to see it, especially when combined with avowed antagonism to it, as in the present case. The decision of the assembly left brother Lake and those who act with him no alternative but the course they have adopted.—ED.]**

(May 1894) LONDON (SOUTH) *Gresham Hall, Gresham Road, Brixton (near Brixton Station).*

In view of the refusal of a majority of the North London (late the Islington) ecclesia to re-affirm the basis on which they have hitherto existed, the Gresham Hall (late the Camberwell) brethren have issued a circular addressed “To the brethren and sisters of the North and South London Ecclesias,” in which they say:—“We deem it advisable to call attention to the fact that the South London Ecclesia adheres to the doctrine of the judgment as expressed in its basis of fellowship, viz:—

“That resurrection affects those only who are responsible to God by a knowledge of His revealed will; that all these, whether just or unjust, faithful or unfaithful, will be raised from the dead at the second appearing of Jesus Christ, and will, with the living, appear in a corruptible nature before the judgment-seat of Christ, to give an account of themselves, and to receive in the body according to that which they have done, whether it be good or bad.”

“The South London Ecclesia, therefore, invites the fellowship of those only who assent to this doctrine in its entirety, including that feature of it which recognises a knowledge of God’s revealed will as the ground of responsibility.” (Signed by the 12 official brethren: A. T. Jannaway, F. G. Jannaway, Chas. Meakin, F. W. Porter, A. J. White, J. A. Bonds, G. Brett, J. L. Green J. M. Evans, H. E. Purser, J. Bellamy, and J. Barker.)

(Excerpt from August 1894) LONDON (SOUTH) *Gresham Hall, Gresham Road, Brixton (near Brixton Station)*. Writing again on later date, brother Bellamy says:—“At our quarterly business meeting held on Thursday evening last, July 12th, the following resolution was passed:—“That in consequence of the stand taken by the Barnsbury Hall meeting in avowing and teaching that unbaptised enlightened rejectors of the Gospel are not amenable to resurrectional judgment, a stand which denies that knowledge is the basis of resurrectional responsibility—the Barnsbury Hall meeting be regarded as out of fellowship; and that any brother or sister fellowshipping that meeting be regarded as infringing Rule 7.—(i.e., Rule 7 in our basis of fellowship).’ We cannot find words to express the grief it causes us in having to separate ourselves from brother Andrew and those whom we confidently regard as being led astray by him; we could see no alternative left us in the matter, the more especially as we were given to understand by brother Andrew himself that we must accept his new teaching or cease to walk with him.”

Brother F. G. Jannaway writes:—“In the *Fraternal Visitor* for June, it is reported that four members have left us on account of being ‘dissatisfied with the spirit that prevails at Gresham Hall.’ The following are the facts: Brother A. Clements was unanimously withdrawn from by our ecclesia over two years ago (April 10th, 1892), at a business meeting, the minutes of which are now before me. ‘We are commanded to withdraw from every brother who walks disorderly’ (2 Thess. 3:6). As to brother and sister J. Smith, they left us on Sunday, May 20th, without any intimation whatever. I immediately wrote asking if such were true, and if so, why they had left us. His reply is also now before me, and the very first paragraph states they were ‘unable to accept the theory of inspiration as held by those meeting at Gresham Hall,’ and therefore ‘have no right to be in fellowship there, unless we could still continue and keep silent on the matter, but such an attitude we consider would not be honest.’ Brother Smith added, ‘It is a wrench to leave those whom we love, because they also long for Christ’s return. We can and must still esteem them. We must meet with those at Kennington as we did this morning; you will not allow us to meet at Gresham Hall.’ The extracts speak for themselves.”

(Excerpt from November 1884) LONDON (NORTH) *Islington Temperance Hall, Church Passage, Upper Street, N. Sundays, 11 a.m., 3 p.m., and 6.30 p.m.; Wednesdays, 8 p.m.*— Brother Lake, referring to brother Andrew’s contradiction last month of brother Lake’s letter as “entirely untrue,” wishes to say as follows in reply:—“When brother Andrew wrote and challenged the accuracy of my statements I immediately replied, with the most brotherly intention, to say that I had no desire to misrepresent him, and that if it were shewn that I had done so, I would publish a withdrawal of the statements. To this offer brother Andrew never replied; and it was not until his magazine appeared that I knew what the statements were to which he demurred. That the term ‘liars’ was applied to us, so far from being untrue, is strictly and literally accurate. He applied Rev. 22:15 to all who differed from him upon his new theory, and in doing so, was careful to explain that the ‘lying’ referred to was not mere speaking of untruth, but meant the holding of false opinions.”

Brother Lake adds: “The outlook of the truth in North London is brighter than it has been for many a long day.”

(July 1895) ROCKHAMPTON -“We have to inform you that brothers Thompson and Lanham, late of the Brisbane Ecclesia, brother Weston and the writer (of this town), have formed an ecclesia here, on the basis of Brisbane, Birmingham, and other ecclesias, viz., the admittance of desiring or inquiring alien as

listeners only at the breaking of bread. We have in love written to all others situated in this locality professing the one faith, earnestly desiring them to co-operate in this movement, to further the cause of our beloved Master by using the talents collectively, with which we have been individually endowed; in preaching and showing by our works His gospel in His name until He comes. We trust in Christ they may respond to our invitation, as it is most essential where Christadelphians are, that they may be united in one heart, mind and deed, to exhibit the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.—GEO. H. CHURCH.

(July 1895) BERLIN.—Considerable time has elapsed since any intelligence has been received from this part. Brother and sister Renshaw and myself have been connected with the Doon ecclesia, but so far as Berlin was concerned our light was to a great extent hid under a bushel [means to conceal one's good ideas or talents]. We have now severed our connection with the Doon ecclesia, feeling the obligation that rests on all the sons of God in showing our light, and contending for that faith which once for all was delivered to the saints, and for which the apostles poured out their hearts blood to defend. We have united with brother Taylor and sisters Mrs. J. Bechtel, Miss E. Bechtel, and Mrs B. Bechtel, of Waterloo, and formed an ecclesia to be known as the Berlin and Waterloo Ecclesia, meeting every Sunday morning at 10.30 a.m., on the corner of King and Queen Streets, Berlin. Our first meeting was held on June 2nd. Brother A. Renshaw spoke on the "Christian Hope." The interest manifested was not very encouraging, but this is a day of small things. Our duty is to sow the seed and pray God to give us fruit.—E. H. CHART.

(December 1895) GRIMSBY—It has often been said by friends of the truth that we should not be aggressive in our teaching, but when it is understood that Romanism is gaining ground by this means, it only shows here that the brethren should bravely expose the evil doctrines of the Apostacy. The lectures for October were as follows:—October 6th, "Nebuchadnezzar's Dream" (brother Hofmeyer); October 13th, "The Four Beasts of Daniel" (brother Hofmeyer); October 20th, "The Millennium" (brother Grewer); October 27th, "The Angels, Who are They?" (brother J. L. Gregory).—E. J. THOMPSON.

(October 1895) BROOKLYN (N.Y.)—A bad fish has gone through the net here. The recording brother writes as follows:—I beg to enclose a copy herewith of a New York paper, giving an account of the doings and conduct of a certain man, by name Henry Hartley, formerly of Brooklyn, who passed current among us as a brother of Christ, but who was in reality carrying on a nefarious business, that came to a sudden end through his trickery and rascality. It is stated by his intimate business acquaintances that he appropriated the funds of the concern to his own use, and so entangled their affairs that they became insolvent, and were thereby forced to close the doors. When these reports came to our ears, we addressed a few lines to him for an explanation, soliciting him to purge himself of the serious allegations that were being circulated around to the ridicule and reproach of the truth, but, in reply, we received a very insolent and insulting letter. And so the matter rested with us until it got into the daily press, as per account herewith; and on behalf of the brethren in Europe, or wherever he has departed to, we have deemed it advisable to inform them, through you, of his past conduct with us, and to warn every ecclesia to be on the look out for this man, who in appearance is very gentlemanly and very affable, but who, we are sorry to say, will not scruple to do or say anything to further his own personal advantages. Since this trouble began, it has come out that he was obliged to leave Boston on account of similar crooked transactions, in which he solicited servant girls everywhere to invest in a fraudulent car-heating apparatus, which was an infringement upon another man's patent, and for which he issued bogus stock that was not worth the paper it was written on. The detectives in New York and Brooklyn hunted him so closely that he dare not appear on the streets, and in order to avoid them slyly departed to Boston and took ship from there to England, leaving his wife and two children to follow him two days later, who were fully cognizant of his conduct and accessory to all that he did. Therefore, knowing these things to be true, we feel obligated to warn the Body of Christ, of which he claimed to be a member among us, that they may not be deceived either by him or his helpmeet.—W. MINNERLEY.

(November 1895) JERSEY CITY.—Some time in August, brother Henry Hartley, of the Jersey City ecclesia, arrived in Birmingham, furnished with a letter of introduction from the brethren of his ecclesia. His presence in Birmingham was unknown to brother C. C. Walker, who was absent from home on the Sunday brother Hartley came. The report from Brooklyn, N. Y., in last month's issue, was inserted in ignorance of brother Hartley's presence among us. Upon receipt of the *Christadelphian*, brother Hartley wrote to brother Walker declaring the Brooklyn report to be "absolutely untrue," and enclosing the letter from the Jersey City ecclesia, and asking brother Walker to write to their recording brother. This he did, with the result of evoking the subjoined reply:—"Your letter of Oct. 1st to hand. I regret most deeply that the article referred to ever issued from your office, but I felt sure it occurred under such circumstances as you mention. That it is untrue and libellous it will be easy to show. The impression one unacquainted with the facts would obtain upon reading it is that brother and sister Hartley recently appeared among us, commenced a work of swindling, pocketed the proceeds, and fled. The facts are that brother Hartley was immersed by the Boston brethren some nine years ago, soon became known among them as a zealous young brother, and, after meeting with them five years, left Boston and came to New York. Since that time brother and sister Hartley have been regular attendants at the meetings. His hand has always been ready in every good cause. His habits are irreproachable. The business in which he was engaged is what is well and favourably known in England as a co-operative store. For some inexplicable reason such ventures have always proved a failure here. This one was no exception. It became insolvent. Brother Hartley left. The investors clamoured for their money. Brother Hartley was made the scapegoat. I fail to find a single charge against him substantiated by direct evidence. When examined it is merely hearsay and inference. Of course, there are many aliens, and a few brethren, who profess to regard it as conclusive. Those of the brethren who do so are either unsophisticated in the ways of this wicked world, or are prejudiced. The calmer and fairer minds put it at its right value. The clipping you received is from the vilest and most unscrupulous paper in New York. No reputable journal took any cognisance of the so-called exposure. Ecclesially, brother Hartley stands with us as he has since he came among us. Last Sunday, brother G. T. Washburne asked that we remember brother Hartley in our prayers to God, that he and his sister wife might be delivered from their present afflictions, and be preserved unto the kingdom. The letter he gave you from us was sent to him after the appearance of the story in the *World*. Brother J. M. Washburne desires to testify that at the time brother Hartley is said to have been in hiding, he called at brother Washburne's place of business in New York City. Far from running away slyly, brother Hartley informed several of the brethren at the tea meeting, on Decoration Day, May 30th, that he intended to sail for England shortly. He sailed July 20th. You will note that brother Minnerly does not affirm anything of his own direct knowledge, but quotes brother Hartley's 'business acquaintances.' Please do what you think best to put brother Hartley right.—Yours in the gospel bonds, JAMES C. BRUCE."

(April 1897) BRISTOL.—(*Oddfellows' Hall, Rupert Street, near Christmas Steps. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.; Wednesdays Bible Study 7.30 p.m.*) "The lectures continue to receive a fair amount of attention. On February 14th we were favoured by a visit from brother J. Lander, of Newport, as also of brother Collard, from the same place, on January 10th. Both brethren addressed us in a manner calculated to strengthen and edify, and each delivered a telling lecture to a goodly number of strangers present. During the month we have been visited by sisters West and L. Jones, both of Birmingham.—With reference to the intelligence from Bristol in the *Sanctuary Keeper* for March, undersigned by the senders, eight in number, we wish to intimate that four of the persons whose names are appended were never members of our ecclesia, while three of the remaining four were withdrawn from this ecclesia about March, 1894, upon an entirely different question than the one referred to. The lectures by our own brethren have been as follows:—February 21st, 'What must I do to be Saved' (brother Sargent); 28th, 'Death: its Origin, its Effects, its Destruction' (brother Jenkins); March 7th, 'Paul's Hope: is it Yours?' (brother Walker); 14th, 'The New Jerusalem' (brother Bradley).—On Good Friday we intend (D. V.) holding our annual tea and fraternal meeting, and shall be pleased to welcome all brethren and sisters who may be disposed to come."—T. W. SWAISH.



(August 1897) GLASGOW.—“I have to report the removal to Glasgow of brother and sister W. J. Miles, from Liverpool, and brother and sister John Grant, from Boston, U.S.A. We are glad to have these additions to our ecclesia. On the other hand, brother Peebles has removed for the present to Falkland, Fifeshire.—Certain published statements and deductions of the Kilmarnock brethren being liable to create misconception as to the position of matters in Glasgow, I have been requested to explain that position, and we shall be glad to have our position made known.—The Glasgow brethren, then, as an ecclesia, believe that God will resurrect all who are responsible to Him, whether they have been baptised or not. (What is the ground of responsibility, brethren? That is the question.—ED.) We know for certain that all who have truly been baptised will be raised to judgment, and as regards those who, although enlightened, may not have been baptised, we admit God’s sovereign supremacy, and that He can do with them as He pleases. We are not prepared to affirm positively that enlightened rejectors of the truth will be resurrected to judgment. We do not regard the evidence as sufficiently explicit to warrant us in making such an affirmation. Therefore, we do not regard the question as one of fellowship, and do not require candidates for baptism to give an expression of belief respecting it. We, however, see no legal or other barrier to the resurrection of ‘enlightened rebels,’ should God require their resurrection. We disapprove of the attitude of brother Andrew, and would refuse fellowship with him, or those who may support him; but we also disapprove of the action of those on the other side who are making the acceptance of their views a pre-requisite to fellowship. The question has hitherto been one upon which varied views have been entertained, and while there must necessarily be a limit to these variations, we think that were God’s sovereignty in the matter is acknowledged, division is uncalled for.”—D. CAMPBELL.

(October 1897) DENVER (Colo.).—“I have to report the obedience to the ancient Apostolic and only saving faith of Mrs. LELA M. GOLDEN, 2,434, West Street, Lincoln, Neb.; and also the re-immersion into the Saving Name of her mother, Mrs. A. HOLMES, 815, North Twenty-Fifth Street, Lincoln, Neb. While on a visit to friends in another part of Colorado, they called at Denver on their way home for the purpose of being examined and immersed, and we rejoice with them in the accomplishment of the object of their call. Sister Holmes first became acquainted with the truth over 20 years ago, through the efforts of a Dr. Reeves at Bucyrus, Ohio. Shortly afterwards, between personal troubles and the ‘Free Life’ heresy, the ecclesia was broken up, only four sisters standing for the truth, all the rest, including those who had been their teachers, going off on the new doctrine. Since that time she has plodded on alone, with the exception of an occasional letter from another sister, which afforded her much consolation and comfort. But, though enduring ‘manifold trials and temptations,’ she never entirely lost ‘hope,’ but devoted herself to the task of teaching her young daughter the ‘truth as it is in Jesus.’ At that time, the ‘things concerning the Name of Jesus Christ’ did not receive as much attention as the ‘things concerning the Kingdom’; and, until recently, she did not understand the full significance of the things of the Name. On a fuller knowledge of the truth, she felt her deficiency in this respect, and sought to rectify it by reimmersion. For her more recent and deeper knowledge of the truth, she is indebted to sister Lasius, whom she remembered and to whom she wrote in deep distress some 18 months ago. Sister Lasius sent her some books and advised her to subscribe for the *Christadelphian*, which advice she followed; and, seeing brother Coleman’s name in the June number, she lost no time in communicating with him; hence her visit. Sister Golden was formerly a member of the Christian Church, in which she has been an ardent and devoted worker.”—S. ROBINSON.

## **PROPOSALS BY INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS**

(Excerpt from November 1865) EDINBURGH.—The brethren here have commenced a series of efforts for the propagation of the truth. Heretofore, their operations have been confined in a morning and afternoon meeting to the process of “building themselves up in their most holy faith;” but recently several of their number realizing the fact that it is part of the duty of the believers of the truth to give testimony for it in the face of an unbelieving generation (even apart from the consideration of results), agitated the

proposal that evening meetings should be advertised for the exposition of the Word of Life, and that such as were at all capable of promoting this object should contribute their willing services. Ultimately the proposal was carried into effect, and five meetings have taken place under the new arrangement.

(January 1866) HALIFAX.—The course of lectures by bro. F. R Shuttleworth came to a conclusion on Sunday, the 24<sup>th</sup> ult. There has been a steady and fair, though limited, attendance throughout. A few are interested, and several immersions are pending. On Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> (Christmas-day), a joint social meeting took place, at which brethren and sisters were present from Ripponden, Huddersfield, Heckmondwike, Leeds, Keighley, and Manchester. A pleasant season of fraternal intercourse was spent. Bro. Shuttleworth, from whom the foregoing information is derived, adds, “We (a few of us) have for some time past taken tea together at the room. We have found this a great advantage during the lectures, inasmuch as it has given us an opportunity which we should not have of conversing with those who are interested. We dispense with the item of expense by each one bringing a few provisions and putting them together.”

(Excerpt from June 1866) BIRMINGHAM. — The proposal to renew the discussion with Mr. Nightingale is allowed to “stand over” for the present, Mr. Nightingale being of opinion that an audience could not be got together while it is light outside. In any case, he refuses to take the affirmative. He insists upon maintaining the purely defensive attitude in any renewal of the discussion that may take place. Meanwhile, there is rumour of challenge from another quarter, but it is impossible at present to say if it will come to anything.

(Excerpt from February 1871) BIRMINGHAM.—The usual quarterly meeting of the ecclesia was held on Monday, January 2<sup>nd</sup>. After tea, the reports were read. The number of additions during the past three months had been 12. No business of public moment was transacted.

The past month has witnessed an incident which, for some reasons, it would be better to say nothing about, but which, for others, requires mention. A letter was read to the ecclesia announcing that a number of the brethren and sisters—whose number was afterwards reported to be twelve—had held a meeting, and resolved to open a room in Bradford Street, and establish a branch ecclesia there; and asking the countenance and co-operation of the brethren and sisters at the Athenæum. A meeting was called to consider the matter, at which brother Roberts submitted reasons why the proposed branch ecclesia should be treated as a faction and not as a fraternal movement. Chief among these were warnings from Dr. Thomas, read from three several letters received a considerable time before, to the effect that a certain brother, who had gone to America with him in the *Idaho*, and had been expelled from his house in disgrace, had returned to England, and would, on his arrival in the latter country, seek to enlist the sympathies of envious or disaffected persons, and set up a rival meeting. This brother was one of the twelve. As an illustration of the sort of procedure that had led to his expulsion, brother Roberts read from the said letters an account of how the said brother (James Martin) had, while in charge of the Dr.’s house in his absence, opened and made a copy of, and re-sealed a private letter, addressed by the Dr. to his wife, who happened to be out at the time, and to whom the said James Martin handed the closed letter on her return, as if nothing unusual had happened. On hearing this, the meeting was adjourned for three days to allow of brother Martin’s attendance to hear and explain the matter, and one of the brethren was deputed to proceed, at the expense of the ecclesia, to Hereford, where brother Martin happened to be, to give him notice of the adjourned meeting and its purpose. At the adjourned meeting (Thursday, January 12<sup>th</sup>), brother Martin being present, brother Roberts went into the whole matter from the commencement, and concluded by proposing that all taking part in the proposed Bradford Street meeting should be considered as brethren walking disorderly, and withdrawn from. This proposal was not voted upon, as another was submitted and adopted, to the effect that they be not withdrawn from at once, but that time be given them to manifest the nature of their procedure. As to brother Martin, who spoke at considerable length in his

own defence, it was decided to withdraw from him at once, as a mischief-worker and a person of proved untruthfulness and dishonour, two only dissenting. On the following Sunday, at a full meeting of the ecclesia, a brother while concurring in the estimate formed of brother Martin, desired the brethren to recal their withdrawal from him, and re-consider the matter, on the ground that the suddenness and unexpectedness of the decision would establish a bad precedent. Two only voted for this course. About twelve voted for time being given to brother Martin to repent, upon which a brother cogently remarked that he had time to repent in the isolated position in which he had been placed, and could reinstate himself at any time by due acknowledgment, and request for forgiveness. The rest of the ecclesia, in an overwhelming vote, refused to go into the matter again, and re-affirmed withdrawal from James Martin. [Compiler's Note: Dark gray the proposal]

(Excerpt from February 1876) BIRMINGHAM. — The quarterly business meeting of the ecclesia was held Jan. 5<sup>th</sup>, when the reports were of an immensely satisfactory character as regards the contributions of the brethren to the various branches of activity in operation. Owing to this and to a brother and sister's contribution of £12 to the Masonic Hall lectures, the brethren had been enabled, without exhausting the balance in hand, to do various things not usually within their reach. It was resolved to appoint two additional presiding brethren. A proposal was also introduced to enable the ecclesia to make the annual elections a merely formal affair when there is no need of change. The idea was to reduce to a minimum the spiritual inconvenience of the process, without surrendering the power of congregational control, which the present circumstances of the truth required to be preserved; or, in other words, to approximate, as nearly as possible, to the permanence of the apostolic institutions, while preserving the liberty of change which our non-apostolic circumstances make necessary. The discussion of the matter was reserved for another occasion.

(Excerpt from March 1878) BIRMINGHAM. — The meeting on the question of whether membership in Gentile brotherhoods (Freemasons, Oddfellows, &c.), is compatible with brotherhood to Christ, was held on Wednesday, Feb. 13<sup>th</sup>. After some discussion, it was resolved to come to no decision meanwhile till brethren, to whom the question is a new one, have had ample time to consider it. The matter was left over indefinitely.

(Excerpt from September 1880) MATLOCK.—As the brethren are aware, there have been repeated efforts on behalf of the truth in Matlock during the last twelve months. The result has been to draw the attention of several good and honest-hearted men to its claims. A letter recently appearing in a local paper deprecating or appearing to deprecate these results, and asking the local shepherds and orthodoxy to bestir themselves in defence of their peace, the opportunity was considered favourable for a special effort. The only brother in the place—brother Smith—having been removed to Derby from want of work, and being unable to bear the burden of such an effort, it was proposed to the Birmingham ecclesia to unite with the Nottingham ecclesia and perhaps others in undertaking it.

(Excerpt from January 1882) BIRMINGHAM—The brethren at the Ward Hall have submitted the following proposal to DAVID KING, by the hand of Brother Andrews:—"I do hope you will not think me impudent in sending this note to you. Believe me, I have the purest motive. It is to ask you to meet 30 or 40 of your ex-brethren and sisters in a conversation. This is not because we have not had a conversation with some of your brethren. No. But because we have, and they have utterly failed to show us that we have gone astray in any one point. Some have thought this might be on account of their inability to deal with our arguments. Now, dear sir, our managing brethren of Ward Hall think it only fair to give you a kindly invitation to meet us a night or two. We will find a room. You shall invite an equal number of your brethren and sisters to that of ours. There shall only be two speakers, you and I; subject or subjects, "What is to be believed in order to valid baptism?" secondly, "Was the Kingdom of God set up on or about the Day of Pentecost?" Dear sir, do not think that I am thinking myself competent to a public

debate with you. No sir, not this. But we want it to be a friendly conversation, and, so far as I am concerned, it shall be this or nothing. Dear sir, if you believe we have gone from the Church of Christ, this, to our mind, is a very fair way of bringing us back, and I can assure you I have the very best of confidence in all my present (but your ex-) brethren and sisters that they are perfectly honest; and whatever we might have to suffer, we should gladly return if you can show us we have gone from the truth. But at present we are rejoicing in believing we have found the Ecclesia of God, and are patiently waiting for Christ's coming and kingdom."—J. ANDREWS.

(Except from January 1884) BIRMINGHAM.—The Ward Hall brethren have proposed to the Temperance Hall brethren that they should amalgamate with the Temperance Hall ecclesia. The letter making this proposal said: "In December, 1879, out of about 40 that came out of Campbellism, 26 received the truth, and formed themselves into an ecclesia.

(August 1885) Birmingham.—During the month obedience has been rendered to the truth by BEATRICE BETTS (20), formerly a Campbellite. Bro. J. Thomas has removed to Newport, Mon., where the brethren are delighted to have his company and help in the truth. During the month we have been visited by sister Barton, sen., of Sydney, Australia, and her husband. It is 30 years since they emigrated from Mansfield. They return to New South Wales in a few months.—A proposal has been made that the Temperance Hall brethren should recognize those who are separated from them, in an ecclesial capacity. The way will be open for the favourable consideration of this if the latter should see their way to accept the complete inspiration of the Scriptures as a first principle in their basis of fellowship, which they will not compromise by association with partial inspiration.—The Sunday School is suspended for July.—Our next tea meeting is on Monday, August 3<sup>rd</sup> (brethren and sisters only), followed, on Wednesday, August 5<sup>th</sup>, by the Sunday School treat, Sutton Park. The children on this occasion will take tea in the park and return to the Temperance Hall for the distribution of prizes about 8 o'clock.

(January 1886) Glasgow.—Brother D. Campbell reports that the meeting on inspiration, referred to in last number of the *Christadelphian*, was held on Sunday, November 22<sup>nd</sup>, when a motion was made to insert in the ecclesial "Statement of First Principles," a paragraph similar in terms to the proposal first introduced at Birmingham, and affirming the divine inspiration and consequent freedom from error of the Holy Scriptures as originally produced. The motion being rejected, the supporters of it have withdrawn themselves and now meet separately to the number of twenty-one on the foundation of a wholly divine and infallible Bible. They have rented temporarily the hall of Nelson's Hotel, East Ingram Street (formerly Cannon Street), where they meet on Sundays at 11.15 a.m. for the breaking of bread. No public effort will be attempted until the beginning of the New Year when the brethren hope to occupy premises to which they can invite "the stranger." Brother Campbell adds: "If there are any brethren in Glasgow desirous of casting in their lot with those constituting the new ecclesia on the basis already mentioned, we shall be very glad indeed of their company and support. Not possessing the list of addresses of the brethren, we have not been able to communicate with all. We trust, therefore, that no one who upon principle should be with us will stand aloof merely because they have not hitherto heard from us. Our fellowship is open to all who accept the divine authorship and infallibility of the original Scriptures and accepting it, hold it to be a first principle."

Brother Dick adds to the foregoing:—"The ecclesia in Glasgow has been in a very unsatisfactory state for a long time owing to the controversy on the divine authority of the Bible. Sunday after Sunday, when the forenoon services were past, generally found some of us eagerly debating the subject, or vigorously criticising some article or letter that had recently appeared. One of the brethren whose mind was sadly exercised by the openly-expressed doubt of the Bible's entire inspiration, wished to have an ecclesial expression of view concerning the subject, but the managing brethren were unwilling to move one foot in the matter. The upshot was he sent in his withdrawal. Other two brethren and four sisters kept away. The

management took the whole affair very coolly, thinking apparently, by pursuing a policy of quietness matters would come all right by-and-bye. But it is impossible such a question can rest till an ecclesia declare itself one way or the other. At two or three of the quarterly meetings, some of the brethren attempted to bring the question to the front, but in vain. Several of the brethren who, believing in a wholly God-authorised Bible, were in a state of hesitancy how to act. Others openly espoused the theory of the Bible inspired, but not necessarily free from error—originals, or copies. A few of the brethren at last resolved to make the ecclesia declare itself. A requisition was then signed by five brethren (according to the rules) to convene a special meeting for the purpose. We met on Sunday, 22<sup>nd</sup> November, after the usual forenoon meeting. About 80 brethren and sisters were present. Brother Campbel proposed the motion, delivering a forcible address in vindication of the position he had taken up. After the seconder had spoken for a short time, two other brethren spoke against the motion. Two or three of the brethren who had not got an opportunity of speaking wanted the meeting continued till the following Sunday, but this was overruled, and after some expressions of discontent, the Chairman put the motion to the meeting; 14 voted for it, and 47 against it. The minority held a meeting and resolved to separate. We have met three Sundays under the new arrangement, none of us feeling that we have taken a wrong step, but consider it was necessary owing to the state of the meeting which we have left.”

(January 1886) Swansea.—Brother Randles and thirty-two other brethren and sisters have stepped aside and organised themselves on a separate basis, in consequence of the refusal of a minority to agree to a proposal to decline the fellowship of the Exchange brethren in Birmingham. The minority did not absolutely refuse what was proposed: but they wished first to communicate with the Exchange brethren in order to be sure that they were not prepared to take a right position as to inspiration, both in doctrine and fellowship. They desired the opportunity of submitting to them a proposed declaration—upon the reception or rejection of which their action would turn. Supposing this to be a sincere proposal on their part (as it seems to be in some cases, at all events), there ought to be no difficulty in reaching an accommodation. Let the minority submit their proposed declaration to the Exchange. If it is accepted, a way will be opened for many reconciliations. If it is rejected, the minority ought to have no difficulty in identifying themselves with the majority.

(Excerpt from February 1886) Bath.—Brother Keepence reports the separation of four on the question of fellowshipping the Exchange brethren. The matter was under discussion at five meetings. The ecclesia was asked to re-affirm their belief in a wholly inspired and infallible Bible. This was done; but a second proposition declaring determination to fellowship those only who so believed, was rejected by half of the ecclesia. On this a separation ensued—all ecclesial effects being sold, and all accounts paid, and the balance divided.

(July 1886) Pietermaritzburg. — Brother Ker writes:—‘I have the pleasure of stating on behalf of the Maritzburg ecclesia that after certain correspondence with brother R. Elliott (representing the Durban ecclesia), a meeting was convened for the consideration of the question of the birth of the Spirit in relation to the withdrawal from brothers Gabriel, Crichton, and Sutherland, with a view to the reunion of the two ecclesias, these last named not being at present in the Maritzburg ecclesia. The following propositions were put to the meeting, and agreed to, on the distinct understanding, however, that all or any of the three brethren in question would not be refused fellowship if it was clearly shown by them that *their* interpretation of the third chapter of John merely meant a change of mind, and did not at all include anything appertaining to present immortality:—‘1. That we believe the birth of the spirit referred to in John 3:5-6 to imply the change from mortality to immortality after judgment. 2. That we would refuse to fellowship any who believe that the birth of the Spirit—that is the change from mortality to immortality—is a thing of present experience in any sense.’ Another resolution related to the mode of procedure towards the three absent brethren.

(October 1886) Bourton on-the-Water.—On Sunday, September 5th, a proposition was carried unanimously refusing fellowship to those whose hands are contaminated with the unclean thing (partial inspiration). We have obtained the free use of the School Board room here which is large and well suited for the purpose of lecturing. Three lectures have been given so far, to comparatively large and appreciative audiences, but we lack the speaking element, so shall be very glad to hear from any brother from Birmingham, or elsewhere, who can come over and lecture for us. Brother Troughton, jun., is appointed secretary.

(October 1886) Glasgow.—A proposal comes from here for the editor of the *Christadelphian*, to publicly debate with brother Smith, of Edinburgh, “the question of inspiration and how it affects fellowship,” The proposal is not an acceptable one in the absence of any likelihood of benefit of any kind resulting from such an encounter. The spectacle of two professed friends of the truth, in public collision, would hinder the truth as regards “those that are without;” and as regards those that are within, it would only prolong a distress which is subsiding. The question has been debated *ad nauseum*, and everyone has made up his mind. The case now comes within Rev. 22:11.

(February 1888) GRANTHAM—Brother John Hawkins writes concerning things that happened in 1885 and since. In the situation that has become established everywhere since that time, we cannot wisely go back upon an old controversy, but adopt the simple rule of working with those only who are prepared to require a recognition of the wholly-inspired character of the Bible as a condition of fellowship, other things being equal.

(April 1892) BALLARAT.—Obedience to the Divine command of immersion was rendered on December 20th by WILLIAM E. WILLIAMS (42), and ELIZABETH HANCOCK (22); and on December 22nd, SUSAN E. TONKIN (22), after declaring their belief in the things of the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. We now rejoice together in the glorious hope of sharing with Jesus both his kingdom and his name with their many blessings. Since our last report, we have commenced a Sunday School, as a means of preparing the little ones for the reception of the Truth when they come to maturity. It is the day of small things with us, but we are hopeful of being connected with greater things as an acknowledgment of our faithfulness. In conjunction with the Melbourne and South Yarra ecclesias we are proposing a fraternal gathering of all the ecclesias and isolated brethren throughout Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand to consider a means of binding the household together in closer bonds of unity as the accompanying circular letter shows. The outcome you may look for by and bye.—J. C. GAMBLE.

[Beware of sacrificing the principle of ecclesial independence. Any number of brethren may profitably come together to hold intercourse on a spiritual basis; but **if they begin legislating, they will begin mischief.** This is the lesson of all experience. Dr. Thomas was dead against it. **Each ecclesia must legislate for itself. A conference of delegates may easily become an incubus on ecclesial life.**—EDITOR.]

## RESOLUTIONS BY INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS

(Excerpt from September 1866) BIRMINGHAM.—on Wednesday, August 15<sup>th</sup>, an unanimous resolution, of which three weeks’ notice had been given, was adopted by the ecclesia, over 50 brethren and sisters being present, repudiating the fellowship of those professors of the truth, who meet in connection with George Dowie, in Edinburgh. The resolution runs as follows: “That the ecclesia having heard read to them, and having considered the report of a discussion on the bearing of the immortality of the soul on the

one faith, which took place on Sunday, April 8<sup>th</sup>, Sunday, April 15<sup>th</sup>, and Sunday, May 6<sup>th</sup>, among those in Edinburgh, styling themselves “Baptised Believers in the Kingdom of God,” and meeting in Union Hall, 98, Southbridge, the ecclesia consider it their duty, as witnesses of the truth, to disavow, and hereby disavow and refuse all connection with the said so-called “Baptised Believers in the Kingdom of God,” and request the Secretary to write to George Dowie, Secretary of the community in question, apprizing him, for the information of himself and the said community, of this their solemn decision.” The occasion of this resolution, as appears from the wording of it, was the reading of the report of a discussion which took place among the parties referred to, on the question of whether or not it was necessary to reject the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, in order to a reception of the truth; and the necessity for it arose from the fact that the parties referred to claim the fellowship of the Birmingham ecclesia, and stand before the brotherhood (in a monthly magazine, and by a yearly gathering, to which they invite the friends of truth), as representative men.

(October 1866) Birmingham.—On the 6<sup>th</sup> ult., a resolution was adopted by the ecclesia, repudiating the fellowship of the Edinburgh professors of the truth, meeting in connection with George Dowie. The following is the document in which this decision was communicated:—

(Excerpt from August 1867) EDINBURGH.—On Sunday, July 14<sup>th</sup>, a large number of brethren and sisters assembled from various parts of Scotland (viz., Beith, Glasgow, Dunkeld, Berwick, Aytoun, Galashiels, Innerleithen, Biggar, Haddington, Dewartown, Pathhead, Tranent, &c.), and spent a pleasant season with the brethren in this city in converse principally upon the resurrection in three phases, viz., the standing again in relation to the sowing and raising of 1 Cor. 15; the time of Christ’s ascension (as the first fruits) to the Father-nature; and the first resurrection in relation to the law of life and death in the millennial age. We are promised a more detailed account for next month. [Compiler’s Note: See “gathering of brethren in Edinburgh” under; Futher Proof Taken / Volumes 1 to 30]

(September 1869) BIRMINGHAM. — A special meeting of the ecclesia was held on Monday, July 26, to consider the question brought up at the quarterly meeting, viz., the propriety of inviting strangers to take part in the worship of the ecclesia. After discussion, in which unanimity was substantially arrived at, the meeting was adjourned to the following Thursday, for a resolution to be drawn up and presented embodying the sentiments agreed to.

The following is the “resolution”:—“That in the judgment of this ecclesia, strangers, not having been immersed upon a belief of the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, are without Christ, and therefore not in a position to offer acceptable worship. That their presence, however, in the place where the ecclesia may be assembled, is no bar to those exercises of prayer or praise, in which it is the privilege of the ecclesia to engage. That nevertheless, the attitude of the ecclesia towards them in the matter ought to be so regulated as not to conflict with the testimony that no man can come unto the Father but by Christ, and that no man can put himself in constitutional relation to Christ but by believing the gospel and being immersed. That there is the more need for the ecclesia being circumspect in the matter, because of the prevalent delusion (exemplified in the almost universal practice of religious bodies) that sinners, convened indiscriminately in public assembly are qualified to engage in acts of divine worship, and that men will be saved by such and other moral practices. That our public attitude, as an ecclesia of Christadelphians, ought not to give apparent countenance to this fallacy of the apostacy, but should constitute a testimony against it by exemplifying the fact that in Adam all are ‘without God and without hope,’ and that men can enter a worshipping relation to the Deity, and attain to the hope of salvation in the appointed way only. That we therefore, ought not to invite strangers to take part in acts of worship, either expressly or tacitly, by handing them a hymn book. That since, however, a stranger has a right to procure a hymn book if he chooses to have one, and a similar liberty to exercise his voice in the singing of the hymns, if he be disposed in that direction, and since there is no detriment in the use of such

liberty, but rather a benefit to enquiring strangers, it is no part of the duty of the ecclesia to forbid them, so long as the relative positions of the stranger and the ecclesia in the matter of worship, is mutually understood and recognised That the action of the ecclesia should go no further than producing this understanding, and that therefore that the sentiments herein expressed be printed on slips of paper, for supply to the brethren and sisters, for use as occasion may require.”

(Excerpt from March 1870) BIRMINGHAM. — The following resolution was also passed, on the proposal of brother Turner:—

“That as the Birmingham ecclesia is now becoming a large body, and getting into its hands much power for good, if only developed and properly organized; and as it is the duty of such an ecclesia to come fully up to its responsibility as the pillar and ground of the truth; and as there are poor ecclesias that would be benefited by lecturing visits, but are unable to provide the means; and as there are many localities ripe for the proclamation of the truth, which cannot be attended to for want of means—RESOLVED, that the ecclesia be recommended to contribute every week as God hath prospered them, in a second collection, to the formation of a fund, by means of which, the wants of the truth, in the various forms referred to, may be provided for; and that brethren everywhere be invited to contribute to such fund; that a special meeting of the ecclesia be called for Monday, February 7<sup>th</sup>, to consider this recommendation.”

A special meeting of the ecclesia was accordingly held on the day mentioned, when the resolution was adopted. The second collection for the service of the truth was inaugurated on the following Sunday.

(Excerpt from February 1871) BIRMINGHAM.—The usual quarterly meeting of the ecclesia was held on Monday, January 2<sup>nd</sup>. After tea, the reports were read. The number of additions during the past three months had been 12. No business of public moment was transacted.

The past month has witnessed an incident which, for some reasons, it would be better to say nothing about, but which, for others, requires mention. A letter was read to the ecclesia announcing that a number of the brethren and sisters—whose number was afterwards reported to be twelve—had held a meeting, and resolved to open a room in Bradford Street, and establish a branch ecclesia there; and asking the countenance and co-operation of the brethren and sisters at the Athenæum. A meeting was called to consider the matter, at which brother Roberts submitted reasons why the proposed branch ecclesia should be treated as a faction and not as a fraternal movement. Chief among these were warnings from Dr. Thomas, read from three several letters received a considerable time before, to the effect that a certain brother, who had gone to America with him in the *Idaho*, and had been expelled from his house in disgrace, had returned to England, and would, on his arrival in the latter country, seek to enlist the sympathies of envious or disaffected persons, and set up a rival meeting. This brother was one of the twelve. As an illustration of the sort of procedure that had led to his expulsion, brother Roberts read from the said letters an account of how the said brother (James Martin) had, while in charge of the Dr.’s house in his absence, opened and made a copy of, and re-sealed a private letter, addressed by the Dr. to his wife, who happened to be out at the time, and to whom the said James Martin handed the closed letter on her return, as if nothing unusual had happened. On hearing this, the meeting was adjourned for three days to allow of brother Martin’s attendance to hear and explain the matter, and one of the brethren was deputed to proceed, at the expense of the ecclesia, to Hereford, where brother Martin happened to be, to give him notice of the adjourned meeting and its purpose. At the adjourned meeting (Thursday, January 12<sup>th</sup>), brother Martin being present, brother Roberts went into the whole matter from the commencement, and concluded by proposing that all taking part in the proposed Bradford Street meeting should be considered as brethren walking disorderly, and withdrawn from. This proposal was not voted upon, as another was submitted and adopted, to the effect that they be not withdrawn from at once, but that time be given them to manifest the nature of their procedure. As to brother Martin, who spoke at considerable length in his



own defence, it was decided to withdraw from him at once, as a mischief-worker and a person of proved untruthfulness and, two only dissenting. On the following Sunday, at a full meeting of the ecclesia, a brother while concurring in the estimate formed of brother Martin, desired the brethren to recal their withdrawal from him, and re-consider the matter, on the ground that the suddenness and unexpectedness of the decision would establish a bad precedent. Two only voted for this course. About twelve voted for time being given to brother Martin to repent, upon which a brother cogently remarked that he had time to repent in the isolated position in which he had been placed, and could reinstate himself at any time by due acknowledgment, and request for forgiveness. The rest of the ecclesia, in an overwhelming vote, refused to go into the matter again, and re-affirmed withdrawal from James Martin. [Compiler's Note: Dark gray resolution]

(Excerpt from April 1874) HAMILTON.—Brother John McPhee writes on behalf of the faithful brethren and sisters in this place, to say they have been compelled to define their position in reference to the Renunciationist heresy, which has found one or two sympathisers in Hamilton. To avoid misrepresentation, brother Kirwin, at a meeting called to consider the matter, stated the basis on which the ecclesia should meet, so far as the matter in dispute was concerned, viz. “That Jesus came in the same kind of flesh as we have; that he was mortal as we are mortal, and that mortality came on him as it comes on us—by the sin of Adam.” Brother and sister Powell and brothers Vassie and Farrar dissented from this; brother Hagley remained neutral. Money matters were arranged and an amicable separation effected, the brethren and sisters meeting on the following Sunday, on the scriptural basis, being brethren Gilmour, Dixon, Curwin, Bolingbroke, Pitt, Faulk, Paisley and McPhee; and sisters Dixon and McPhee. Sister Bolingbroke was absent from illness through accident. The position of others not mentioned was unknown at the date of the report. Eleven hold fast to the faith and practice of the apostles.

(Excerpt from July 1874) EDINBURGH. — In view of the position taken by the Renunciationists, and the uncertainty caused by conflicting reports as to how some ecclesias stand in relation to their doctrine, the meeting passed a resolution, of which the following is a copy—

“We, the Edinburgh Christadelphian ecclesia, meeting in the Temperance Hall, Nicholson-street, in annual general meeting assembled, take this opportunity, in consequence of the special circumstances which have arisen among the ecclesias throughout the country in connection with the Renunciationist teachings concerning Jesus Christ, of declaring our unswerving adherence to the faith which we have maintained on the subject in past times (stated in our printed *Basis of Association*). We consequently express our entire repudiation of the doctrine which teaches that Jesus, though seed of the woman, of Abraham, and of David, had a ‘free life,’ and did not inherit, by nature, the condemnation of death, which has passed upon the race, of which he was a member, in consequence of Adam’s disobedience. We further wish to express our cordial sympathy with the brethren in divers parts, who are faithfully contending against the conningly devised fable of Renunciationism; and hereby distinctly declare that we have no fellowship with the doctrine or with those who maintain it.”

(Excerpt from September 1874) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Burton reports that at a special meeting of the ecclesia, held Aug. 2<sup>nd</sup>, the following resolution was unanimously passed:—“We the immersed believers of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, meeting in the Mechanics’ Lecture Hall, Nottingham, recognizing the scripturalness of the statement of the one faith, recently issued by the London ecclesia, and the desirability of having such a defined statement of our faith, hereby adopt the same as our basis of fellowship.”

(Excerpt from September 1874) MANCHESTER. — He adds:—“It has been deemed essential by the ecclesia meeting here, to make known, through the *Christadelphian*, the relationship sustained by its members toward the controversy concerning the nature of the Christ. Having met on several occasions for

the discussion of the matter, it was ultimately agreed to meet on the afternoon of Sunday, July 26<sup>th</sup>, to consider paragraph IX. Of the London basis of association, with a view to its adoption and incorporation with our own, by reason of its explicit character. The result was its adoption in its entirety.”

(Paragraph 9. See above) 9. That Jesus was a mortal man made of a woman, made in all things like unto his brethren, but begotten by God, through the power of the Holy Spirit, inconsequence of which he was called the Son of God ; that being the seed of the woman, the seed of Abraham, and “ the fruit of David’s loins,” or Son of man, he inherited the consequences of Adam’s sin, including sentence of death ; that he was the arm of the Lord put forth for the salvation of men, and therefore was called Emanuel, or God with us; that he was anointed with Spirit at his baptism, and sent forth as a prophet to work miracles, and to preach to the Jewish nation ; that he was tempted in all points like as we are, and yet committed no sin ; that at the end of his ministry he was put to death on the cross, whereby sin was condemned in his flesh ; that, in consequence of his perfect obedience to his Father, he was raised from the dead, whereby a way was opened from the grave for all who avail themselves of his covering name in the appointed way ; that after being immortalised he ascended to heaven, where he now sits at the Father’s right hand to intercede as a High Priest for those who believe and obey the truth ; that he will remain there until the time for his enemies to be made his footstool, when he will return to the earth to raise the dead, judge the living and resurrected saints, punish the nations of the earth, restore the Jews to their own land, and establish his Kingdom over the whole earth. Heb. ii. 9; Gal. iv. 4; Heb. ii. 14-17; Luke i. 35; Gen. iii. 15; Gal. iii. 16; Acts ii. 30; John v. 27; Isa. 53:1; Matt. i. 23, iii. 16; Acts x. 38; Heb. iv. 15; Phil. ii.8-9; Rom. viii. 3; Heb. i. 9; Ps. xvi. 8-11; Acts iv. 2, 12.; i. 9; Ps. Ex. 1; Heb. X. 21; Acts iii. 21; 1 Thess. iv. 16; a Tim. iv. 1; Rev. xi. 18; Isa. xxvi. 9; Rev. xiv. 14-20; Isa. xlix. 6; Luke i. 68-75; Zech. xiv. 9.

(January 1875) LEITH, Dec. 15<sup>th</sup>.—Owing to the numbers of this ecclesia having been much reduced of late by death and removals to other places, and there being a prospect of still further reduction, a general meeting of the ecclesia was held, at which the difficulty of continuing the meeting, under present circumstances, was made apparent; and it was then almost unanimously resolved to dissolve the ecclesia in the meantime, and to join the brethren meeting in Edinburgh.” D. MCKILLOP.

(Excerpt from July 1875) NOTTINGHAM.— Writing again June 15<sup>th</sup>, bro. Kirkland forwards for publication a resolution of thanks to the brethren everywhere for their hearty response that was made to the Nottingham appeal on behalf of a brother in affliction. The resolution says the assistance rendered was in a peculiar sense “a contribution to the work of Christ in Nottingham, which (owing to circumstances well known, and to the unprecedented amount of sickness in the ecclesia), has been a very heavy burden on the brethren. The prayer of the Nottingham brethren is that workers and helpers may stand accepted in the presence of Christ at his appearing, when he will reward his servants, and when those who have given a cup of cold water to a disciple in his name, will not be unrewarded.” Bro. Kirkland also encloses a letter from the brother referred to, couched in the following terms:—“*To Brother Kirkland.*—Please communicate to brother Roberts for publication in the *Christadelphian*, my sincere thanks to all the brethren and sisters for their very liberal and seasonable help during the somewhat long affliction of myself and family, and I hope and pray that they may be all partakers in the bountiful goodness and love of God to be practically manifested and dispensed by His beloved Son at the judgment-seat.”

(November 1875) SHEFFIELD.—Brother Boler reports: “Our ecclesia here has been disturbed for several months, through brother John Savage endeavouring to force upon the brethren the doctrine (from Halifax) which we believe is contrary to the teaching of the word, viz., that Christ had not a free will in the least degree in the matter of his obedience; that he was righteous because he could not be otherwise, from which the rest of us argued that his temptations, and his sufferings, and his obedience were in that case a mockery and not an example to us in any form whatever. Brother Savage was entreated to drop the

subject, but he would not be prevailed upon to do so. Therefore, we considered it indispensably necessary to adopt a basis of fellowship containing the following definition:”—

“Christadelphians believe and teach that Christ was the Son of God by Mary, a virgin of the house of David, and therefore, God manifested in the flesh, by the Spirit, yet having, as an individual, a I and independent will from the Father which he used as intelligently in compliance with his Father’s will as we are asked to use ours, but that, though thus possessing the abstract capability to sin, he rendered a perfect obedience through the strength belonging to him as the Son of God, and was thus fitted to be that sacrifice of a sinless son of Adam which the righteousness of God required, in order that sin might be condemned in a sinless possessor of the very nature of him that offended in Eden, and a propitiation be thus provided for our approach to God from whom sin had severed us.” This basis brother and sister Savage did not agree to after it had been passed, consequently they went out from us. There are also three who have not finally decided what course they will take; also another whom we fear has gone back into the world, and brother McDermott has removed to Halifax, where he is meeting with the brethren, in the Assembly Rooms, Harrison road. The following are the remaining faithful brethren and sisters:—John Dobbs, Joseph Boler, Ann Boler, James Skinner, Henry Leah, John Neale, Henry Graham, Miriam Sorby, Sister Wray, and John Waller.

(Excerpt from May 1876) BIRMINGHAM. — A proposal to discontinue the monthly question night was brought forward, but was something like unanimously rejected, the brethren being of opinion that it was working well to the advantage of the truth. It was resolved to adopt the plan of the Leicester ecclesia, as regards the Bible readings at the Sunday morning meetings—that is, to take the *Bible Companion* reading of the day, leaving out the first of the three portions; and also to adopt the *Bible Companion* reading of the day for consideration at our week-night meeting.

(Excerpt from December 1877) BIRKENHEAD. — We regret that brother Paine is no longer with us. He expressed a wish to retire, on a pretext that took us all by surprise. But it was subsequently ascertained that his conduct in the world had been such as would have utterly disqualified him for the fellowship of the brethren, who feel bound to stand apart from ‘the unfruitful works of darkness.’ His retirement, therefore, has rendered unnecessary any further action on our part, and was evidently his own device to prevent inquiries, which otherwise must needs have been made to his great confusion.

(Excerpt from February 1878) BIRMINGHAM. — On Thursday, Jan. 3<sup>rd</sup>, the usual quarterly business meeting was held, at which very satisfactory reports of the previous three months’ proceedings were read, showing that notwithstanding a heavy drain for the poor, the balance of account was in favour of the ecclesia. A special meeting was appointed to be held, in consequence of a resolution of the managing brethren, in the case of a certain application for readmission to fellowship, to the effect that odd-fellowship and freemasonry were incompatible with brotherhood in Christ. The question will be fully discussed and decided at the said meeting, which has had to be postponed during repairs in the Athenæum. [Compiler’s Note: See below from outcome]

(Excerpt from June 1878) BIRMINGHAM.—The meeting on the subject of Oddfellowship, was duly held on Tuesday, April 30<sup>th</sup>. For the decision arrived at, the reasons relied upon for the decision, and the circumstances leading to the consideration of the question, the reader is referred to the article on “Freemasonry, Oddfellowship,” &c. commencing on page 245 of the present number. [Compiler’s Note: See Freemasonry, Oddfellowship and Brotherhood in Christ under; Futher Proof Taken / Volumes 1 to 30]

(Excerpt from September 1878) NOTTINGHAM.—Bro. Kirkland reports the adoption of a resolution at the last quarterly meeting of the ecclesia, condemnatory of the marriage of one of the brethren with a wife

not in fellowship with the truth. The matter had been first dealt with in private in the proper manner. To the resolution, this clause was appended: "We pass this resolution, not with any desire to cut off brother Keeling from fellowship, but that we may not be partakers of his sin." At a meeting held two weeks later, brother Keeling being present, another resolution was passed, expressing the conviction of the brethren that the brother in question ought not to be offended, but ought, if in a proper state of mind, to resume his place at the table. Brother Keeling has since withdrawn from the ecclesia. [Compiler's Note: Light gray Mat. 18:15-18]

(January 1879) BIRKENHEAD.—Brother Collens writing December 19<sup>th</sup>, reports with sorrow that on the 14<sup>th</sup> of August last, the ecclesia found it expedient to withdraw from fellowship with brethren R. D. Robertson and Abel Andrew. This action was partly the result of brother Robertson's own procedure: who demanded a declaration whether or not he was to be at liberty to hold views of history and prophecy respecting the scattered Ten Tribes of Israel, contrary to the views held by the brethren throughout the world. The result was a decision adverse to brother R.'s ideas. Continued efforts have been made to bring them to the truth of the matter, but hitherto without much effect. The action taken by the ecclesia on the date mentioned, did not meet with the entire approval of several members of the ecclesia, and a special meeting was held on the 28<sup>th</sup> of October, to consider the whole subject, which resulted in the passing of a resolution repudiating the theory which claims for the powerful British nation a possible or probable identity with the scattered house of Israel *alias* 'the lost Ten Tribes,' and recording an entire though sorrowful approval of the action of the ecclesia in withdrawing from the two brethren named. On the 6<sup>th</sup> ultimo, a letter was received from the following members of the ecclesia, viz.: brethren Thomas N. Parker, Clara A. Parker, Annette Andrew, Elizabeth Andrew, and Esther B. Robertson, condemning the action of the ecclesia, and expressing a determination to fellowship brethren R. D. Robertson and A. Andrew, as a matter of comfort to them under the separation. "These troubles" observes brother Collens, "have been exceedingly painful to us as a body; we have as it were cut off our right hand and lost the remainder of the limb from sympathy; but we are confident that we have done that which is right in the sight of the Deity, and still cherish the hope that we may yet be reunited on the sure foundation of the word of life. [Compiler's Note: Dark gray the result of Bro. Collens; underlined Mat. 18:15-18]

(Excerpt from May 1879) MUMBLES. — The Mumbles brethren wish it stated in the *Christadelphian*, once for all, (so as to obviate the necessity of continually making the intimation at their own meetings,) that they cannot receive those who hold the doctrines of the Renunciationists or No-willists. Their statement goes into detail; but this is sufficient.

(Excerpt from October 1879) JERSEY CITY. — The letter of sister Lasius in this month's *Christadelphian* illustrates this. Next Sunday brother John Scott's eldest daughter will put on the name, uniting with the ecclesia in West Hoboken. Last Sunday was a happy day in West Hoboken church, as no less than ten persons, forming the bulk of the members in good standing from the old Jersey City ecclesia applied for fellowship, through a trio, delegated for that purpose, and were unanimously accepted. And how glad I am to be able to say, that at last I believe the mists of uncertainty and darkness have been lifted, and that I now see with the eye of faith, the plain testimony concerning the Father of all good and His dear Son, our Lord, to whom my constantly grateful heart goes out in praise and thanksgiving for having led me by a way, which, though I understand it not, yet has been the way to life and light, and a joy and confidence that I trust I shall never again be deprived of. Oh! That all young brethren (young in years), would turn the deaf ear to all distracting suggestions, even though they are set forth with great plausibility by old heads, who ought to be better employed. The sorrow caused by such work is incalculable, as many despair of ever getting at the truth, which, judging from the intricate propositions often advanced, is anything else than the simplicity of Christ. I believe the gospel can, and does, save children; but I know perfectly that if children were required to accept, as the truth, some things it has been my misfortune to bear, and try to believe, they never could be saved. God's blessing be upon those who have kindly helped the wanderer in his search for the way, and whose pleasure it is to save a soul from death, not plunge him into it. Though you may receive official notice of it from brother Balmain, yet I

will say that, the week before last (on Sunday), I was received into full fellowship by the West Hoboken Church, with whom I shall continue to meet. Of course I was required to make a statement, which contained my abjuration and confession, and I wish my standing as a good Christadelphian to be made as public as my bad one was. Tears of thanksgiving often well up when I think of His abounding love, which has enabled me once more to stand right in His sight, yea, blessed be His holy name for evermore. Praise ye the Lord, for His mercy endureth for ever toward them that fear Him.”

(November 1879) MC.MINNEVILLE, OREGON. — Brother Nichols reports “Since his last communication six more have become obedient to the faith. CHESTER SKEELS, formerly Adventist; T. WALKER, (from Canada, and formerly of the Hacking party); FRANK BORLEN, formerly Catholic; CAROLINE WARK, formerly neutral; NELLIE RIDER, formerly of the Thurman party; and WILLIAM SAMPSON, son of sister Sampson formerly neutral. The last four were immersed at the close of the Yearly Grove meeting, which commenced on Thursday evening, June 19<sup>th</sup>, and continued night and day over two Sundays. All were thoroughly pleased with the meetings. Sixty eight brethren and sisters have signed an act of withdrawal from brethren Wing, Skeels and Plummer on the ground of corruption in doctrine and practice. The document has been transmitted to us with the list of names. But this notice of it is sufficient.

(Excerpt from January 1880) LONDON.—Brother A. Jannaway writes: — It may be interesting as well as suggestive to mention that we have recently started in connection with our ecclesia a Mutual Improvement Society, which has been, as far as it has gone, a great success. The meetings are open to any of the brethren or sisters, but only members. Brethren of the London ecclesia are allowed to take part. On each evening there is an essay or address and reading from the Scriptures, followed by criticisms, though the undergoing of the latter is not altogether pleasant. It is, unquestionably, highly beneficial, as was borne out by one who said, after having been subjected to the ordeal, ‘I had no idea I had so many faults.’ We have also in accordance with a resolution, passed at the last quarterly meeting, decided to present every newly-immersed member with a *Bible Companion*, a copy of *The Rules of the Ecclesia*, and *A Statement of the First Principles of the Truth*.

(February 1880) LEICESTER.— Brother Yardley writes:—“You will have heard with sorrow and pain, the serious charge made against our brethren Collyer and Dunmore (of using unsound meat in the manufacture of goods they sell), and the equally serious decision of the magistrates (who concluded that our brethren must have known of the state of the meat and fined them £100). Circumstances transpired in connection with the trial which prevented evidence of an explanatory character being given, consequently our two brethren called an ecclesial meeting (which was well attended); at this meeting they had an opportunity of speaking for themselves, when the evidence in question was laid before us. The evidence was of so satisfactory a nature that the result was the unanimous adoption of the following resolution, which was ordered to be inserted in the two daily papers, and the town placarded with posters. Seeing that our brethren are so widely known among the brotherhood, I think it should find its way into the *Christadelphian*. ‘We, the Christadelphians of Leicester, hereby inform the public that it being our practice to consider all charges affecting the character of members of our body, and if the charges are proven, to withdraw from their fellowship, have thoroughly investigated the case of Viccars Collyer and William Dunmore (two of our brethren), and believe that they are entirely innocent of any intention to deceive the public, but that they have been the victims of the carelessness and deception of their servants, and despite public opinion to the contrary, and the fact that they have been held amenable, our confidence in them is unshaken, and we believe them to be still worthy of our esteem and fellowship. Signed on behalf of the Christadelphians meeting in the Central Hall, Silver Street, Leicester—Joseph Yardley, Secretary. January 12<sup>th</sup>, 1880.’”

Brother Collyer writing, afterwards, says: "This matter has come on me unlooked for and is the greatest trouble of my life. It seems so hard after years of patient care and so much attention to avoid the very point of our present difficulty, and at times at great pecuniary sacrifice. However I am quite convinced that the hand of God is in it for some good purpose. It may be this terrible lesson is all required for myself and intended to stay me in a course that might in time menace my best interests. It is evident that trouble and chastening of some kind is needed, and is meant for our ultimate good. I cannot see the whole intent of this at present, but feel sure part of it is to thoroughly shake our confidence in things as they are at present, and lead us to look more earnestly towards that glorious possibility of the future which is our hope. We ask your prayers for us in this trying time, and that whatever else may come, we may not lose the rich reward."

The following letters have appeared in the public papers, and briefly present the facts of the case which in justice to brethren Collyer and Dunmore ought to be known:—

To the Editor of the *Leicester Free Press*.

SIR, —I ask your permission to put before the public some few points in reference to what has been a most painful affair to me, my family, and friends, viz., the bad beef case which came under the notice of the Leicester magistrates on Friday last. First, let me say that under no circumstances have I attempted to show that it was *not* bad beef; indeed, those who had the conducting of the matter for the firm know perfectly well ("if they would testify") that I declared I would not allow the beef to be spoken of as anything but bad. There is an impression that this beef was bought at a low price for the purpose of large profits. This impression is incorrect, and to prove this, I will show any one who may wish it, the receipts for all the cash paid, if they will call at my office, 24, Silver street. I find on close examination of the accounts that the price paid to the man North has averaged rather more than the price paid to a well known and most honest butcher in this town. I have the privilege to mention the name of another gentleman, who has seen the receipts, and who says that the price in all cases, including the lot seized, was sufficient to procure a really good article in lean beef. This gentleman was a witness for the prosecution—Mr. R. Stafford, butcher, Parade. Some think that the adjournment of the case was a mistake. Let me say that the adjournment of the case was arranged without my knowledge, as also the obtaining of counsel. Some will say, how strange that things should have gone against you in so many particulars. Yes, it is passing strange, but up to the point of the trial it was so. The tide is turning now. I am not writing to pacify the rowdies who will turn this (or anything else) to their own account. Their action is beneath contempt, as is that of those from whom they get their inspiration. But, Sir, there are many in this town who have known me for nearly twenty years, and whose confidence I have as regards the moral features of a man's character. I desire to retain a good name with such, and this is why I ask the privilege of a few lines in your paper. The real sting of the affair is that 'we must have known the beef was bad.' If he had said we ought to have known, I should have been content. I did not know, and was truly surprised to be shown the stuff by Mr. Wand. Had I been mean enough, and base enough to traffic intentionally in such abominable stuff as this, I should have wanted it at a good deal less than half the price paid. Whatever the verdict of the public may be, I have at any rate answer of a good conscience in this matter, and whilst admitting the folly of meddling with a trade I did not understand, I am perfectly clear of any intention of doing wrong. I am, gratefully yours, VICCARS COLLYER."

To the Editor of the *Birmingham Daily Post*:—"Sir, will you allow us to say a word in explanation of the seizure of unsound meat on our premises, which you reported on Saturday last. We assure you we are the victims and not the victimisers, as by the operation of the law we have been made to appear. The meat seized had nothing to do with what are being ironically talked of as 'the celebrated pork pies.' We use pork only in this manufacture. Every piece of meat in our place was examined by the inspector, and the pork was passed as healthy and good. The beef is used in the manufacture of German sausages. These

departments are totally separate in more senses than one. The one we understand and are responsible for; the other is a new department, opened at the request of customers, and in the hands of an agent. Neither of the firm, although perfectly acquainted with all kinds of pork, has any practical acquaintance with beef, and therefore had to depend upon the judgment of the agent. In Christmas week we were working day and night to fulfill our orders. The beef was taken in on December 26, without the knowledge of the principals, and on December 29 it was seized. It was the apparent impossibility of having such a large quantity of meat on our premises without our knowledge which weighed greatly in the minds of the magistrates. This may weigh with some, but when it is remembered that the German trade is quite new to us, and left to the control of the foreman, and also that we had so much business in other directions to take our attention, it will not appear so remarkable.

Allow us to say in conclusion, that we paid a higher price for this beef than the quotations for beef in the London markets, and we are quite willing to show our invoices and receipts to prove this. This disposes of the idea that we could have any object in foisting unwholesome stuff upon the public. We may add that we have given up manufacturing all commodities requiring the use of beef. Yours respectfully, VICCARS COLLYER and DUNMORE. Leicester, January 14. [Compiler's Note: See November, December 1881, and January 1882 Leicester from further history]

(March 1880) MANCHESTER.—Brother Smith recalls the Editor's attention to the fact of his having paid Manchester a visit last December, with a view to investigate and advise upon the causes of division existing in that town. He says he expected some announcement of the fact and of the result. The omission was due to oversight, and the oversight was owing to nothing in the shape of a letter on the subject coming under his eye in the usual intelligence preparation. Brother Smith says: "The ecclesia meeting in Stockport road, has passed a resolution annulling the act of withdrawal from brother Holland and those meeting with him, and recognising them in a separate ecclesial capacity. We have every wish that by the means of an independent meeting, those concerned may be enabled to serve their Master faithfully, as the state existing prior to your visit certainly was not what could be called faithful service. You will, therefore, understand that this ecclesia fully recognise those brethren meeting in the northerly portion of the town, known as the Miles Platting ecclesia." [Compiler's Note: See November and December of 1879 Manchester under the heading examples of members withdrawing from an ecclesia or ecclesial divisions for history]

(March 1880) PLYMOUTH.—Brethren Sleep and Peline write as follows:—"We, the undersigned, write to inform you that after due and diligent study we have come to the conclusion that Jesus was made in all things like unto his brethren, partaking of the nature of Adam, which is sinful nature, and consequently, subject to the same condemnation. In all other points of doctrine we are agreed with the views held by the Birmingham ecclesia, and others of the same faith elsewhere, in relation to the foregoing statement. We, therefore, reject 'free life' and 'substitutionary' sacrifice, as taught by the late brother E. Turney and party, and also the latest emanations both from the Nottingham and Birmingham Renunciators, which we believe to be subversive of God's plan of salvation. Those with whom we have been meeting were asked, that in order to have sound fellowship, a day should be appointed that we might declare our views, and scripturally discuss them, and to see how many, if any, would believe with us, and if not in accordance with our views, we should withdraw ourselves from them. The managing brethren granted us a hearing, which was to have taken place on the 18<sup>th</sup> inst., being a clear week and four days from the request being granted. But instead of the meeting taking place, a resolution was passed declining to hold it. We have, therefore, withdrawn, and ask to be recognised by the Birmingham ecclesia, as two brethren holding the same truth with them, and we will endeavour, to the best of our abilities, to advance the truth. If any brother should happen to be coming so far west as Plymouth or Devonport, we shall be glad to see them. Our addresses are A. Sleep, 46, Marlborough street, Devonport; J. Peline, 18, Buckwell street, Plymouth." [To A.S.: If a man is tormented with doubts with regard to the validity of a previous

immersion, doubtless, the Lord, who is “full of compassion,” will pardon its repetition, even if in His estimation it should be unnecessary.—EDITOR.]

(Excerpt from October 1880) NOTTINGHAM. — Brother Sulley, writing also says: “Some mistakes have been made by brethren visiting Nottingham regarding our place of meeting. In two instances, the error has not been discovered before breaking bread at the Renunciationist synagogue. To prevent such mistakes for the future it would be well to make known that those who hold fast to the name meet in the People’s Hall, Heathcote Street. The secretary of the ecclesia is brother Kirkland, of ‘Holly Villa,’ Robin Hood Chase, to whom it is well to have a letter of introduction from known brethren by all intending visitors who are not known to us—It is well for such a letter to be addressed to ‘brother Kirkland or the presiding brother for the day.’”

(January 1881) MUMBLES.—There is good news from this place. Seven years ago, the large ecclesia, meeting in what used to be a Methodist chapel, was broken up through various causes, principal among which was the outbreak at that time of Renunciationism. Brother W. Clement espoused the plausible doctrines promulgated from Nottingham, and a number with him did the same. About an equal number refusing the new doctrines, separated themselves, and met in the Assembly Rooms. Here they were again afterwards subdivided, through various untoward occurrences. In the progress of time, Renunciationism has come to naught: not to speak of the dissolution of its principal assemblies, its principal support is in the grave; its next, has gone over to sceptical Unitarianism; its next, has become a Josephite, denying that Jesus was the Son of God. The increasing corruption caused our Mumbles friends to re-consider their position. Re-consideration resulted in the acceptance of the truth originally professed. This opened the way for proposals of reunion. The proposals, after consideration and discussion in a written form, were accepted on all sides; and the result has been the coming together of the broken fragments of the original assembly, with the resolve to redeem the past by a better future, should the long-suffering of the Lord provide scope in further delay for that amendment and salvation of which he desires to see all men avail themselves. This excellent result has likewise extended itself to Swansea, where disunion (due, however, to different causes) is now at an end. At Neath also, fellowship has been accepted on the basis of the truth. Brother W. H. Jones reports from Mumbles that several immersions have taken place, including HENRIETTA EMILY BEHENNA, eldest daughter to sister Behenna. The ecclesia now numbers fifty-seven. Brother D. Clement writes, Dec. 12<sup>th</sup>, of arrangements connected with the delivery at Mumbles of a course of lectures by brother Roberts, of Birmingham, in inauguration of the new and hopeful turn of events. He says: “We are expecting next Sunday the largest meeting on the basis of the truth ever held in Wales. We shall have, in addition to our own number (about sixty), sixty or so from Swansea, and representatives from Neath, Llanelly, and Gower. It is quite possible that from 130 to 140 will break bread together. Truth is stranger than fiction. Who would have suggested such a thing was among the order of probability? We have resolved to open the Assembly Rooms (which is ours till Christmas), for the purpose of making a general spread for the brothers and sisters from Mumbles, Swansea, and all others attending, to dine and tea together on Sunday. We intend to give up the Sunday school after dinner, and hold a fraternal meeting at half-past two.”

(August 1881) JERSEY CITY (N. J.)—We have duly received from brother Seach a volumin-document, announcing the re-organisation of the ecclesia in purity and peace, and setting forth the basis adopted and the reason thereof. We are unable this month to deal with the document, but will probably publish portions in the September number.

(October 1881) JERSEY CITY (N.J.)—See article “The Truth in and about New York,” present number, page—Brother Seach further reports several accessions to the ecclesia so recently. Names and particulars are as follows:—A. J. GLOVER. Formerly Baptist, who had been searching for the truth for some years; NILS PETERSON, formerly Methodist, whose attention was first directed to the truth by Brother Frank



Norton, and who has since, in his somewhat distant isolation, by the study of the Scriptures, in connection with several Christadelphian works, found “the truth as it is in Jesus” JOSHUA SADLER, of the race and stock of Israel (after the flesh), who, through the faithful efforts of an intelligent Christian wife, is no longer a stranger “from the covenants of promise.” These, in the presence of a number of the brethren and sisters, on Sunday afternoon, July 31<sup>st</sup>, rendered the obedience which the truth enjoins, in being buried with Christ beneath the watery wave.

Brother Vredenburg writes concerning the action described in the article already referred to. He says:— We have all along felt the need of something which would put us in a better light before our brethren, as many had, in these parts, wandered away from the truth, and it seemed questionable whether *the faith* had any substantial advocates. Not until we separated from the West Hoboken meeting were we able to say ‘yea’ to the question whether there were such. We are now able to say ‘yea,’ for which we are grateful beyond expression. God is knitting our hearts together in love, and three men are seeking their way into the name which mantles with a robe of righteousness, so that we are bearing fruit, bless God. To Him be all the glory, through his dear son.” [Compiler’s Note: See article “The Truth in and about New York,” under; Futher Proof Taken / Volumes 1 to 30]

(Excerpt from December 1881) TEWKESBURY—There has been a revival. The brethren and sisters have started afresh to cleanse the body of all the dross it has gathered during the last 12 or 18 months. They have resolved that they will not fellowship any who meet with J. C. Phillips.

(January 1882) LEICESTER—Bro. Collyer was released on December 6, in moderate health. About a fortnight or more before his release, the document referred to last month was duly circulated in Leicester, and has had curious and gratifying results, not the least singular of which was the appearance on the very day of Bro. Collyer’s release, of a public vindication of his innocence, in the shape of a letter to the public papers by one of the convicting magistrates.

After the circulation (through the post) of about 5,000 copies of the document referred to, an article appeared in the *Leicester Daily Post*, (which we are told the Inspector had something to do with getting inserted) sceptically referring to the said document, and also to the remarks appearing in the November *Christadelphian*. The animus of this article is manifest from the quotation of one verse from the lines of Brother Collyer, which are made to appear as if written at the time of his imprisonment. “We are told,” says the writer, “that the reason there is so much distress is that we may love the world the less.”

“’Tis to purge away the dross,

To take away the tin,

’Tis that we may clearly see

The sinfulness of sin.”

By this, of course, Bro. Collyer was made to appear in the attitude of acknowledging the guilt imputed to him. The lines were written and sent to the editor many months before, as was stated; but this fact is withheld. As in the management of the meat case, so in this, a perfectly modest and worthy matter was handled to give an evil colour. However, the case came out in just the opposite way from the intention of the writer.

In the course of his remarks, he made this statement:—“The genuineness of the letter purporting to have been sent by one of the magistrates, stating that he believed Mr. Collyer to be innocent, has been denied. .

The letter, on the face of it, is a most extraordinary one, and it is extremely improbable that it was ever penned by any magistrate.”

Next day, the very day of Brother Collyer’s release, the following appeared:—

*To the Editor of The Leicester Post.*

Sir,—I am the magistrate who wrote the letter to Mr. Collyer’s son, of which a true extract has been printed.

The incident which, at the hearing of the case, induced, as I believe, all the magistrates to concur in the conviction, has since been explained, and it not only leads me to believe in Mr. Collyer’s innocence, but that if the case had been properly put before the Court at the trial, both Bench and audience would have concurred in his acquittal.

Your obedient servant,

W. NAPIER REEVE, J.P.

On this there was the following comment by the Editor of the *Post*:—

“The case of Mr. Viccars Collyer, which has excited so great an interest in Leicester, has during the last few days taken a most unexpected turn, by the publication of the letter from Mr. W. N. Reeve, one of the convicting magistrates, who now positively asserts his belief in Mr. Collyer’s innocence. Such a circumstance in itself is pregnant with meaning. It means this—that if the view now arrived at be the correct one, a number of independent and perfectly unbiassed gentlemen sitting to try a case as judge and jury, have been guilty of a flagrant injustice to a perfectly innocent man. The bearings of the case have now assumed a most serious aspect, which alike in the interests of the accused, the public, and of justice, demands the fullest investigation. The difficulty cannot be met by the plea that as Mr. Collyer has now served his term of imprisonment, no good can come from the further discussion of the case. To urge this is altogether to beg the question at issue, namely, whether or not there has been a gross miscarriage of justice, such as Mr. W. N. Reeve, in his capacity as a magistrate, now asserts has taken place.”

After further remarks, the Editor of the Leicester paper continues:

“It is somewhat rare to find a bench of magistrates sending a man to prison one day and fifty or sixty days afterwards to be proclaiming to the world that the same man is a martyr to justices’ justice. But what an insight into the operations of the magisterial mind does this case of Mr. Viccars Collyer afford. On the confession of one of their number, they were unable to comprehend the main facts of the case, and actually sent a man to gaol without knowing the essence of the charge brought against him. It is a case like this which gives force to the demand for a stipendiary magistrate, showing as it does that complicated and important questions affecting the guilt or innocence of accused persons require the legal acumen of trained experts to bring all the facts to light and point out their true relations.”

Mr. Reeve responded to these remarks next day in a letter occupying three-quarters of a column. We can only give extracts. He said, “I read the article as a challenge to myself, not to the man, but to the *magistrate*, to state openly why, having been willing once to convict the accused, I am now convinced of his innocence. I accept the challenge—I come as it were to a Court of Appeal. I only ask that those to whom I now address myself, will also come to hearing, as judges should do, without prejudice. That the original hearing was not so, everyone must admit who witnessed the circumstances. In the yard of the

police office, a mass of putrid meat was exposed, alike disgusting to sight and smell; and this yard generally closed, was thrown open to the public, and hundreds and hundreds of people passed through it, believing, as it was intended that they should believe, that this mass of putrid meat was the staple commodity of Mr. Collyer's pies. But by far the greater part of this mass had been that day seen for the *first time* by Mr. Collyer himself. It was a consignment from America, which had become bad on the voyage. Mr. Collyer was no more responsible for this event than any other provision merchant would have been. Eleven casks of meat, which were seized unopened, were thus exposed, not distinguished from the rest, but gathered up in one promiscuous heap and swelling the bulk, and as was intended, the prejudice. Was this fair play?

“But this is little to what follows:—In every provision warehouse there accumulates (as I am told), pieces of meat, which, becoming bad, are in due time consigned to the tallow chandler—no one would ever pretend that they were intended for food. Mr. Collyer made no concealment of these accumulations. Mr. Wand (the Inspector) might have seen them, and probably had seen them many times; but now he seizes these with the American barrels, heaps them up in the yard with the rest, and virtually calls on the public to believe that this is the stuff out of which Mr. Collyer's pies are made. Again, I ask, was this fair?”

Mr. Reeves goes into other particulars, and then refers to the portion of meat cut up and seasoned. “This meat had been prepared on the *Saturday*; it had become bad during the *Sunday*. It was found to be so on the opening of business on *Monday* morning at *six* o'clock. Mr. Wand is at Silver Street at eleven; for five hours the works at Sussex Street had stood still; not a pie made; not a patty-pan used; the *chopped meat* which long ere that time would have been used in manufacture, found in bulk by Mr. Wand, *untouched*; and, as the manager swore at the trial, already condemned as unfit for food, not by the inspector, but the manager, on whom Mr. Collyer had a right to rely.

“I say for myself, plainly, that what fault attaches to me, as one of the magistrates, is that I did not fully understand and appreciate the importance of this fact. I cannot answer for brother magistrates. I have never exchanged a word with them on the subject, but I say now that the fact of *no* manufacture going on, while the material for such manufacture was *at hand*, is a proof to me that the evidence given on oath was *true*, that this tainted material was never intended to be used for food.

“And so I have said my say; to the public in general my words will be as idle words,—“the dog was hanged for a bad name”—*being innocent all the while*. For myself, however, I like to hear the dog's story, and from my heart I pity the suffering that in this case has, I think, been unjustly endured.”—W. NAPIER REEVE.

Leicester, December 7<sup>th</sup>, 1881.

The Editor of the *Post*, in the course of comments on this letter, says:—“The case has now, however, it must be admitted, assumed a most serious aspect, and it cannot be allowed to rest in its present condition of uncertainty—further inquiry must take place. Whatever may be the ultimate issue of any such inquiry, it must be admitted that a great blow has been given to the public confidence in the administration of justice by a bench of magistrates, however good and honourable they may be in their intention.”

Brother Collyer, on his release wrote thus to the Editor of the *Christadelphian*:—

“DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—I am so thankful to be able to write to you again. Through the tender mercy of our Father in heaven, I have been so far brought through this latest sorrow; of course, somewhat cast down, but not destroyed. I have not suffered much in my bodily health; my grief has been mostly on account of my family, as you will know. In this respect, God has been much better to me than my fears. Dear Sister Collyer has had a cruel trial to her constitution, but has been helped through wonderfully. Respecting business, it has been a terrible breaking up, of course; our loss is very great, although, as Sister Collyer says, might have been worse. I am taking good advice, viz.:—‘In time of adversity *consider*.’ ‘Our God can supply all our need! I have had a very strong lesson on *economy* in food, but it has removed some anxiety as to the future requirements; at any rate, *absolute necessities*. I cannot sufficiently thank you for the noble part you have taken on my behalf. We do not seem to have seen the end of it yet. I cannot repay your kindness. God can and will. I have seen your letter to Brother Gamble. I am quite willing to see the brethren, and quite agree with you that their questions should be answered.

Affectionately your brother in Christ,

V. COLLYER.

Brother GAMBLE, secretary to the Leicester Ecclesia, writes thus:—“It is with much pleasure that I send you the intelligence this month. For two long months we have been, as it were, clothed with sack-cloth and ashes. We have deeply felt the trouble which has been laid upon the shoulders of our brother, Collyer. He is now released. I told you last month that the 7<sup>th</sup> was the day of his liberation, but we afterwards found the 6<sup>th</sup> was the proper date. We had made all the necessary arrangements to meet him and convey him home in a cab, supposing that he would be liberated at the usual time, viz., nine o’clock a.m. I went to his house shortly after eight, previous to going to meet him at the prison gates, and judge of my surprise when I saw him already at home and enjoying his breakfast. He was liberated at seven o’clock. A very short time in conversation was sufficient to show the truth of your words, “Brother Collyer will come forth as gold.” He *has* come forth as gold. You were perfectly correct when you said that he knew how to accept the direst evil. The hand of Jehovah has been heavy upon him, but it has had a good effect, by helping him to think less of present things, and look forward the more earnestly to that time when the government of the earth will be in the hands of infallible men; when erroneous judgments will be unknown, for men will receive the *just* reward of their works.

“On Friday, Dec.9, a meeting was held in Brother Collyer’s house (our hall being engaged) for the purpose of giving any of the brethren an opportunity of putting any questions to Brother Collyer. The meeting lasted from 8.15 p.m. to 11.15 p.m., and, as the result, the following resolution was carried without a dissenting voice: “This meeting of the Leicester Ecclesia (summoned by the managing brethren, to put questions to Brother Collyer, on the occasion of his release from prison, concerning the charge of intentionally using bad meat for which he was imprisoned), having heard a great variety of exhaustive questions put to him by a number of brethren, and having heard his answers and explanations during two hours and a half, are of opinion that the charge brought against him is without real foundation, and they therefore express their sympathy with him in the deep affliction which has befallen him, and offer to him the hearty confirmation of their fellowship in the Gospel.” Brother Collyer broke bread with us, on the following Sunday morning, and we hope, now to go on in the truth the better for the afflicting hand which we have so severely felt.” [Compiler’s Note: For previous history see February 1880, November 1881, and December 1881 Leicester]

“Arrangements have been made for a periodical distribution of *Finger Posts*.”

(March 1882) MELBOURNE.—Bro. Hardinge writes:—“Thanks for publishing and commenting on my letter of February, *re* the question of designating serving brethren. I have carefully read your remarks, and

also those of the other brethren, who have written on the subject, and, while I do not endorse *all* that has been written, yet I think, all things considered, that as a matter of expediency it is best to adopt those names only which define their duties, while not obscuring their brotherhood, and therefore if I were to have to again decide upon the matter I should do so in favour of your mode of resignation, viz., as “managing” or “presiding” brethren. But I regard the matter of so little importance, and as one calculated only to produce contention, that I shall not take any steps to reverse our previous decision. I am very happy to state that the division which has existed for the past year, is now on a fair way to be removed, as our Bro. Betts, who with several others had withdrawn from us, and had formed another Ecclesia, owing to some misapprehension (the particulars of which I was never able to learn) has now applied for re-union, on behalf of himself and the others, and our Ecclesia have had a special meeting to consider the matter, when it was unanimously agreed to receive them, provided they would conform to our rules, &c. [Compiler’s Note: See (May 1881) Melbourne, and Ecclesial Organisation in the Nineteenth Century under; Futher Proof / Volumes 1 to 30]

I may here say that our rules are similar to those of the Birmingham Ecclesia, but slightly altered to suit our circumstances, so that I have every reason to believe that ere you get this letter, the Melbourne Ecclesia will be again united, and in a still better position to spread the glorious truth of the gospel in this beautiful, but *sin cursed* colony.”

(Excerpt from July 1882) MANCHESTER—A meeting of the brethren comprising the Manchester and Miles Platting ecclesias was held on the 28<sup>th</sup> of May, to consider the advisability of a union of the two meetings, when a proposition declaring “that, in the interests of the truth, and for the welfare of the brethren, an amalgamation of the Manchester and Miles Platting ecclesias was desirable,” was unanimously carried. We are, therefore, meeting at the Co-operation Hall, Oldham Road, until a room more centrally situated can be obtained.

(July 1882) MELBOURNE.—Brothor Gamble reports, “Brother and Sister Betts, also Brother and Sister Jackson and Sister Fincher have returned to fellowship. Brother and Sister Pearce, whose immersion was reported in the February *Christadelphian*, from St. Kilda, have also united with us in fellowship, so that the St. Kilda ecclesia has ceased to exist, and we are one again. We have been further strengthened by the immersion of JOHN RUSSELL (26), after the usual good confession, which took place on March 28, 1882. Brother Russell is the son of Sister Russell, of Edinboro’, Scotland, who will doubtless rejoice in the fact that one of her sours has been ‘born of water.’ On April 22, we assisted ALICE SPENCER(22), formerly Campbellite, to put on the name, after a very satisfactory confession of the faith, after a little investigation of the truth. These additions, inclusive of Bro. C. C. Walker, who has returned from Ballarat, make our numbers in fellowship 48. I am also glad to acquaint you with the fact that the designations of our serving brethren has been changed from Elders and Deacons to Presiding and Managing Brethren, by a large majority of the ecclesia. We trust this vexed question is now permanently settled, and that our minds may be occupied with those things which are of far greater moment [Compiler’s Note: See (March 1882) Melbourne for privise history]

(Excerpt from August 1882) BIRMINGHAM- At the usual quarterly business meeting, it was reported that the number of the ecclesia, after allowing for deaths and removals, is 452. At the same meeting, an alteration of Rule 14 was resolved upon, which will have the effect of simplifying the annual elections, and giving the ecclesia more control of the same. Hereafter, the brethren actually serving will always be considered in nomination for the next election; but no one will be appointed on simple nomination. The names of the brethren actually serving, and any new names that may be nominated, will all be submitted in ballot form to the brethren and sisters. There will be a place after each name for the word “Yes” or “No,” to be written in. The writing of one or other to each name is compulsory. If omitted from any name, the paper not to be counted. Election to fall to those having a majority of “Yeses”; and if more than the

necessary number have this majority, the names having the highest number of “Yeses” to be chosen. If numbers in any case be equal, the lot to decide.

(November 1882) NORTH LONDON.—(*Wellington Hall, Wellington Street, Upper Street, Islington, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.*) Brother Owler, in reporting the formation of two new ecclesias in London, says, “We are all anxious that it should be widely known that the new ecclesias have been formed on the principles of love and peace and goodwill.” He refers to the circumstances leading to their formation, thus:—“The work has for years been carried on quietly and perseveringly, and the good seed has been carried into the public parks and in the by-ways by zealous brethren; while at various times and in different districts, halls have been hired and the gospel proclaimed. The result of these labours has been recorded in the *Christadelphian* from month to month, and many of those who obeyed the truth resided in districts far distant from our hall. Until recent years the majority of the brethren resided in North London, where our efforts have been chiefly concentrated. The truth, however, has now penetrated south, east, and west. This fact led to a proposal—which was not unforeseen by those who have eagerly and anxiously watched the progress of the truth in the metropolis—to plant another light stand in the extreme west. This proposition was made twelve months’ ago, by brethren residing many miles from our hall, requesting the ecclesia to sanction the establishment of a new one at Fulham. When the proposition came up for consideration, another was made embracing the district in question, and extending it still further. The object of this latter proposal was in effect simply to widen the area, and consequently appealed for co-operation to a larger number of brethren. Both propositions were considered, and the ecclesia (the Fulham brethren consenting) sanctioned the second proposition, as being more likely to maintain a separate organization. The brethren, however, were unable to obtain a hall in the locality agreed upon, and, after waiting some months, the Fulham brethren intimated that they had formed themselves into a separate ecclesia, on the same basis as at Islington. The brethren in southwest London then applied for, and obtained, the sanction of the ecclesia to establish another light stand in the City of Westminster, or neighbourhood. A hall was shortly afterwards obtained, and on Sunday afternoon, Oct. 1, 51 brethren and sisters left us to carry on the work of the Lord, as a separate ecclesia, at Westminster. There are now three ecclesias in London, meeting on the basis of ‘the one faith,’ and all in fellowship. I consider this event unique in the history of the truth in these closing Gentile times. Meetings have been formed many times, and oft out of contention, or in consequence of error, and have become synagogues of Satan. But in this instance, at least, the arrangements have been made in harmony with the principles of the gospel, and in a fraternal spirit, so essential in provoking each other to love and good works. Brethren visiting London will now have no difficulty in discovering a meeting-place within a reasonable distance of the stations of the principal railways, and will, no doubt, be glad to find all of one body, and members in particular. I have also to announce that Brother and Sister Benton have left London for Southampton; and Sister Geo. Phillips has gone to Peterhead. Brother Franklin, who was immersed in 1873, and has been in fellowship with those holding erroneous views on the taking away of sin, has been added to our number.

(November 1882) WESTMINSTER.—(*Victoria Hall, 327, Vauxhal. Bridge road, near Victoria Station, Sundays, 11 and 7.*) Frank Jannaway officially announces the formation of this ecclesia, in accordance with the intimation made by Brother Owler in the foregoing. (See November 1882 North London-Wellington Hall) After describing the circumstances leading to it (already set forth by Brother Owler), he says, “We have, with the consent of the Islington ecclesia, formed ourselves into the WESTMINSTER ECCLESIA. Nay, I may say, with their *entire approbation*, in token of which they have kindly presented us with a very handsome service for the breaking of bread. The hall is situated within two minutes’ walk of Victoria Station, and is at the rear of a bookseller’s shop, the entrance being through a door at the side. It is capable of seating nearly 100 persons, and has been taken by the brethren for one year certain, at the end of which time (if our Master has not come) we hope to have obtained a larger hall. We number in all 55 members, among whom I am pleased to say are many experienced and well tried brethren, which at the commencement of an ecclesia is so desirable. Our first general meeting was held on Sept. 17, when the presiding and managing brethren were elected for the ensuing 12 months. Our opening lecture was to

have been delivered by Bro. J. J. Andrew, but on account of a severe cold, he had to give way, and the lecture was delivered by our Bro. A. Andrew on October 8, when our hopes were fully satisfied, the hall being well filled; the subject was "Christendom astray." Thus far we have made a good commencement, and our prayer to the Giver of all good gifts is that we individually and collectively shall make a good finish, and receive a welcome into *that* state of things yet to be established. I may add that although we and those at Islington and Fulham form entirely separate ecclesias, yet CO-OPERATION is our motto, and we are thankful for the willing and worthy fellow labourers so close at hand. Our other lectures for the month are:—Oct 15, "What is man?" by Brother A. T. Jannaway; 22, "The Devil of Christendom," by Brother Atkins; 29, "The future inheritance of the righteous" by Bro. A. Andrew.—FRANK JANNAWAY

To this Brother Arthur Andrew adds the following remarks:—"Previous to the present year there was only one ecclesia in London, meeting on the doctrinal basis by the brethren who refused to accept the heresy known as Renunciationism, and that was the ecclesia meeting in Islington. About a year since, however, sixteen brethren and sisters living in Walham Green and the neighbourhood, near the extreme southwest part of London, finding it inconvenient and expensive to come so far, applied to the ecclesia for its sanction to their forming a separate ecclesia. This application was met by a proposal, supported by brethren living in the west and south-west of London, to establish an ecclesia embracing, in addition to Walham Green, the districts of Brompton, Chelsea, Pimlico, and Westminster, as it was thought by them that a larger ecclesia would be more efficient and better in various ways. This was agreed to, and search was made for a hall for some months without success, and eventually the brethren at Walham Green withdrew from the more comprehensive scheme, and constituted themselves into a separate ecclesia. The advisability of proceeding with the larger plan was then considered, and it was unanimously decided by those concerned to proceed with it, and for some months the matter was in suspense, simply for want of a suitable hall, a thing very difficult to obtain in London, as in most other places. At last a hall has been obtained, not altogether a 'suitable' one, as it is very small, but one which may serve as a makeshift for six or twelve months, by which time, if the Lord does not return in the meantime, we hope to obtain a more commodious place of meeting. It will probably serve for some time for the meetings of the brethren, though we hope it will soon be found to be too small for the meetings for the public. It is situated very near to Victoria Station, and is very accessible from various parts. There are now, therefore, three ecclesias in London meeting on the same doctrinal basis, viz., the one in Islington (numbering about 200), Westminster (about 50), and Walham Green (I believe, about 20 m number)."

(Excerpt from December 1882) BIRMINGHAM-The new rule of voting (requiring "No" to be written against all names not having "Yes") is found to interfere with the appointment of any one when there is a large number of brethren nominated. The fact was not discovered till coming to fill a vacancy for which five were named. Notice has been given to drop this feature, but otherwise to preserve the new rule intact.

(Excerpt from February 1883) BIRMINGHAM-The quarterly meeting was held after the reading of Sister Robert's address. The business was principally routine. An alteration of Rule 14 was adopted, by which, in the annual ballot appointments of serving brethren, the writing of "No" after any proposed brother's name was made optional.

(May 1883) BILSTON-Inasmuch as the attendance at our Sunday evening lectures has of late been discouragingly small, the ecclesia here has resolved to give up the Temperance Hall at the end of the quarter, and unite their efforts with the Wolverhampton ecclesia, three miles distant. Before taking this step the ecclesia decided to make another special effort, and for this purpose arranged with the following Birmingham brethren to lecture:—March 27, (Bro. Ashcroft), subject: "Some of my Difficulties as a Ministerial Exponent of the Scriptures, and how I got out of them." March 28 (Bro. Shuttleworth), on "Eternal Realities. The Earth for ever; Christ for ever; and Life for ever; final and full amalgamation of

these three co-eternals in the perfect purpose of God.” April 3 (Bro. J. J. Bishop), subject: “Who are infidels—and how they can be identified?” April 4<sup>th</sup> (Brother Roberts), subject: “Heaven—God’s dwelling-place, but not the inheritance of the saints; their reward to be upon the earth.” The attendance of strangers at each lecture was but small (about 40), and this fact has strengthened our conviction that the ecclesia has rightly decided to unite with the Wolverhampton brethren at the close of the present quarter.

We shall therefore give up Bilston, at least, for the present, with a consciousness of having for nearly three years faithfully proclaimed the truth, and used all means, to the extent of our ability, to make it known throughout the district.—T. PARKES.

(October 1884) AUCKLAND.—We have received a copy of the *Ecclesial Guide*, and are pleased to find in its pages such an amount of useful information in so concise a form. We think it will supply a want very much felt in these far distant parts of the world, and at our half-yearly meeting we resolved to use it as our rule book, as far as it meets our ecclesial requirements, and also as our basis of fellowship the statement of doctrines contained in it.—We are not growing very fast in numbers as our means for spreading the truth are very limited, and on account of the great distance we live apart, we only meet once a week, but still we have occasion now and then to rejoice over some one obeying the truth. Yesterday we assisted ELIZABETH ANN WRIGHT (23), to put on the saving name in the appointed way.—At the present time New Zealand is in the throes of a general election, and we cannot help noticing the clayey element of the ruling power now-a-days. May the time soon come when we shall have the power concentrated in one despot, holy and true, who will nominate his own assistant rulers.—ALBERT TAYLOR.

(Excerpt from January 1884) BIRMINGHAM—The Ward Hall brethren have proposed to the Temperance Hall brethren that they should amalgamate with the Temperance Hall ecclesia. The letter making this proposal said: “In December, 1879, out of about 40 that came out of Campbellism, 26 received the truth, and formed themselves into an ecclesia. We have added to our number since that time, by immersion into Christ, 36 (the majority of whom were previously of no religious profession). There joined us from the Temperance Hall, 7; we have had to separate from 5; left the town, 7; left for the Temperance Hall, 21; now remaining, 36. We have a Sunday school of about 60 scholars, 5 teachers, and superintendent. We have no difficulty in finance matters. Out of the 36 brethren and sisters remaining, 9 or 10 are of mind to join the Temperance Hall. Under the circumstances, we think the wisest course would be for us all to take membership at the Temperance Hall, and leave you to consider whether the Ward Hall should be kept on by you for the school and lectures on Sunday evenings, or whether we should give three months’ notice. Our only object is to work orderly with you till Christ comes.” It was resolved to comply with the wishes of the Ward Hall brethren, who will commence meeting at the Temperance Hall, on Sunday, Dec. 30<sup>th</sup>. The Ward Hall will be kept open for a time, by the Temperance Hall ecclesia, as an experiment for Sunday School and evening lecture purposes.

(Excerpt from February 1884) BIRMINGHAM— The quarterly business meeting took place on the first Thursday in the year. The presiding brother (not unduly) on the necessity for keeping in view the future to which the gospel introduces us in order rightly to regard the humdrum duties of the present, of which our quarterly meeting was one. The Scripture reading of the day from Matthew was a pleasant preface in this sense.—Brother Bishop then read at length the report of our various doings for three months past. The treasurer’s report, while telling us of large receipts, informed us of equal disbursements, with this result, that while in the first collection account we had gained about 30s., in the second account we had lost ground to a similar extent, so that we were just equal to level the state of things at the beginning of the quarter. We had nothing to show for a quarter’s spendings, but a quarter’s activity. This, it was observed, would be reckoned a poor state of things if we were a secular society, or operating with financial aims; but as a community endeavouring to 184arasse the laws of Christ, in the midst of a large and dark town,



the case was different. It meant that we were doing our duty and answering the end of our existence. Our spendings were wastings from the earthly standpoint; but from the heavenly, they were savings—treasures laid up in heaven.—The case of brother Jones supplied a painful sequel to the meetings. For three years or more, patience and exhortations and entreaty of the most brotherly character have failed to help out of the ways of intemperance. The managing brethren considered that the last point of forbearance had been reached, and that Paul's express words in 1 Cor. 5: 14, required them to recommend the ecclesia to withdraw.—Brother Jones attended, and pleaded pathetically for another quarter's trial.—Brother Shuttleworth proposed he should have it.—Brother Hadley thought a limited withdrawal would be a greater help to brother Jones. He proposed three months, at the end of which brother Jones should be at liberty to apply for the re-instatement in case of reformation.—This proposal was adopted.

(March 1885) Huddersfield.—At a special meeting of the ecclesia held on the inspiration question February 16<sup>th</sup>, we adopted the resolution which appears in *Light-stand* for Feb. 14<sup>th</sup>, last page second column at the bottom. All voted in favour of the resolution except three, who remained neutral. We are thankful to the God of all grace for the result.—JOE HEYWOOD.

(March 1885) Mumbles. — Brother D. Clement writes: “We have not been idle, though silent. Things have taken the usual course. We have had a visit from brother and sister Roberts, in connection with which, the Young Men's Improvement Class got an address from brother Roberts. The address was preceded by a social tea, after which brother Roberts directed attention to the superiority of Bible wisdom over every other form of wisdom, so-called. We have good reasons to believe that an additional impetus was given to the class in a good direction. The class has been in existence nearly twelve months, and has been a great success. Our relation as an ecclesia to the inspiration question has been made a matter of special attention. It may seem strange that a meeting having (as far as we know) no believers in the semi-inspiration theory should pass a resolution on the subject, but we consider it to be our duty, under present circumstances, to stand up for the right side. A special meeting of the ecclesia was held February 11<sup>th</sup>, 1885, when it was unanimously resolved—‘That our ecclesia distinctly repudiates the theory that there are any mistakes in the original Scriptures, holding that all were alike inspired of God, and we offer fellowship to those only who believe in the inspiration of the whole Bible—Old and New Testaments.’ The law of the Lord is perfect; and we would suggest that every ecclesia should speak out in its defence without delay. The next piece of intelligence we would, if we pleased ourselves, omit, namely, we have had to withdraw from brother and sister Ridding, for behaviour unworthy the name of the Lord, and brother Lincoln Behenna for continued absence from the Lord's table.”

(Excerpt from June 1885) Normanton.— Writing again, bro. Dowkes says:—“At a meeting of the ecclesia, held here on April 23<sup>rd</sup>, the following proposition was adopted—‘That we believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were, in all parts of them, given by inspiration of God, and that we cannot offer fellowship to any who hold the doctrine of partial inspiration.’”

(June 1885) Nottingham. — Brother Kirkland writes:—“I have pleasure in reporting another addition to our number by the obedience of WILLIAM BORER SANDERS (49), who put on the sin-covering name in the appointed way on May 3<sup>rd</sup>. It is also my duty to report the withdrawal from us of bro. J. Pepper and bro. S. Richards.” Brother Kirkland, in a later communication, corrects an untrue report which has appeared of the meeting of which an account was given last month (namely, the meeting at which the Nottingham ecclesia adopted a resolution with reference to brother Ashcroft):—“I was at the meeting, and, although I did not count the number present, I am able to say it was an unusually large meeting of the ecclesia. I sat by the side of the chairman, in front of the brethren and sisters, therefore in a good position to judge of the number voting. The following was proposed as an amendment:—‘This ecclesia while expressing no opinion as to the merits or otherwise, of one brother against another in the dispute which we so much deplore, and disclaiming any feeling of partizanship is convinced that the attitude taken by

bro. Ashcroft, as shown by his letters to us, and especially by his refusal to see bro. Roberts when visited by him at our request, is contrary to the precepts of Christ, and if persisted in, it necessitates the disassociation prescribed in the word.’ This amendment had previously been considered by the managing brethren, and objected to on the ground that the dispute the brethren knew of, was on the subject of ‘Inspiration,’ and that if they adopted the amendment, it would appear as if they had no opinion on that subject.—The two brethren who had framed it, said they had no such idea in their minds, and gave it up in favour of the resolution appearing in the May number *Christadelphian*. Notwithstanding this, at the meeting of the ecclesia, the amendment was taken up by a brother, and proposed. I am not aware of any reason why he took this course, but when it was put to the vote (which was taken by shew of hands) I believe four only voted for it. It was then put to the contrary, and a large number voted. The chairman declared it to be lost. The resolution was then put to the meeting. It appeared to me (as I sat) as if all present voted, but I suppose a few (very few) did not vote. The chairman, who was standing on his feet at the time, put ‘the contrary.’ Not a single hand being raised, he declared the resolution carried unanimously. However, one brother then said he did not agree with the resolution, and withdrew from the meeting. He has since returned, and says he objected to the resolution because he thought brother Ashcroft should have had more time given, but is now convinced bro. Ashcroft maintains a wrong attitude, and endorses the resolution. The above is a faithful and true report of the meeting. The Ecclesia stand firm to their resolution, believing their action is in harmony with the precepts of Christ.”

(July 1885) Auburn (N. Y.),—Brother Thomas Turner writes:—“The ecclesia here in Auburn, N. Y., consisting of ten members, wish to express themselves upon the subject of the ‘Inspiration of the Scriptures.’ We unanimously approve of the course pursued by brethren Shuttleworth and Roberts, and unreservedly accept the resolution passed by the Birmingham ecclesia.”

(August 1885) Brierley Hill.—Bro. H. O. Warrender reports the obedience of GEORGE DUNN, DAVID MEESE, and JAMES BECKLEY, who were baptized into the sin-covering name of Christ, at Dudley. Also that the following resolution has been unanimously adopted by the ecclesia: “That this ecclesia believes that the Holy Scriptures, commencing with Genesis and ending with Revelation, were originally produced in all parts of them by inspiration of God, and in no part were the writers left to their unaided efforts; that the original writings were therefore, free from error, and rendered infallible by the superintending power of the Deity; and also that we refuse fellowship to any who do not accept this foundation of faith.”

(August 1885) Devonport.—Brother Sleep reports that at a special meeting of the brethren held June 21<sup>st</sup>, the following resolution was carried unanimously:—“That we believe the Scriptures in all parts are God-inspired, and that we shall refuse fellowship to anyone who believes in their partial inspiration.” He adds: “We also desire to express our sympathy with you and the Brethren and Sisters in Birmingham who have taken the stand you have for a wholly inspired Bible.”

(August 1885) Heckmondwike.—Bro. Barraclough reports the immersion of Mrs. ACKROYD (36), which took place on May 20<sup>th</sup>. He says, “We have been highly gratified by the assiduous manner in which our new sister has sought for the pearl of great price which, having found, she evidently estimates at its full value. Also on June 24<sup>th</sup>, ROBERT WALKER ATKINSON (61), postmaster, put on the saving name. He is brother in the flesh to bro. Benjamin Atkinson, and was formerly neutral. We have also unanimously adopted the resolution upon which you have acted at Birmingham, respecting inspiration.”

(August 1885) Neath.—Brother Tucker reports that the ecclesia having duly considered the inspiration of the Old and New Testament, resolved unanimously (June 28<sup>th</sup>, 1885) that the whole of the original were inspired, and are consequently true and reliable in all parts, and that they should refuse fellowship with any who hold the doctrine taught by brethren Ashcroft and Chamberlin. On June 14<sup>th</sup>, brother D. Clement

lectured on “The Geography of Hell.” On July 5<sup>th</sup> brother W. Clement delivered a stirring address on “The only way, the Apostle’s way, God’s way to Glory, Honour, Immortality, and Eternal Life.

(September 1885) Dudley.—Brother and sister Parker, of Hyatt Farm, Netherton, of the Dudley ecclesia, have decided to emigrate to Texas. They hope to arrive there the third week in September, and would be glad to make the acquaintance of any of the brethren in that part of the world. Anyone wishing to communicate with them can do so by writing, or applying, to Mr. A. B. Close, agent to the Galveston, Harrisburg, and San Antonio Railroad Company, San Antonio, Texas.—Brother Hughes, inviting brother Powell, of Birmingham, to lecture at Dudley, reports that the ecclesia has adopted the following resolution:—“That this ecclesia believes the doctrine of the divine inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures, in all parts of them, as originally written by the prophets and apostles, and that we repudiate the doctrine that the Bible is only partly inspired and contains an element of merely human authorship liable to err, and that we discontinue fellowship with those who hold the same.”

(September 1885) Llanelly.—Brother Green reports that with the assistance of the brethren of Mumbles, and occasionally of Swansea and Neath, the truth has been kept before the public here now for three years past. The interest which the novelty of the thing naturally excited at first has subsided; and the audiences now have dropped to about two dozen, in addition to the brethren (except where there is a subject touching politics, when we have the old number, about 200). The two dozen mentioned have been constant hearers from the commencement, and are as firm advocates of the truth as the brethren themselves, but from some cause or other, fail to give themselves over as the Lord requires. The brethren pray that they may all yield to the heavenly calling before it is too late; also, that they who have yielded, may be faithful to the very end. At a meeting held on the 14<sup>th</sup> of June, the brethren unanimously declared their faith in the complete inspiration of the Scriptures, and their resolution not to fellowship anyone holding the view of a partially-inspired Bible.

(September 1885) Ripley.—Brother Wharton reports the loss of sister Louisa Mitchell by removal to Pittsburg, Pa., U.S.A. Her place has been filled by the removal to Ripley of sister Wood, from Derby, now sister Parkin.—On August 13, the ecclesia adopted the following resolution:—“That we believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were in all parts of them given by inspiration of God, and that we cannot offer fellowship to any who hold or tolerate the doctrine of partial inspiration.”

(Excerpt from September 1885) Swansea. — Brother Randles forwarded last month, too late for insertion, a resolution adopted by the ecclesia, refusing fellowship to all who believe in the doctrine of a partly inspired Bible, propounded by the *Exegetist* and endorsed and advocated by the *Æon*.

(September 1885) Tottenville Staten Island.—Brother Coddington writes:—“We desire to report that an ecclesia has been organized on the Dr. Thomas status of Faith and Fellowship, at Tottenville, Staten Island, N.Y. Our membership are brother C. M. Robinson, Elmira Robinson, his sister-wife, and his two sisters (in the flesh), Amanda and Eleanor Robinson, of Tottenville, brother J. Ward Tichenor, of 175, Mt. Prospect, Ave., Newark, N.J., sister E. J. Lasius (Dr. Thomas’ daughter) of 38, Graham Street, City Heights, N.Y., brother J. Coddington, and sister-wife, and sister Lucy Light, of Brooklyn, N.Y. With fidelity to the oracles of the Deity, through much tribulation we are working to maintain a lightstand in the vicinity of N.Y. city. The earnestness of brother C. M. Robinson in circulating the writings of the One Faith among the people of Tottenville, is now bearing fruit. Mrs. MARY L. LA FEVER (30) formerly of the Dutch Reformed Church, after giving a clear and full confession of the faith once delivered to the saints, was duly baptised into the saving name of Jesus Christ, on August, 2<sup>nd</sup> inst. Also, at the same time, Mrs. HATTIE CODDINGTON, of Middletown, N.Y. (sister-in-law in the flesh to brother J. Coddington) who began to read about three years ago. Others are attending our lectures, who are growing interested, and we hope to aid them soon into the memorial name. By resolution of our ecclesia, we take firm ground

on the inspiration of the writing of Moses, the Prophets, Jesus, and the Apostles. We will tolerate no quibbling in this ground. In our united love to you for your noble stand on inspiration, we greet you and yours in the one patient hope of life soon to be manifested in the Sons of the Deity.”

(October 1885) Cannock.—Brother Beasley reports that the ecclesia here has resolved “that we do and shall henceforth make entire inspiration a first principle of fellowship in our ecclesia.” Brother Roberts, of Birmingham, visited and lectured, on Sunday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, on “The Kingdom of God and the sign of its coming.”

(October 1885) Leeds.—Brother W. H. Andrew reports: “Two more have been added to our number by baptism. On August 27<sup>th</sup>, ANN HUNTER (wife of brother Hunter), formerly Methodist Free Church, and on August 31<sup>st</sup>, SYER SHULVER (29), tanner, formerly Methodist Free Church. Sister Hunter was brought to a know edge of the truth by reading *Christendom Astray*. Brother Holdsworth reports that at a special general meeting of the ecclesia, the following resolution was adopted: “We believe that the writings collectively known as the Bible were originally produced free from error by inspiration of God.” In answer to the inquiry whether the ecclesia were prepared to maintain as a first principle of their fellowship the truth so clearly confessed, brother Holdsworth says: “We have always recognised it as a first principle, as you will see from a perusal of the enclosed statement of first principles.”

(October 1885) Lampasas (Tex).—Bro. Solomon T. Blessing reports the holding of a fraternal gathering at Lampasas, commencing Saturday evening, Aug. 1<sup>st</sup>, and continuing until Monday morning, Aug. 10<sup>th</sup>.—Bro. Dr. W. H. Reeves, of Springfield, Ohio, was present by special invitation, and spoke many times to edification, as did also bros. A. R. Miller, W. A. Oatman, John Banta and others. The meeting was very harmonious. The following had been studying the truth for some time and came to the meeting for the purpose of putting on Christ in baptism. There were immersed on Saturday evening, August 8<sup>th</sup>, by bro. Wm. Greer, namely, ROBERT BUNTON, W. WATSON, W. H. FERRELL, G. W. MAYNARD, JOHN CAMERON, JAS. M. GATLIFF, SUSAN MAYNARD, SUSAN CORNUTT, ELIZA MCKEE. There were present at the gathering, including the nine that were immersed, 96 brothers and sisters, besides a number of the alien. It was decided that our next gathering should be held in the same place, August 14<sup>th</sup> and to continue eight days. The following resolution was adopted without a dissenting voice. “Whereas some among our body, through print and otherwise have called in question the complete inspiration of the Bible; and, whereas we believe such doctrine will undermine the very foundation of our faith; therefore, be it resolved that we, as a body assembled together in this Fraternal Gathering, declare our belief and firm confidence in the complete and unerring accuracy of the Old and New Testament, from Genesis to Revelations, in the original manuscripts; and whatever little inaccuracies there may be, arising from transcribing or translations, does not militate against their being wholly inspired. That the several writers were inspired to record what they wrote, even though they quoted from uninspired sources. For instance, Moses was inspired to record the declaration of the serpent:—“Ye shall not surely die,” though that declaration was a lie, we believe that all Scripture was given by the inspiration of God. Early on Monday morning we assembled at the tent for prayer, thanks giving, and bidding each other good-bye if the Lord defer his coming. A special invitation is given to all brothers and sisters and interested alien to meet in next year’s fraternal gathering.

(December 1885) Sydney.—Brother Burton (for the brethren in Castlereagh Street,) reports that the following persons have been assisted to put on the sin-covering name in the appointed way, after having given evidence of an intelligent understanding of the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ:—June 25, KATE HOBSON (26), and on July 5, her mother, Mrs. FARRAND (49), also on July 19, Mr. FARRAND (73), on July 19<sup>th</sup>, all formerly Campbellites.—Sisters Farrand and Hobson leave for England by the “Carthage” and we commend them to the affectionate care of any Brethren of Christ with whom they may come in contact. Brother Burton also forwards a resolution

adopted by the ecclesia, expressing “their entire sympathy with the editor in the very trying circumstances in which he has been placed; and their approval of the line of action adopted and maintained by him; and their hope that all who favour the theory of partial inspiration, may soon be enabled to repudiate the same.” (Having promised to omit all future reference to brother Ashcroft, brother Burton will understand the changes made in the terms of the resolution.—ED.)

(January 1886) London. — ISLINGTON. — A special meeting of the Ecclesia was held on Oct. 19 to consider the inspiration question, notice having been previously given that the following propositions would be moved:—1. “We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the divine authorship, and consequent infallibility, of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship.” 2. “We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it.” Brother J. J. Andrew moved the first of these, which, however, was not voted upon, as at the close of the meeting a proposition by brother H. H. Horsman to adjourn the question for 12 months was carried by 43 to 36, many not voting. As this amounted to a refusal, either to reject the “fallible authorship” theory or to repudiate the fellowship of those holding it, the supporters of the proposition at once withdrew from fellowship, and to the number of nearly 100 have since been meeting at 69, Upper Street, for the breaking of bread. The brethren at Wellington Hall then met (Oct. 25) and passed the following resolution:—“That this meeting, whilst refusing to countenance an unnecessary agitation, maintains its old position of confidence in the divine authorship, inspiration, and consequent infallibility of the Bible; and will continue to deal with cases of departure from the Truth in accordance with the rules.” This we refused to accept, as it did not define the “fallible authorship” theory to be a “departure from the truth,” nor did it repudiate those who might hold such a belief outside the ecclesia. A meeting was then held between seven brethren on either side, at which it was agreed the first proposition should be accepted by those at Wellington Hall, and that a meeting should be held to discuss the *second*—i.e. upon the question of fellowship. This meeting was held on Nov. 9<sup>th</sup> (the adjournment motion having been previously rescinded), but was without result, and at a subsequent meeting of the Wellington Hall ecclesia, our second proposition was put to the vote and rejected by a large majority. Until after that meeting, we had taken no definite action towards forming a new ecclesia, having no desire to make the separation complete, if it could, without compromising any principle, be avoided, but in view of the absolute rejection of the second proposition we at once formed ourselves into an ecclesia on the same basis of fellowship as hitherto with the addition of the two propositions given above. The Wellington Hall brethren have since amended their proposition of Oct. 25 as follows:—“That this ecclesia whilst refusing to countenance an unnecessary agitation maintains its old position of confidence in the divine authorship and consequent infallibility of the Bible; and deeming a belief in the fallible authorship of any part of the Bible to be a departure from the truth, declines the fellowship of those who so believe, and will deal with such in accordance with the rules.” This it will be seen concedes the principle that we are contending for, and we hope (subject to some necessary preliminary arrangements) will shortly lead to a re-union.—WM. OWLER, Secretary.

(January 1886) Newcastle-on-Tyne.—Brother Little reports:—“On May 14<sup>th</sup>, 1885, we adopted the amended resolution on inspiration. There were only two dissentients, viz.:—Brother and sister Forbes, who objected to it being made a basis of fellowship, and therefore withdrew themselves. We have, since then, endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation on the ground of wholly-inspired and infallible Bible, but, I regret to say, it has been unsuccessful. This was not mentioned at the time, as we expected it would be unnecessary.”

(January 1886) Sheffield.—Brother Shemeld reports that a meeting of the ecclesia, held November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1885, the following resolution was adopted:—“We, the brethren and sisters of the Sheffield Christadelphian ecclesia, do believe that the autographs of the Scriptures were produced in all parts of

them, by divine revelation and supervision, and were free from any error whatever. And we refuse fellowship to anyone who believes them to be partially inspired. Also, we extend our fellowship to those brethren and sisters and ecclesias *only*, who believe in the full inspiration of the Scriptures, and who refuse fellowship to those who believe in partial inspiration, as above set forth. Also, that a scriptural course must be taken before anyone be withdrawn from.”

(February 1886) Derby.—Brother Clark reports that a Special Meeting of the ecclesia was held on January 6<sup>th</sup>, to consider and declare its position on the inspiration question. The following resolutions were proposed by brother W. Chandler, and seconded by brother E. Grimes:—1.—“We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the Divine Authorship and consequent infallibility of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship.” 2.—“We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it.” An amendment was proposed by brother Colebourne, and seconded by brother C. S. Tyler, as follows: “That upon the question of inspiration, we affirm our belief in every Bible declaration upon the subject, accepting fully the apostolic statements, that ‘Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit,’ and that ‘All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable,’ &c. But we deprecate most earnestly the making of any particular theory a matter of division in our midst, and we are prepared to give the brethren everywhere the right hand of fellowship who hold fast to the truth, as hitherto believed amongst us.” The amendment was carried by 36 to 27. As this amounted to a refusal to dis-fellowship partial-inspiration, the 27 and five others who were not at the meeting, resolved to separate themselves, as they could hold no communion with those who would tolerate such a dangerous doctrine as a partially-inspired Bible. Being in a minority, they were obliged to leave. They have taken the bold step of securing the Athenæum, Victoria Street, which is twice the size and much better in every way than the old one. “Although it will be hard work at first, we shall do the best we can to build up an ecclesia on the sure foundation of an inspired and infallible Bible. The following compose our ecclesia:—Sister Berry, brother and sister Chandler, sister L. Chandler, brother Duffield, sister Ellis, brother and sister Godber, brother E. Grimes, brother and sister Jackson, sister Mann, brother and sister W. Millband, brother and sister T. Millband, brother Morrall, sisters Ruckwood, brother and sister W. Smith, sister A. Smith, brother and sister Stenson, sisters Stevens, brother and sister Taylor, brother and sister Whittaker, sister M. Wilson, and the writer, W. Clark.”

(Excerpt from February 1886) Derby.—Brother Clark reports that a Special Meeting of the ecclesia was held on January 6<sup>th</sup>, to consider and declare its position on the inspiration question. The following resolutions were proposed by brother W. Chandler, and seconded by brother E. Grimes:—1.—“We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the Divine Authorship and consequent infallibility of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship.” 2.—“We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it.”

(February 1886) Great Bridge.—Brother Hollier says several brethren have asked for an explanation of the apparently anomalous position of things appearing last month. He deems it necessary to make the matter clear. The ecclesia, which has passed the resolution reported by brother Hardy, contains those who were determined not to abide by that resolution, neither by the one adopted by the Temperance Hall (Birmingham), which those with brother Hollier have fully accepted.—Brother Moseley also writes that notwithstanding their resolution, the table of those with brother Hardy is still open to the Exchange, Kidderminster, and Wolverhampton brethren by whom partial inspiration is tolerated. Brother Moseley says: “To my mind no resolution is sufficient that does not embody these three points:—(1) Belief in a wholly infallibly – inspired Bible. (2) Disfellowship of those who believe otherwise. (3) Dis-fellowship of

those who *tolerate* the doctrine, of a partially or imperfectly-inspired Bible. A brother with whom those with brother Hardy is in fellowship, sent a message to our brother Hollier that he was surprised to find that a man who had read his Bible so much had not yet had his eyes open to its imperfections! This illustrates what is hidden under their plausible resolution, and explains why those who desire to be faithful have had to stand apart. Brother Hollier says:—"Our time for breaking bread is 2.30 p.m. and 6.15 for lectures. The lectures for the present have been by brethren White, Moseley and Hollier. We shall be now writing to the various lecturing brethren to help us."

(March 1886) Paddington.—Brother D. Logan reports the adoption of the following resolution:—"That we, the members of the Christadelphian ecclesia meeting at the Temperance Hall, Pitt Street, desire to convey our hearty sympathy and approval of brother Roberts' action, and all brothers and sisters who have stood with him in his contention for a wholly-inspired Bible, and that we fully endorse the step he has taken in withdrawing from all who deny this important Bible doctrine, believing, as we do, that the logical outcome of such denial would be the entire destruction of our faith and practice in the whole of the book."

(April 1886) Leeds.—At a special meeting of this ecclesia held on March 7<sup>th</sup>, the following resolution was unanimously passed:—"We believe that the writings collectively known as the Bible were originally produced free from error by inspiration of God; and this conviction as a first principle in the basis of apostolic faith. This ecclesia will fellowship only those who believe likewise."—W. H. ANDREW.

(April 1886) Leicester.—Brother Gamble reports that at a special meeting of the ecclesia, held on Sunday afternoon, February 28<sup>th</sup>, a resolution was adopted of which he encloses a printed circular copy. The resolution declares the belief of the ecclesia in the entire inspiration and consequent infallibility of the original Scriptures, and their refusal to fellowship those who believe and teach the doctrine of a partial or fallible inspiration as pertaining to the word of God, or who knowingly fellowship such doctrines. Brother Gamble also reports that on March 2<sup>nd</sup>, three put on the name of Christ by immersion, viz., MARY BAILEY, JOSEPH COOK LEATH, and FANNY LEATH, his wife; also that the number of the ecclesia has been increased by the removal of sister Wright from Derby, which was omitted to be mentioned at the time.

(April 1886) Warrington.—Brother Smith reports that at a general meeting of the ecclesia held on Sunday, Feb. 28<sup>th</sup>, the following resolution was proposed and unanimously adopted: "We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the divine authorship and consequent infallibility of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship; and we reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it."

(April 1886) Spotsville (Ky.).—Brother Green forwards a resolution passed by the ecclesia here on the subject of inspiration. He says, "We wish all to know that we have no place in our minds for fallible inspiration. We are in sympathy with the warfare you have so successfully waged in defiance of God's Word. We sincerely thank God for your work, and greatly appreciate your personal efforts in the matter. We neither impugn your motives, nor your judgment, but are quite satisfied with your work." The resolution is as follows:—"We, the members of the Christadelphian ecclesia of Henderson County, in special meeting convened, do declare our allegiance to the Holy Scriptures, believing the same to be in all parts thereof in the original writings the result of the inspirational power of God, however exercised, such inspiration securing absolute infallibility. We do also refuse fellowship to all, who in theory or practice, believe otherwise."

(May 1886) Cardiff.—We must refer Bro. Brock to the correspondence that has passed with the ecclesia. “Disowning” is not our attitude at all, but sorrow that the ecclesia erect a barrier by sticking to a resolution worded to admit compromisers on the subject of inspiration. It is in their power to remove the barrier by sanctioning what at present they call “extreme resolutions.”

(May 1886) Huddersfield.—Brother Heywood reports a visit from brother R. Roberts of Birmingham, who delivered three lectures in the meeting room, Devonshire Chambers. On Sunday afternoon, March 21<sup>st</sup>, brother James Briggs, of Sowerby Bridge, subject: “Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord;” evening, by brother Roberts, “The Christadelphians. Who they are. What they are aiming at.” Monday evening, “Trouble abroad; the Bible only the way of peace and hope for man.” Wednesday evening, “The Eastern Question—(irrepressible and insoluble)—considered from a Bible point of view.” The lectures were fairly attended. On Thursday evening the brethren met to consider the position of certain brothers and sisters who were not in fellowship on account of the ecclesia’s withdrawal from brother R. Sanderson; after inquiry into matters, with brother Roberts’ assistance, it was resolved that there was no further cause for division. The position of those brethren on the inspiration of the Word was then investigated, resulting in their affirming the wholly inspired character of the Bible, and refusing to fellowship any who believe or tolerate the partial inspiration theory. All the brethren have since met in fellowship with us. May the Lord keep us faithful.—Brother Heywood adds that MARY ANN HIRST was immersed into the saving name in January last, intimation of which was omitted to be made at the time.

(May 1886) Keighley.—Brother Sutcliffe reports the restoration of fellowship between the ecclesia and those eight members who withdrew some time ago, and formed themselves into an ecclesia at Haworth. Not satisfied with the separation without an effort for re-union, both parties agreed for Brother Roberts to come, as he was visiting Yorkshire. So Brother Roberts was asked to do so, and consented to have an interview with both parties on Friday, March 26<sup>th</sup>. After interview the following resolution was adopted:—“That the brethren constituting the Keighley Ecclesia, having no objections of a spiritual nature to the statement of faith adopted by the Haworth Ecclesia; but on the contrary agreeing to it as an exposition of the true Apostolic faith, in all points and particulars, positive and negative, this joint meeting is of opinion that the two ecclesias, while remaining distinct as ecclesial organisations in different localities, four miles apart, should re-unite in fellowship one with another, as the law of Christ requires.”

(May 1886) Stockport.—Bro. G. WAITE reports the induction by baptism into the saving name of the Anointed, after the usual confession of faith, of Mr. THOMAS CLARKE (25), and ALICE ANN CLARKE, his wife (25), both formerly of the Church of England. During the month, the question of the relationship of brethren to trades unions, friendly societies, brotherhoods, &c. &c., &c., has been under consideration. Some do not object to association of the brethren with such, provided they take no prominent or public part therein and have but a mere nominal connection by subscription as a provision against contingencies. Some are for going farther and would withdraw from brethren who are in any way connected with “worldly orders.” This was the issue recently before us. The following resolution shews the decision at which we arrived. “That while we leave to the individual conscience and discretion of brethren and sisters the question of making provision against sickness or death by subscribing to ordinary benefit Societies, Burial Clubs, or Insurance Societies, and decline to interfere with their liberty in these matters, we do consider that brethren of Christ are upon doubtful if not forbidden ground when they are identified with trades unions worldly brotherhoods, and Societies which are of political or of a religious character. We therefore advise brethren to hold aloof from these altogether.” Two of the managing brethren who were formerly connected with the order of Rechabites (though their connection was merely sustained by Subscription) led the way by resigning at no slight amount of self-sacrifice and we have reason to believe that such conduct will be fruitful in good results. The following Addendum was framed



to meet a particular case where a brother interested himself by public association with “Bands of Hope” Teetotal Societies, etc. It would also apply to cases (if we could conceive of such) of a brother politician, a brother Town Councillor, a brother M.P., or any other such worldly vanity which is not compatible with saintship. “That we add to the foregoing resolution (the record of) our unalterable conviction that it is inconsistent with our position as brethren of Christ to publicly identify ourselves with the world in its various schemes and organizations, whether social, political, or ecclesiastical. We may do good to all men as we have opportunity, but in the carrying out of this commandment, we must be careful not to trench upon others which are of a very exclusive character, ‘Love not the world neither the things that are in the world’ (1 John 2:15); ‘Come out from among them and be ye separate’ (2 Cor. 6:17); ‘Be not conformed to this world’ (Rom. 12:2); ‘If ye were of the world, the world would love his own, but because ye are not of the world therefore the world hateth you’ (John 15:19). We conclude therefore that a brother who publicly identifies himself with the world in its schemes and organizations is in open rebellion against the spirit of the foregoing commandments, and we earnestly trust that our duty to the ecclesia, over which we for the time being preside, will not require us to go beyond, thus generally pointing out to brethren our conception of duty in these matters. If the contrary course were maintained, we should feel it our duty to recommend withdrawal of fellowship.” Of course our action has given offence to some brethren. With some we have not gone far enough, because we did not expel from the meeting those brethren who were in any way connected with “worldly orders,” instead of advising retirement from doubtful ground. With others we have exceeded our duty by interference in the matter at all. So what can we do but steadily strive to perform our duty through evil and good report as in the sight of Him in whose presence we must all shortly stand to hear either the welcome words—“Come ye blessed, &c.,” or the dreadful “Depart from me.”

(May 1886) Wigan (PEMBERTON).—Brother Rylance writes:—“Will you kindly announce in the *Christadelphian*, that our ecclesia has adopted the following resolution on inspiration:—‘That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, were originally produced in all parts of them by the inspiration of God (the Holy Spirit moving and guiding the writers), and that the writers were in no case left to themselves, the result being that their writings were free from error; also, that we refuse the fellowship of all those who cannot accept these resolutions.’ Two did not vote for the resolution, but we have reason to believe they will yet see their way to accept it. We are still keeping on with the lectures, and doing our best for the spread of the truth; but the audience are very poor. We had brother Thos. Holland April 4<sup>th</sup>; subject: ‘Where are the dead ones?’ We are thinking of starting a Sunday school very soon.”

(June 1886) Newport (Mon.)—Brother Thomas reports the immersion of Mr. ALFRED HARMAN, formerly neutral, and Mrs. S. A. NOAKES, wife of brother Noakes, also formerly neutral.—Brother Thomas, referring to the Cardiff brethren, says the Newport brethren fellowshiped them on the assurance that they had passed a resolution declaring their belief in the inspiration of the whole of the Scriptures, but he found that what they had done was virtually worthless, that they fellowship brethren who do not believe that the Scriptures are wholly inspired. This has led them to amend their own resolution to the effect that “they also refuse fellowship to all who, while believing the whole of the Scriptures to be inspired themselves, yet extend fellowship to those who do not.”

(Excerpt from June 1886) Melbourne.—Brother Whalley, on behalf of the ecclesia at St. Kilda, reports that they continue to struggle together in the maintenance of all things tending to strengthen them in their most holy faith, but between the darkness of the age and the wrestlings from within, their course toward faithfulness and purity seems at times nigh blocked up. Yet they fight on, and by the help of that sustaining power which “the Truth” affords, and which supplication unto God supplies, they live in hope that in the day of the Lord Jesus, “Victory” and the “Crown of Life” will be theirs.—Brother Whalley says:—“Sister Strand, of Tasmania (some four or five years ago of Birmingham), has come over to Victoria to recruit her health, and while here has met and will continue to meet with us in Windsor. We as

an ecclesia have unanimously agreed upon a resolution, 'affirming our belief that the whole Bible is the Word of God; that all parts of it was originally produced by His inspiration; that therefore the autographs were infallible to the minutest detail. That the Bible, as we now have it, is a thoroughly reliable reproduction of those originals, being in no way impaired by the few discrepancies and mistranslations that are to be found in it. And that from this time forward we cannot fellowship any who believe otherwise, nor those who can tolerate such belief.'"

(July 1886) Leicester.—Brother Gamble writes:—"Since my last report to the *Christadelphian*, we have been in trouble, by reason of some of our number supposing that the resolution passed in February could not apply to the Exchange meeting at Birmingham, and some other ecclesias who are in fellowship with them. On Easter Sunday, we were visited by one from the Exchange, who declared his intention to break bread with us, and this being refused, the whole matter was again brought up. The question was finally settled at a special meeting on Sunday afternoon, May 9<sup>th</sup>, when the following resolution was carried by a majority:—"We have discovered, with much regret, that some of our number are of opinion that where division has taken place in any town on the inspiration controversy, either of the two meetings may be fellowshiped by us without violating our resolution of February 28<sup>th</sup>, and to secure purity of fellowship, we now declare that we will not fellowship any ecclesia, in whatever town, which is not in fellowship with the brethren at the Temperance Hall. Birmingham." The result was a division. One or two who went away have since returned, leaving the total loss at 10.—Our meetings are still held in the Central Hall, Silver Street, where we shall be pleased to see any of the Lord's people who may be passing through the town.

(August 1886) Neath.—Brother Gregory reports as follows:—"When we passed our resolution upon the question of inspiration and fellowship (which appeared in *Christadelphian*, August 1<sup>st</sup>, 1885, and had refused fellowship to brother Morgan, who advocated partial inspiration), we thought ourselves in a fair way to a peaceable settling down to our labour of love in the truth, but, alas! We had not got far on the road before it became clear that our position was one of outside union, without inside unity; which is not a fulfillment of an apostolic exhortation to be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment (1. Cor. 1-10). Consequently, a special ecclesia meeting was held May 27<sup>th</sup>, to which meeting a resolution was put the effect which is that we do not fellowship any meeting of which the Exchange meeting, Birmingham, is an example,—no matter what their good words and fair speeches are, which are calculated to deceive the hearts of the simple. Those who did not agree to this refused to leave the meeting. It therefore became necessary to close the room. Since then, those who are in harmony with the resolution, have been meeting in brother Gregory's house, for breaking of bread and fellowship. We hope, however, soon to re-open the Academy with renewed determination to hold aloft the light of truth, and rejoice together in the hope of the gospel. We shall be glad of the visit of any brother or sister like-minded, who may be passing this way, also of the assistance of any brother who may be able to deliver a lecture to the alien."

(August 1886) Radstock.—Brother Young says:—"After a long silence I am much pleased to report the addition of two to our little ecclesia, viz., CHARLES FORD (32), formerly Baptist, and WALTER FORD (30), his brother in the flesh, who both put on the sincovering name of Christ at Bath in the appointed way June 6<sup>th</sup>. Our hope and prayer is that they, together with us, will be found worthy to put on immortality at the appearing of Christ. I may also add that a resolution has been passed, and signed by each one of us, as follows:—1. "We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the Divine Authorship, and consequent infallibility of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship. 2. We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it."

(September 1886) London.—ISLINGTON.—*Sundays, Lecture Hall, 69, Upper Street, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays (Bible Class), 8 p.m.; Fridays (for practice of hymns), 8.30 p.m.*—Brother Owler reports that on May 28th at a special meeting of the brethren who withdrew in October last from the North London ecclesia meeting at Wellington Hall, the following motions were unanimously adopted:—“That we, being a majority of the members of the North London ecclesia as it existed on October 18th, 1885, and being the only section who are adhering to its basis of fellowship, hereby change the name from the North London ecclesia to the Islington ecclesia.” “That no brother shall be eligible for nomination to any office, unless he has been in fellowship for two years immediately preceding his nomination.” At the annual meeting on July 4th, it was decided that a copy of the foregoing be forwarded to the *Christadelphian* for publication.—The annual outdoor meeting of the ecclesia and the children attending the Sunday School, was held on July 26th. The spot selected was Chaselands, near Enfield, where the children were taken on two former occasions in vans, but this time by train. The latter was somewhat of an experiment, which proved very successful. The children (and adults) numbered about 120, and the weather being favourable, the usual outdoor exercises were enjoyed. The brethren and sisters retired to a sheltered spot in one of the fields, and read the Scriptures apportioned for the day. After tea we made for home, which was reached in safety. Several brethren and sisters have visited us from a distance, and I may mention, in passing, that ample accommodation may be obtained at sister Fenton’s (23, Islington Green, N.), by giving her previous notice. Brother Elsmore, from Birmingham, has been added to our fellowship. The lectures continue to be fairly well attended; but in the summer months it is very difficult in London to entice people indoors. However, the gospel is proclaimed, whether the people hear or whether they forbear.

LECTURES.—August 1st, “Ancient and Modern Paganism” (brother Lake); 8th, “The ‘One Faith’ not preached by the Clergy” (brother Elliott); 15th, “Immortality a Conditional Gift” (brother Bosher); 22nd, “The Irish Problem” (brother Andrew); 29th, “The Mission of Jesus Christ” (brother Graham).

[A communication from the Wellington Hall brethren in reference to our remarks of last month contributes no new or explanatory feature, and is best left in abeyance so far as the *Christadelphian* is concerned. The true remedy is to be found in agreement with the Islington brethren.—EDITOR.]

(September 1886) Lanestville (Va.)—The following is the document which was held over from last month for want of space:—

*Reiteration of the Doctrines endorsed by the present Membership of the Lanestville Christadelphian Ecclesia since its disintegration and division, February 15th, 1886.*

*We, the undersigned, having been mercifully called out from among the Gentiles as a people for Yahweh’s Name, and having accepted the call by “obeying from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered unto us, being then made free from sin and become the servants of righteousness, we should have our fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life.”—“Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever”—and having thus purified our souls by obeying the truth, through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren,” we do most earnestly desire the loving unity and fellowship with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ, and with all, in every country, and in every place who are *one in Christ*, and “for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren,” and who, in the aggregate, constitute “the ecclesia of Christ, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.” These, and these alone, can take the Christadelphian name, and with these, and these alone, we desire fraternal fellowship. And, wishing to record more in detail the principles and “form of doctrines” we believe and accept, we hereby declare:—*

1.—That we believe and accept the truth that all Scripture, as originally given, was given by the inspiration of God, and is consequently infallible, being profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished into all good works—that a wholly inspired and infallible Bible is the word of the living God, upon which alone our faith, hope, and love are based.

2.—To save labour in writing out in detail, we will say that we accept as the doctrines of the Bible, “The statement of the doctrines forming the Christadelphian basis of fellowship,” which may be found on pages 45 to 49 of the *Ecclesial Guide*, published by Robert Roberts, Editor of the *Christadelphian*, Birmingham, England; and that we accept the *Ecclesial Guide* as a *general rule* in the conduct of the branch of the true ecclesial vine which we desire to represent, subject, however, to such suitable modification as we may deem proper in one branch of the “True Vine.”

3.—We believe and accept the teaching of Jesus that we “are not of the world” but being taken out from among the Gentiles, we are cut out of Daniel’s “*mountain*,” Jeremiah’s “*destroying mountain*,” and Zechariah’s “*great mountain*,” to form the stone kingdom, and having put off our Gentile nationality when we put off the old man and put on the new man, which is Christ, we change our nationality and citizenship each one becoming a “Hebrew of the Hebrews,” no longer an “alien from the commonwealth of Israel and a stranger from the covenants of promise,”—“no more strangers and foreigners,” but “fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God.” *Therefore*, Christadelphians, having changed their nationality and citizenship do not register as citizens of Gentile commonwealths, nor voice their will in Gentile politics. They “are come to the ecclesia of the first born, enrolled, (or registered) in heaven,” (Heb. 12.) and their citizenship, or commonwealth is in heaven out of which also they wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, (Phil. 3.)

4.—We believe and accept the truth that no true Christadelphian ecclesia can exist without the keeping of the commandments of Christ, as a rule of life, especially the two great commandments upon which hang all the law and the prophets and which embrace the love of God, the love of Christ, the love of his brethren, and the love toward your neighbour, “which is the fulfilling of the law.”

5.—We believe if any man consent not to the above sound doctrine, and the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus, he cannot be a member of the ecclesia of Christ, and if already one by profession, the commandment is imperative, “From such withdraw thyself.”

6.—Should there be uprising of the *flesh* in the ecclesia, such as bitterness, wrath, anger, clamour, and evil speaking, with all malice, it must be put away at once, by withdrawal from it, for the ecclesia can have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.

7.—“Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy, for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.” “Ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if it be so, that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his” (Rom. 8:9).

*Festus King, J. T. Edwards, Geo. W. Hance, Deucalion Hance, Emm i C. Edwards, Rosina King, Virginia Hance, L. Edwards, Zillah Johnson, Anna Edwards, Calista Wilshen, Rose King, M. C. Tibbs, Ada B. Neale, Sallie T. Bibb, with a prospect of others when they understand fully*

(December 1886) Dudley.—Brother Hughes reports the obedience of brother T. WALKER (24), formally belonging to the Presbyterians, who after evidence of his understanding of the one faith, put on Christ on Wednesday, November 10th. The lectures continue to be well attended, and several are much interested. Brother Hughes reports, on the other hand with regret, that eleven have left the meeting in connection with inspiration troubles. A resolution, declaring belief in the complete inspiration of the Bible, was passed over 12 months ago. It was thought that those who opposed the resolution at the time would finally see their way to accept it, seeing they were willing to remain, but matters have gone from bad to worse. They have condemned it more and more. They denied that partial inspiration had been taught, and when the evidence was produced, they would not accept it, and refused to withdraw from those who taught it. In consequence of these and other things, the managing brethren invited these brethren to a special meeting

with them on September 23rd, to see if some means could be adopted to bring about a better state of things; but the brethren in question would suggest nothing. They had asked previously to this that we should have lectures from the Exchange, &c. This was out of the question. We now asked them to withdraw from us if they could not accept the resolution, and that we would give them an equal portion of the ecclesial property. But this was refused. There being no means of bringing the matter to a peaceable settlement, it was decided that the matter should be brought before a general meeting of the ecclesia. The meeting was held Sept. 30th, 27 brethren and sisters being present. It was proposed that the ecclesia refuse fellowship to all brethren and sisters who would not accept the resolution; 17 voted for it and 7 against; 2 left the room before it was put, and 1 was neutral. Up to the present 34 have accepted the resolution. These are all of one mind, and now meet together with unity, love, and peace in our midst. We already feel much benefited by the separation, though deeply regretting it.”

(January 1887) Huddersfield.—Brother Heywood reports that brother John William Edwards has been united in marriage with sister Jane Howe, of Elland. Sister Howe (now sister Edwards) endorsed the resolution not to fellowship partial inspiration or any meeting not in fellowship with the Huddersfield Ecclesia and was received into fellowship. Miss. ANN WAKER (28), formerly Church of England, having made a satisfactory confession of the faith, was to be immersed December 15th into the saving name of Christ Jesus our Lord.

(Excerpt from April 1887) Boston (Mass). — Brother Trussler writes:—“Our numbers have been increased by the removal of brother and sister Grey from Florida. Brother Grey withdrew from this ecclesia before going to Florida. He has been seen, according to our rules, and is now in fellowship with us. We rejoice especially in this case, because he is known to be a good worker in the truth. A few days ago I received a letter from the *American Baptist Publication Society* to ask if we could supply them with *Bible Finger-posts* series. I referred them to *Christadelphian* Office, Birmingham.

(January 1888) NOTTINGHAM—To meet scruples that had arisen in connection with a case in which a brother and sister had submitted to the marriage ceremony at the hands of an orthodox minister, the ecclesia during the month passed a resolution declaring it to be an offence against the law of Christ for brethren and sisters to countenance the false pretensions of the clergy by taking part in ceremonies or services conducted under their auspices.

(February 1901) DUNEDIN (NZ).—In renewing subscription for the *Christadelphian*, I have thought it good to let you know that ecclesially we are still struggling on, trying to “strengthen the things that remain.” Our numbers have increased slightly lately, and we have been doing a little toward removing that stain which, in the Colonies, has for years clung around the name of the Dunedin ecclesia on account of the presence here of some errorists. With the object of clearing ourselves in the eyes of the brethren, we have recently passed resolutions declaring that we have no fellowship with those who hold: (1), “That believers have the present possession of eternal life”; (2), “That natural Israel will not be restored”; (3), “That the death of Christ was not necessary for our salvation and was not God-appointed”; and (4), “That the Scriptures are only partially inspired.” We have also adopted the Birmingham Statement as our basis of fellowship, and will receive only those who consent to its wholesome words. We have recently had as visitors brethren Baxter (from Milton, late of Kilmarnock), Jones (of Auckland), and Henry Roberts (of Sydney). The latter was accompanied by sister Roberts.—W. HOLMES.

(July 1888) BELFAST- The ecclesia desires to declare its belief that the Bible is true, wholly inspired, and infallible, and that they will fellowship none who do not so believe. Also that they will fellowship none who, while believing in the entire inspiration and infallibility of the Bible themselves would be willing to fellowship those who do not so believe. It having been alleged that the Belfast ecclesia did not believe in the Judgment, in that they believed in Immortal Resurrection, and also that they believed in the Renunciationist doctrine that Christ did not partake of the condemnation which passed upon all men in Adam, the Editor wrote making inquiries as to the truth of these allegations, withholding meanwhile the Intelligence that was in hand from Belfast. The result of inquiries made in consequence in Belfast among the brethren themselves has been to show that one brother did not believe that Christ partook of our nature. The brethren are therefore endeavouring to show him the truth of the matter, and if he feels himself unable to receive it will withdraw from him. The rest, with the exception of a brother who is away in Scotland, and whose fellowship will only be continued on a pure basis, have put their signatures to a letter setting forth the truth concerning the matters above referred to, showing their decided attitude with regard to the Inspiration of the Bible, and that they do not hold the doctrine of Immortal Resurrection or that of the Renunciationists concerning the nature of Christ. The signatures are as follows:—

JAMES M. GIBSON  
ROBERT J. ANGUS  
MARY MURRAY  
WILLIAM JOHN BURNS  
GIDEON MAGEE  
HUGH CLOSE  
MARY J. CLOSE  
JAMES MCKIDWIN.

(November 1888) SOUTHAMPTON- Continuing to sow the seed both by word of mouth and leaflet distribution, we have now increased facility for so doing, through the kindness of interested friends who have placed a room at our disposal for meeting purposes. Thankfully accepting, we have for the last seven weeks met every Sunday afternoon for Bible reading and exposition of the truth. Owing, perhaps, to our meeting room being in a private house, the attendance is at present small, and would be discouraging, did we not realise that we, as instruments of the Deity, can, with confidence, accept the results He permits, and regulates according to His purposes. Since last writing we had the pleasure of a visit from brother and sister Hayes, of Jersey, who stayed with us a few days, including a Sunday, when brother Hayes lectured on “Jesus Christ as a Prophet, Priest and King,” also giving us cheering words of exhortation at our meeting for the breaking of bread. Owing to brethren who advocate partial and fallible inspiration occasionally visiting Southampton, we have found it necessary to now state that we cannot fellowship any who do not make entire and infallible inspiration a first principle of the basis of fellowship.—E. PITT.

(June 1893) LONDON (SOUTH) *Surrey Masonic Hall, Camberwell New Road, S.E. (Lecture Room upstairs). Sundays, 9.45, 11 a.m.; and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays, 8 p.m.*—We are gratified this month to announce the baptism, on Sunday, May 14th, of REUBEN LENG of Weybridge, Surrey son of brother and sister Leng, of that town; and also brother in the flesh to brother C. Leng, of our ecclesia. This will be a source of consolation to our brother and sister Leng in their present isolation. The following resolution was passed at a business meeting of the Camberwell ecclesia, held on January 8th last:—“That a copy of the pamphlet, ‘Marriage with the Alien,’ be handed to the newly-immersed unmarried brother or sister,” and we would like to take this opportunity of earnestly commending this resolution to the notice of ecclesias, small and great, throughout the world, with the exhortation that they follow our example. And we would urge all our unmarried brethren and sisters everywhere to read the same, and the married, too, for the matter of that, with a view to their being the better qualified for counseling the former in this matter; *for how great and grave are the issues involved* this truthful little book will show. It is also our

practice to hand a copy of "The Bible Companion" to the newly-baptised. Lectures for the month of June are as follow:—Sunday, June 4th, "Milton's War in Heaven (brother F. G. Jannaway); 11th, "Christ's Last Message to the Churches" (brother J. J. Andrew, of Islington); 18th, "This do in Remembrance of Me" (brother F. W. Porter); 25th, "God still speaking: How He speaks," &c. (brother A. T. Jannaway).—JOSEPH BELLAMY.

(December 1894) DERBY *Athenæum Rooms*.—Brother J. W. Dorricott reports that the "Rev." Hewitt, mentioned last month, has been approached by brother Gamble, of Leicester, with a view to debate the subject: "Does the Bible Teach that Man has an Immortal Soul?" with the result that Mr. Hewitt declined the proposal on the ground that Christadelphian teaching tends to Atheism and Infidelity! We can only lament the mist that seems to gather thicker and thicker round the Word of God, and resolve to cling more tightly to the One Hope that is imperishable.—Brother and sister Sturgess have removed from Birmingham to Derby. The brethren and sisters of Birmingham will know how acceptable an addition they will be to our number. We have had to withdraw from brother Fitchett and sister Palmer, who, for the sake of parents (not in the truth), persisted in being married at the Church of England, thus giving countenance to the false pretensions of a class of men whom enlightenment compels us to regard as ecclesiastical sorcerers. The ecclesia passed a resolution on the occasion.

(November 1895) TORONTO.—Brother Smallwood writes:—"At an ecclesial meeting held on October 2nd, it was unanimously resolved to put on record our emphatic protest against the Bible-nullifying and truth-destroying influences at work on the American continent, lest our silence should be construed to signify acquiescence in, and approval of, such a state of things. The following resolution was therefore moved by brother McNeillie and unanimously adopted": "That in view of the drifting character of the times in matters of faith among professed believers, we, as an ecclesia, wish to put on record our solemn protest against the assumption of many that the truth of God is an open question, awaiting settlement by the judgment of poor humanity. That is the attitude of some at least amongst us towards the word of God. We have the evidence in the late statement of a leading brother (and the editor of a magazine of wide circulation) that 'the truth is a theory.' However astounding such a statement may appear, it is in entire harmony with a prevailing habit among the brethren, of treating saving truth as yet awaiting solution by their continued researches and investigations. We, as believers, regard the truth in our day, as brother Roberts says, 'as fully and finally discovered,' and are engaged in the work of applying it to our own individual cases, and as much as we are able of drawing the attention of our fellow men to this wondrous source of light and life. We believe that Jehovah, in the Scriptures, has given us a perfect work, and that He has left nothing to be determined by the wisdom of men. We believe that the truth is a *unit*, and is not divisible into 'first principles,' various 'phases,' more or less 'advanced,' and portions more or less 'essential.' We believe it is all essential—vitaly essential; and is an infallible communication of divine wisdom to men. We protest against this God-dishonouring treatment of the divine word, and decline the fellowship of all individuals and ecclesias who are engaged in the unhallowed work of making the truth of God of non effect by fleshly tradition."—WM. SMALLWOOD, Recording Brother.

(August 1896) JERSEY—The half-yearly business meeting of this ecclesia was held on Thursday, July 2nd. The principal item of consideration was, "The Scripturalness or otherwise of Singing with the Alien." It was decided by a majority of the brethren that, although our lectures may be attended principally by "friendly strangers" or "almost Christadelphians," nevertheless it is unscriptural to encourage such to think that they have part or lot in the service of the sanctuary *until* they have made a "covenant with Jehovah through sacrifice." We therefore commence on Sunday, July 5th, to reason and persuade from the Scriptures without this etcetera.—N. J. PRIGG.

["Singing *with* the alien" is one thing; singing in *the presence* of the alien is another (compare Acts 27:35). The latter can be done without deceiving the stranger as to his alienation. The resolution of the

Birmingham ecclesia of nearly thirty years ago (printed on p. vii. of the preface of the hymn-book), doubtless expresses the right course of the action in this matter. Jealousy for the truth is to be respected; but it is a pity to needlessly deprive the brethren of edification and comfort.—C. C. W.]

(February 1897) LEEDS. — *Wellington Road*. — Brother Suggitt reports: “Our special efforts have commenced with the first Sunday of the new year, when we had the company and assistance of brother R. Roberts, of Birmingham, who gave us a substantial exhortation in the morning at the breaking of bread. In the evening, he delivered a lecture on ‘The Troubled World.’ We had a good company of thoughtful people. On Monday night we had a joint meeting of the Great George Street and Wellington Road ecclesias in the Great George Street room, when the following definition was unanimously adopted (with two exceptions only), as expressing the intended and Scriptural sense of the clauses in the basis of faith which had for some time been the subject of controversy. Brother Pickles (Wellington Road), moved, and brother Gamble (Great George Street), seconded, ‘That Christ at this present time, is High Priest over his own house only, in this sense: that he does not intercede for the world in any cases, and that no man or woman is in a position to obtain the forgiveness of sins or to offer acceptable worship to God until they have believed and obeyed the gospel in baptism; also, that the statements contained in the printed slips, pasted on the hymn-books, express the truth as taught by the Apostles of Christ.’ On Tuesday night brother Roberts lectured on the subject of ‘Turkish Horrors.’ On Wednesday night we had a grand time of it, when our brother gave us a lecture on ‘Christ in the Earth again.’ Thus has been sown the good seed of the Kingdom, which, we trust, will bring forth by our Heavenly Father’s will, fruit a hundredfold to His glory, and our eternal welfare. On January 10th, brother Pickles lectured in the same place (Gladstone Hall), on ‘The Great Salvation.’”

(February 1897) YSTRAD.— “Last month’s intelligence from this place notified the withdrawal from brother J. Smith without stating any of the facts connected with the case, and to rectify matters a little, it should be made known that the withdrawal from the brother in question was an unscriptural procedure, which brother J. Thomas, of Bath, succeeded in pointing out to the brethren here, with the result that the brethren rescinded the unscriptural resolution, and received brother J. Smith back into fellowship. Brother J. Smith has subsequently removed from Ystrad to Ferndale to reside, and meets with the brethren and sisters there. This is the time when mistakes do occur. But Christ is coming, who will not judge after the sight of his eyes, nor after the hearing of his ears, because he is able to discern the very innermost thoughts and intents of the heart, consequently he will judge a righteous judgment. No fear of mistakes then.”

(May 1897) HAMILTON (CA)—Brother A. Mackay reports the return of brother and sister Coulter to Irvine. He also enters at some length into the circumstances referred to in brother Hosie’s letter of last month. Brother Hosie, it will be remembered, reported having with some others retired from the meeting on account of the adoption of a resolution imposing silence on the responsibility of enlightened rejectors. Brother Mackay now says that not one in the meeting denies that perfect light brings (resurrectional) responsibility, and “not one,” says he, “believes a single point of brother Andrew’s new theory.” So far, this is satisfactory, but the resolution imposing silence is a little difficult to understand. He says it was because of attempts to coerce the brethren into an extreme view.—Brother Hosie writes on the other side in a manner that compels those at a distance to suspend judgment. No doubt, personal investigation would enable a visitor to see how the land lies. If all believe in the privilege of light being the ground of responsibility, it ought to be easy and would be highly satisfactory to the friends of the truth elsewhere if these brethren should re-unite. While quarrelling about those who are to be rejected, they may endanger their own acceptability with the Judge, who is at the door.

(March 1897) KILMARNOCK.—The brethren, considering that recent denials of the responsibility of those **who know the truth and do not obey it**; and the kindred errors which have been introduced to



sustain it, are subsversive to some of the essential elements of the truth, have come to the conclusion that they cannot fellowship those who have embraced these doctrines, or who tolerate such in fellowship.

(Excerpt from May 1897) LONDON (SOUTH).—*Gresham Hall, Gresham Road, Brixton (near Brixton Station).*

[Brother Guest reports the adoption of a resolution by the Camberwell brethren, refusing acceptance of the position taken by brother Andrew, as defined in the circular of August, 1896. But they are not in line with the Gresham Hall brethren, from whom they went out some time ago. **It would simplify matters for themselves and others if they would re-establish fellowship with the Gresham Hall brethren before asking co-operation elsewhere.**—ED.]

PLYMOUTH.—Brother Gruitt expresses the sorrow of the brethren at losing two such able and zealous brethren as brethren Sleep and Williams, who take extreme ground on the right side of the Responsibility Question. Brother Gruitt says: “With one or two exceptions, we are in perfect agreement with them, except as to test of fellowship (and even here we go as far as possible). We called a special meeting on May 30th, in consequence of brethren Sleep and Williams sending a notice of their intention to withdraw from us. We submitted and carried the following resolution:—‘Our ecclesia affirms its belief that light brings responsibility to judgment. If this is admitted by those seeking our fellowship, we would not judge a brother’s doubtful thoughts as to the extent of enlightenment creating such responsibility, and consequently when such responsibility commences. Brethren Sleep and Williams take with them brethren Atkins and Peline, jun. The Lord’s will be done. We shall continue to warn the alien to flee from the wrath to come. Teaching those things which concern the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus the Christ, and knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men. I think it also advisable to explain a matter about which there has been a misunderstanding as to our fellowshiping brother Guest: it was entirely due to a mistake. Brother Guest was coming this way, and wrote to us, saying that the Camberwell ecclesia had repudiated brother J. J. A.’s views, and had prohibited the sale of the *Sanctuary Keeper* at their meetings, and asked for fellowship the following Sunday, on the grounds that they were meeting on the same basis as Gresham Hall. Upon these representations, we permitted brother G. to break bread with us, but it afterwards transpired that these were not exactly the facts; that the Camberwell ecclesia had not entirely severed themselves from brother A.’s teaching, and so we notified brother Guest that we could not fellowship him till his ecclesia had put themselves in a right position. The brethren here wish me to state that they were willing to pass the resolution you advised brother Sleep to submit to them, but he did not think it went far enough.—[If we recollect, it was to this effect: ‘That though God winks at times of ignorance, He does not wink at times of knowledge, but will hold men answerable in the day of judgment for a knowing refusal to submit to the claims of the Gospel.’—EDITOR.]—Nothing would satisfy but the putting of ourselves out of fellowship with all the ecclesias (Birmingham included), with one or two exceptions, which, of course, we could not do, although we were willing for peace sake to go with them as far as possible.”

Brother Williams forwards the amendment which he and brother Welhams and two others voted for, viz.: “That God winks at times of ignorance but not at times of knowledge, and that men who knowingly refuse to submit to the Gospel will have to answer for it at the resurrection; and that we refuse fellowship to any ecclesia or individual not agreeing with this belief.”— [It seems to us that the resolution and amendment are consistent with one another, and that there ought not to be a division.]—EDITOR.]

(August 1897) KILMARNOCK.—Brother Baxter, writing on behalf of a dozen brethren and sisters who have had no meeting for eight weeks, says they have been obliged to open another meeting room at the Strand Club Room, Strand Street, where they meet on Sundays at 11 a.m., and will gladly welcome brethren sound in faith and practice. The reason of the separation was the adoption of a resolution by the

Garden Street Hall ecclesia withdrawing from everyone that was not prepared to require a belief in the resurrection of enlightened rejectors as a condition of fellowship, even if they believed the truth **themselves** on this point and all other points; also brother Baxter and those in association with him believe in the resurrectional responsibility of enlightened rejectors of the truth, and were even prepared to refuse fellowship to those who oppose that truth, but they could not consent to refuse those believing the truth in the matter who might not be prepared to withdraw from those who were uncertain on the subject. They were, therefore, asked to consider themselves withdrawn from. After an absence of some weeks, they wrote, asking if anything could be done to allow of their return. The answer being negative, they felt they had no alternative but the sorrowful one of forming a separate meeting. **The painful spectacle is presented of two meetings believing exactly the same thing, and differing only as to how they ought to treat those who are uncertain as to how much the Lord will punish a certain class of his enemies.**—Brother Baxter notifies a change in his address: it is now Lossie Bank Cottage, Renine Street, Kilmarnock.

(September 1897) NOTTINGHAM.—“At a special meeting of the ecclesia, called to consider the Lincoln question, which has been under consideration for six months or more (during which time we have endeavoured to unite the two meetings—up to the present, we regret, without success), the following resolution was passed:—

““After careful consideration we believe there ought to be only one meeting at Lincoln, as there no longer exists any justifiable reason for standing aside from the brethren meeting in Boultham Avenue. We cannot, therefore, be responsible for refusing them fellowship at the table of the Lord; and, in future, must extend to them the same welcome as to other brethren of like precious faith whenever they attend our meetings.””

—HERBERT H. COLLYER.

(October 1897) LINCOLN. — *Masonic Hall.* — “Circumstances compel us to withdraw from the Nottingham ecclesia, on account of their having identified themselves with the Boultham Avenue meeting (as shown by the Nottingham intelligence of last month); at the same time, not having granted us the privilege of satisfaction upon the differences existing between us when we were willing (and are still) to submit it to an impartial committee of five brethren from five different ecclesias—two to be chosen by us, two by the Boultham Avenue meeting, four selected to choose the fifth. With regard to the Lincoln intelligence, the statements are inaccurate, and do not represent the true facts of the case. We are also anxious that there should only be one meeting in Lincoln, but we cannot see our way clear without a proper understanding upon the questions at issue.”—GEORGE HARLEY.

[The above is inserted simply to show how the case stands at Lincoln. The suggestion made by brother Harley might surely be acted on with advantage. Meanwhile, it seems uncalled for the Masonic Hall meeting to withdraw from the Nottingham ecclesia. Cannot a mutually satisfactory basis of reunion at Lincoln be arrived at?—C. C. W.]

(October 1897) SLEAFORD.—Here the state of affairs in Lincoln is causing some embarrassment. In answer to enquiries it may be said that the declaration of the Boultham Avenue brethren was inserted in the September issue under the impression that reunion was impending and that it might help it, No doubt, as a brother says, the right course is “First unite at home, then all will be well.”

(December 1897) HAMILTON.—The brethren of the Hamilton ecclesia held a meeting on the 9th October to reconsider their basis with regard to the Responsibility Question. Brother Mackay writes: “We have now withdrawn the resolution passed on February 13th, 1897 (imposing silence on the subject—C.

C. W.), and wish it to be stated that we still believe that the privilege of light is the ground of accountability to God. We do not think that we are justified in refusing fellowship to any brother who may be uncertain as to the extent of the privilege or degree of knowledge which would create this accountability in our age, so long as no limit is placed on the power and authority of God. Where this is admitted we see no reason for division.”

(December 1897) MERTHYR.—Our numbers are the same as when we last reported. We still meet at the Victoria Buildings, at 6 p.m. every first day of the week, to “exhort one another,” and “shew forth the Lord’s death till he come.” And we also do what we can to convince all “that the Lord has spoken good concerning Israel.” I write especially at this time to inform all whom it may concern that we have received a communication from the Aberdare ecclesia, dated November 8th, which reads as follows, viz.: “We are very pleased to inform you that union has been concluded between the brethren of Cwmaman and Aberdare upon the following basis:—1st. That we do not believe in the doctrine of the ‘partial inspiration of the scriptures,’ and will not fellowship with any who believe in such doctrine. 2nd. That we return to the basis which existed before the division of the brethren in 1885, it being understood that the first proposition be the only difference.—Signed, WM.MARSHALL, Rec. bro.” While neither expressing approval nor disapproval on the action of the two ecclesias named, we thank the Aberdare ecclesia for informing us of the step they have taken, and hasten to inform through the *Christadelphian* all other ecclesias who are not so informed.—S. JONES.

[A very nebulous basis indeed, the value of which remains to be seen, and must be tested.—C. C. W.]

(December 1897) PLYMOUTH—Brother Finnemore writes regretting the continuation of controversy on the Responsibility Question, and enclosing a recently-issued circular in which the ecclesia defines its “position on the Question of Resurrectional Responsibility of enlightened rejecters of the truth”

THUS.

“We adopted a resolution on May 30th last, ‘That Light brings Responsibility,’ and when it came to our knowledge that some (outside of our ecclesia) took advantage of the word ‘Resurrectional’ being omitted from this resolution, to contend that we could and did fellowship those who deny that Light brings Resurrectional Responsibility, we, at our quarterly meeting, held on October 3rd last, by an unanimous vote so far as the Plymouth ecclesia was concerned, resolved that the word ‘Resurrectional’ be placed before the word ‘Responsibility’ in our Resolution of May 30th. . . . Consistently with this Resolution we have refused to fellowship brother Guest from London, because as yet, he could not say ‘Yes’ to it.

“Now as to how this Resolution affects our Fellowship with each other, and those coming among us from other ecclesias. We would not fellowship any brother or sister who denied that Light brings ‘Resurrectional Responsibility to Judgment apart from Baptism’; neither would we fellowship anyone coming from any ecclesia, if that ecclesia by resolution denied the foregoing resolution or its equivalent, and thereby gave the lie to the teachings of our Lord in John 12:48, ‘He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.’ If, however, it turned out that any among us should say that to them, it was a doubtful question as to whether rejecters in this age or day of uncertainty and doubt will come to judgment by resurrection (not denying it being so in the days of Christ and his Apostles, and admitting that it may be so in our day). We consider that in such a case, the commandment of Paul would apply in Rom. 14., ‘Him that is weak in the Faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations.’ (Judge his ‘doubtful thoughts,’ marginal reading). In such a case, whether it was one of our own ecclesia or a visitor, we should instruct and teach and not refuse fellowship, fearing we may go beyond the will of the Lord.”

[Various objections are taken against this statement by those who are separated, with whom brother Gruitt has felt constrained to throw in his lot. And yet (if exception be allowed to the phrase “*by resolution*” in the allusion above to the distant ecclesia), it seems to represent a reasonable attitude on the question.—C. W.]

## INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS WITHDRAWING FROM MEMBERS

### GENERAL CASES

(Excerpt from June 1869) EDINBURGH.— At a later date, viz., May 19th, brother Tait communicates the following NOTICE OF REMOVAL, which, we understand, refers to a few only of the parties named.—“The Christadelphians meeting in Cockburn Hall, Cockburn Street, Edinburgh, will, on and after Sunday, May 30th, assemble in their former place of meeting, Calton Convening Rooms, Waterloo Place, Edinburgh.”

(September 1871) MANCHESTER.—The ecclesia here have withdrawn from David Slocombe, who has left the place and gone to parts unknown. The ecclesia hope the brethren will be on their guard against his imposition.

(January 1872) WHITBY.—We are asked to state that the ecclesia has withdrawn from J. Beadnell and H. Clarkson, and also from Elizabeth Fowler and Mrs. Beadnell. The ecclesia here has been strengthened by the presence of brother Walker, from Scarborough for a time. Brother A. Hogarth died on the 19th of September, aged 32 years.

(July 1872) STRATFORD-ON-AVON.—Brother Habgood is, at present, under the necessity of standing apart from the few brethren here, on account of their defense of a brother immersed some considerable time ago, who never assembles with the brethren at the breaking of bread, or on any other occasion, because of the offence it gives to friends in the flesh. Bro. H. feels that if he were to join in their excusing of him, he would sin against Christ, who requires obedience of his commands as the very first condition of discipleship, without which, knowledge is only to condemnation. The friends of the truth, everywhere, hope that the excusing brethren will be enabled to see the error of their position, and that the brother causing the difference will add to his faith courage, and serve Christ at all risks, knowing that if we save our life now, at Christ’s expense, we shall lose it in the day of his glory. [Compiler’s Note: This intelligence item was difficult to classify and so has been placed under in this section]

(August 1872) WHITBY.—Brother Winterburn announces the withdrawal, after long patience, from brother Henry Weatherill and George Tweedy who have brought reproach upon the truth in ways that need not be particularised.

(August 1872) CHICAGO, ILL.—Brother Harris reports the withdrawal of the ecclesia from D. Ryder and his wife, observing that otherwise the ecclesia seems in a healthy state.

(November 1872) NEW PITSLIGO.—Brother Reid announces the withdrawal of the ecclesia from brother and sister Campbell for their continued countenance of witchcraft.

(April 1875) FROME.—Letters from brother and sister Clark and sisters Butt and Taylor, announce their withdrawal from brother Hawkins, after repeated endeavours during several months to avoid rupture. It would not be proper in the *Christadelphian* to enter into the merits of the disagreement. [Compiler’s Note: Bold Mat. 18:15-18]

(May 1875) FROME.—In reference to the announcement of withdrawal from brother Hawkins, which appeared last month, brother Hawkins and others write to say that there was no just ground for it. So far as the *Christadelphian* is concerned, there the matter must rest. There is some proposal to try to bring things to amicable arrangement, which is exceedingly desirable. There are cases in other parts where fraternal breaches have occurred and separations taken place, but they are of a character that no good object can be served by the publication of them. Where a properly constituted and reasonably conducted ecclesia deliberately and with good reason and the common consent withdraws from an offender, justice to the brethren everywhere requires its notification: but where it is a case of a community rent to pieces through personal disagreements of which parties at a distance cannot judge, the publication of the fact is only a spread of the evil without any compensating advantage. It is extending the quarrel without settling it. Wisdom forbids this and rather dictates the confining it to the seat of the trouble, if it cannot be cured. The penalty in such a case (from which alas the unoffending suffer as well as those at fault), is that lovers of peace in other parts are cut off from visitation and intercourse. It is better to endure than fly asunder if the doctrine and law of Christ are received. If there is no remedy from within, try arbitration from without. If this does not produce harmony, it may, at all events, deliver the innocent. But to report the mischief merely is without profit and cannot be done in the *Christadelphian*. [Compiler's Note: See April's FROME above.]

(Excerpt from March 1876) LEEDS— Writing again Feb. 13th, brother Paterson reports that on that date the ecclesia had come to the decision to withdraw from brethren Humphrey and J. G. Chapman, for reasons which are furnished at length, but which it is not necessary to publish.

(Excerpt from May 1877) MUMBLES. — He also desires it to be notified that the following are not in fellowship with the ecclesia: Walter Winstone and wife, Thomas Behemia and Morgan Rees, sen. The intimation would have been made before, but that hopes were entertained of things coming right.

(January 1879) WHITE PLAINS (Md.).—An intimation of withdrawal from a brother here, will have to be more specific as to the cause before it can appear in the *Christadelphian*.

(Excerpt from March 1879) DUDLEY.—Brother Blount reports that during the month of January, the brethren and sisters withdrew from Mary Allen, who after a few months' profession of the truth, returned to Congregationalism.

(Excerpt from October 1880) SPALDING.—Brother Jane reports two withdrawals, viz., “brother Allenson who has not assigned any reason; and brother Simpson, from whom we had to withdraw on scriptural grounds.

(Excerpt from April 1881) CUMNOCK. — Owing to what appeared in the *Christadelphian* for last month, it is necessary to state in faithfulness that the ecclesia decided on 22nd August to withdraw from sister Dalgliesh on grounds ocularly demonstrated and previously discussed, and two brethren were appointed to inform her of this decision; her letter intimating her withdrawal (so called) is of date 30th October, and as a matter of course it was taken no notice of or considered.”

(October 1881) ALFRETON—Brother Turner wishes it now stated that the report of the withdrawal from Bro. Vernon, published in August, was on behalf of the Riddings ecclesia, not including Ripley and Swanwick, where the matter in several cases is not understood.

(Excerpt from November 1881) DUDLEY There has been an addition to our small number, viz., Mrs. JAKEMAN (33), wife of Bro. Jakeman, who was immersed into Christ Sept. 14th. On the other hand, we

have lost three by removal to Birmingham, viz.: Brother and Sister Smith, and Brother Smith. jun., and one withdrawn—Sister Smitherman—after long patience.

(Except from December 1881) GLOUCESTER-- We have withdrawn from Brother Jackson Glenton, and we wish to warn the brethren everywhere against him, as we fear he will attempt to impose upon them.— [He did so at Birmingham before the nature of his case was known, he has also been at Halifax; let the brethren beware.—EDITOR.]

(Excerpt from December 1881) TEWKESBURY-- There has been a revival. The brethren and sisters have started afresh to cleanse the body of all the dross it has gathered during the last 12 or 18 months. They have resolved that they will not fellowship any who meet with J. C. Phillips.

(February 1882) SWANWICK- There has been a wrong impression gathered by the brethren from the intelligence which appeared in the October number of the *Christadelphian*, from Bro. Turner. The idea which the brethren drew from this was that the Swanwick and Ripley Ecclesias sympathise with Bro. Vernon, and do not wish to abide by the decision of the Ridding's Ecclesia. This is wrong: we are thoroughly in harmony with the Riddings brethren in their withdrawal from Brother Vernon. What Bro. Turner wished to be understood was that there was an error in his former intelligence on this subject, in which it was stated that the Ripley, Riddings, and Swanwick Ecclesias had withdrawn from Bro. Vernon. The error was in the names of Ripley and Swanwick appearing, being three separate Ecclesias, and Bro. Turner, in his September intelligence, only wished to withdraw the names of Ripley and Swanwick, having used them in error. I also have to report the loss of Bro. Atkin to our Ecclesia, who has left this country for America.—J. DRAYCOTT.

(January 1883) LEICESTER- ELEANOR MARY YARDLEY, daughter of Brother and Sister Yardley, was inducted into the sin-covering name on Thursday, November 30. A tea meeting was held the same evening in connection with the Mutual Improvement Society, the meeting being the first anniversary of the society. On Wednesday, November 22, Brother Lucas, an old brother, fell asleep in the hope of a glorious resurrection. Brother Lucas before coming in to the truth some 10 or 12 years ago was a Methodist local preacher. His name appears (in conjunction with another brother now deceased) upon a Leicester circuit plan dated 1861. He was a very faithful and consistent brother, and until he became infirm was a very able exponent of the truth, in which he rejoiced, and in which he died firmly settled and grounded. The ecclesia, on the recommendation of the managing brethren, have withdrawn from John and Mrs. Cope. The brethren in other places are for good reasons advised to have no dealings with them.

(August 1883) RIVERTON.—The brethren of this district withdraw from sister Annie Ward, daughter of late bro. John Ward. Mr. and Mrs. ELLIOTT have obeyed the truth, with the assistance of brother Thomas More, who buried them in the waters of the Jacob's River, on Sunday, January 14. So writes bro. William Roberts.

(September 1883) RIPLEY-We have to report another addition to our little ecclesia, viz., JOHN BROWN (34), formerly neutral, who was introduced into the fellowship of the truth by being baptised into Christ, after having witnessed a good confession, Aug. 5th. We have to report also that we have been reluctantly, but unanimously, obliged to withdraw from sister Martha Jackson.—W. MITCHELL.

(January 1884) SYDNEY.—Since last writing, we have had the pleasure of immersing into the sin-covering name—September 13th, SUSAN BEAUMONT (44), formerly Baptist; September 21st, EMILY BUTLER (26), and October 5th, SAMUEL SEAWARD (28), and his wife, GERTRUDE (22). We also report with, sorrow, that we have found it necessary to withdraw from brother R. Tunnicliffe. We continue to maintain our testimony in Sunday evening lectures at the Temperance Hall, Pitt Street, which

we have taken for another year. We desire also to state that, at our annual meeting a few days ago, brother W. M. Bayliss was elected secretary for the ensuing year.—J. J. HAWKINS.

(February 1884) IRVINE- Bro. Mitchell reports the obedience of JOHN O. HARROW and THOMAS PEAK, both formerly of the Established Church, on Jan. 1. The ecclesia has found it necessary to withdraw from brethren David Hayburn, Robert Hinds, and Isaac Hinds. Bro. Nisbet, of Glasgow, has lectured here recently on “Man; what? whence? whither?” The annual social meeting was held on the first evening of the new year, when 35 assembled, some coming from distant towns. Profitable addresses were delivered by various brethren.—Bro. Mitchell appeals on behalf of bro. Dick, who has been out of work for two months, in consequence of bad health. He has a wife and six children dependent upon him. The Irvine brethren have done all in their power to assist him. The smallest contributions to his aid will be gratefully acknowledged by bro. Jas. Mitchell, 70, High Street, Irvine, Ayrshire.

(February 1884) FULHAM.—(15, Broxholm Road, S.W., Sundays 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m. Wednesdays 8 p.m.)—Bro. Marshall reports that the lectures continue to be well attended. Sister Pegg has removed to Chertsey and brother Chivers to Salisbury. “We have been reluctantly compelled to withdraw from brother Pegg.”

(Excerpt from March 1885) FULHAM (15, Broxholm Road, Walham Green, S. W.)— [Bro. Pegg wishes to say that he and sister Pegg went into the country for the benefit of sister Pegg’s health; and that there could be no ground for the ecclesia withdrawing from him. We publish the disclaimer merely as a matter of right, having no knowledge of the matter one way or other.—ED.]

(Excerpt from April 1885) FULHAM (15, Broxholm Road).—Bro. Hutchinson, referring to bro. Pegg’s disclaimer last month, says, “We are at a loss to understand his statement, as he is perfectly well acquainted with our reasons for disfellowshipping him. Should he make application to any of the ecclesias for fellowship, we will be pleased to furnish them with all particulars and correspondence on the matter leaving it to them to act as they may think best.

(Excerpt from June 1885) Nottingham. — Brother Kirkland writes:—“I have pleasure in reporting another addition to our number by the obedience of WILLIAM BORER SANDERS (49), who put on the sin-covering name in the appointed way on May 3rd. It is also my duty to report the withdrawal from us of bro. J. Pepper and bro. S. Richards.”

(July 1885) Cardiff.—Brother Symonds reports:—“On Whit-Monday we held a tea-meeting on behalf of the Sunday School, which was largely attended by the brethren and sisters and by some friends. Being a wet day, the meeting was held in a large room which was formerly used as a skating rink, kindly lent to the ecclesia for the occasion, by brother W. Trimmell. A most enjoyable and profitable evening was spent by all present. It is with regret that I have to report the withdrawal of the ecclesia from Albert Hough.”

(February 1886) Neath.—Brother Tucker reports that brother Morgans has ceased to be in fellowship with the ecclesia.

(August 1886) Crewe.—We are sorry that circumstances compel us to withdraw from brothers Bedson and Burden. The sister, whose removal to Runcorn I reported in last month’s, was not named Croper but Cooper. [Proper names should be written very plainly—Ed.] Our lectures are not very well attended during the summer months; people prefer walking out. But we don’t despair.—C. W. HEATH.

(August 1886) Huddersfield.—Brother and sisters Sanderson have left the ecclesia because of the adoption of fermented wine at the breaking of bread. It is a pity. The Lord did not prescribe vegetable

grape juice. He used wine—ordinary wine—which could intoxicate if used to excess, as shewn in the case of the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11:21.) Teetotalism is all very well as a rule of individual practice, but it ought not to be allowed to interfere with the divine ordinance, and divine significances. Rom. 14. applies only to private life.

(December 1886) Bradford (Yorks.)—Brother Booth announces that the ecclesia has withdrawn from brother Nicholson, for good reasons. They have been much troubled, but brother Booth thinks the morning is about to dawn upon them. There are two candidates for immersion. Sister Binns attends the meeting at Bradford, being nearer than Keighley. Sister Robinson, late of Sheffield, is also added to the ecclesia, having come to live at Shipley.

(May 1887) Caulfield (Victoria).—Bro. Barlow reports the immersion of Capt. F. F. HULSTON; and withdrawal from Bro. Schneider

(July 1888) BATH—The meetings have been much better attended during the past month. The brethren have withdrawn from brother and sister Strange and brother Knight. Brother Rowell was married to sister Periam on the ninth. We shall welcome our new sister with pleasure, and hope to engage her services in the Sunday school, where the Master has work for a willing and able sister. Brother Guest was a means of strength and upbuilding to the ecclesia. We should welcome any firm, steadfast brother in our assemblies, and be thankful for their assistance.—FREDERICK GEO. HOPKINS

(September 1892) LIVERPOOL—We have had to withdraw from brother J. W. Jackson, on account of his irregular attendance at the table. Sister Mary Collens has separated herself from the meeting, mainly on the grounds of the narrowness of the way. She also believes there is a personal devil,—a powerful spirit being whose evil work God permits and controls, and whom He will, in His own time, destroy. Then there is the mysterious disappearance of brother Clothier, of Chester, who has not been heard of since the 13th of July last, when he left Bristol, where he was spending his holidays to go to Bath to see some friends, since which time no tidings of him have been received by his wife or anyone else. Brother and sister Firth have removed from Liverpool to Stroud, near Gloucester, where we regret to hear they will be in isolation, as there are no brethren in his immediate neighbourhood. We feel that there is no consolation in these troubles, except in the confidence which we have that the promises of God stand sure, and that the good things for which His word has taught us to hope will come to pass, however men may fail. May He grant us grace to remain steadfast unto the end.—HY. COLLENS.

(October 1892) LIVERPOOL—Upon the 27th of August last, ISABEL GARSIDE (19), daughter of brother Garside, of Ormskirk, was immersed into the saving name. With reference to last month's report regarding brother Clothier's disappearance, letters have been received from him from Boston, U.S. in one of which the circumstance is explained. (Some have thought from the wording of last month's intelligence that brother Clothier's disappearance had influenced sister Mary Collens in separating herself. This is an entire misconception. There is no connection between the two things. The word "then" introducing the subject of brother Clothier's disappearance is used as a term of enumeration as detailing the various items of intelligence in that communication, and not as connecting it with the preceding sentence. The ambiguity is due to a slight editorial liberty.—ED.]

(October 1892) ADELAIDE.—Since our last report it has been our pleasure to assist the following to put on Christ in the appointed way:—FREDERICK JAMES LAYCOCK (38), formerly neutral; RACHEL COLLINS (25), formerly of Brisbane, neutral; ADA COBBLEDICK (21), daughter of brother Cobbledick, neutral, and her sister LUCY (18), neutral; also H. H. MANSFIELD (19), trained and nurtured in the fear of the Lord by his father and mother and brother and sister Mansfield. We have also received into fellowship, after an examination on the Scriptures, brother John Scrimshaw and his sister-



wife, Ann, from Rockhampton, Queensland, where they have been living in isolation. We continue to meet each Sunday morning at 11, for the breaking of bread, etc., as commanded, at the Hall, Wakefield Street. Also each Sunday evening a lecture is addressed or read to the alien, but we regret to say the attendance is very small. We hold a Bible class each Wednesday evening at 7.45. The Sunday School is held at the house of our brother Mansfield, Porter Street, Park-side, brother Mansfield and his sister-daughter Amy devoting their time to the important duty of training the young, and could you have heard the ready and correct answers given by the scholars, from the *Christadelphian Catechism*, you would have readily admitted that the labours of our brother and sister had not been in vain. We have just held our annual examination of Sunday School and our tea meeting, and we all, brothers and sisters and scholars, spent a most happy and profitable evening. I am pleased to add four of our elder scholars have applied for immersion, and we are not among those who would forbid water to any, of whatever age, who, intelligently and believingly, pass an examination in the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. For the information of any brother who may be passing through Adelaide, I may state that our brother Funnell can be found at Messrs. Charlick Brothers, grocers, Rundle Street, also myself at the same address. Our brother Wenner, at Messrs. J. J. Green and Co., leather merchants, Hindley Street; our recording brother Lanham, at Florence Street, Goodwood. It is always best for brethren, when travelling, to carry a letter of introduction. Our ecclesia being based upon a wholly-inspired Bible, we desire to fellowship none but the true metal. We have had our troubles and divisions, but now working in love. We have withdrawn from a brother and sister for their teaching and believing that we might remain in fellowship with the churches of error, and at the return of the Master receive the gift of immortality. We have had to withdraw from a sister for continual absence from the table, and from another for disorderly walk. This is greivous, indeed. We thank our Father for the restored health of our dear sister Roberts. We read and enjoy the monthly *Christadelphian* and *Good Company*, and would rather give up a meal a day than miss the monthly feast of Scriptural comfort and upbuilding in "the faith." The sky is darkening as the days pass on. Political and social troubles are increasing on every hand. God's chosen people are being hunted and driven hither and thither, and will find no rest until they return to their own land. Let us work and watch and pray, for at an hour we think not we may hear the gladsome shout, "Behold the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet Him." We are looking for His return to earth to set up His glorious kingdom and reign.—JOHN B. HOPKINS.

(December 1895) STOCKPORT -Since last writing it has been our reluctant duty to withdraw our fellowship from two members of our ecclesia. In July it was necessary to withdraw from brother A. Anthony, and in October from sister Sarah J. Hodgkinson. Our meetings are fairly well attended and some interest is manifested. We had a pleasant visit from brother Shuttleworth, who lectured for us on October 13th, in connection with which we had a small tea meeting in the room on the Saturday afternoon.—S. F. WILLSON.

(November 1896) DERBY.—Brother Clark reports that the brethren have been compelled to withdraw from brother Robert Wood.

(January 1897) LEAMINGTON.—Brother Willitts reports withdrawal from brother Hudson on the ground of his impeachment of the ecclesial attitude of antagonism to the new doctrines promulgated by brother Andrew. Brother Hudson could not attend the meeting of which he was notified, but sent a letter to say "he saw no absolute necessity for him to do so as the matter in question was straight." Correspondence accompanies the announcement.

(January 1897) MANCHESTER.—(*Geoffrey Street, Shakespear Street, Sundays at 3 and 6–30*).—Since our last communication, we have had the co-operation of brother Eley, who is attending College in Manchester, and who has assisted in exhortation and lecturing. We have had to withdraw from brother and sister Keay, of Sale.

(February 1897) NEWPORT (MON.). — Brother Schofield reports: “Our lectures, which are being well attended, have been by our own brethren, with the exception of one by brother D. J. Hughes, of Swansea, whom we were pleased to see and hear. He delivered the word of exhortation on firmness in doctrine, intertwined with those Christ-like graces produced by the obedience required by the word of truth, as exemplified before us in our living head, who was obedient unto death, and hath been highly exalted. Brother and sister Collard have lost their youngest child, who died on December 30th, 1896, aged 11 months, who had been suffering from convulsions. Brother J. Lander officiated at the interment, at Newport cemetery, January 3rd, 1897. We have also to report withdrawal from brother Joseph Medhcott, after long patience and frequent admonition. On December 26th, 1896, we gave our Sunday School their annual tea and entertainment, which passed on very satisfactory, comprising: Reading of Scriptures, singing of anthems and hymns, views by magic lantern—on which brother W. Collard lectured, as they were presented to view. Brother J. Lander presided. Brethren and sisters were present from the Pontypool and Abergavenny ecclesia.

(July 1897) OLDHAM.—“On May 18th we assisted one more to put on the Name of Christ in baptism, viz., ALFRED MELLOR, formerly neutral. Against this I have to report withdrawal from brother James Bell. Lectures for the month:—May 16th, ‘The goodness and severity of God, as shown in the work which Christ will accomplish on his return to the earth’ (brother S. A. Garside, of Ormskirk); 23rd, ‘He that hath not the Son shall not see life—what then?’ (brother J. Battersby, of Droylsden); 30th, ‘The Glory to be Revealed at the Coming of Christ’ (brother S. Ormerod, of Heywood); June 6th, ‘Resurrection—is it essential to Salvation?’ (brother S. F. Willson, of Stockport).”—J. E. BAMFORD.

(August 1897) LEAMINGTON. — Brother Hudson protests against the published withdrawal of the brethren here from him, and requests that his protest be considered. We have done so in connection with the evidence, and can see no ground for demurring to the action of the ecclesia. Brother Hudson has, of course, a perfect right to accept the new doctrines promulgated by brother Andrew: but he cannot reasonably find fault with the brethren for recognising and acting on the change.

(September 1897) LONDON (Ont.). — We again report progress here. It has been rather up-hill work; some having withdrawn (or rather we withdrew from them), because we have a hope of being kings and priests in the future age, which they deny; also that Jesus of Nazareth was born king of the Jews. We claim that Jesus is the immortal king, because he said so; the prophets and all the teaching of the scriptures is that Jesus is “the king.” Nevertheless, we are now sound, having all those who hold to the contrary parted from us. We meet in Duffield Block, corner of Clarence and Dundas Streets, at 11 a.m., for the breaking of bread, and in the evening at 7 p.m., with subjects for the stranger, that some may see their weakness and come to the truth. Brother Parkin, of Hamilton, was with us in May; he has been a great help to this ecclesia. We also had a visit from brother Mitchell, of Woodstock, on June 20th, and sister Bruce, of Jersey City, N.J., on June 11th and 18th. We very much enjoyed their company, and will be very pleased to meet all those who are firm on the Birmingham basis.—J. WYATT.

Rule 34

That no brother or sister withdrawn from by, or out of fellowship with, another ecclesia shall be received in fellowship until the case shall have been investigated, and found such as to warrant the reception of the said brother or sister; but that this investigation shall not take place without first asking the said other ecclesia to take part in the proposed investigation: that if the said other

ecclesia shall refuse their cooperation in the said investigation, the matters in question shall be investigated without them; that if, on the other hand, they consent to take part in it, they shall, after the re-investigation conducted in their presence, have equal voting power with the first ecclesia, and that no decision shall be valid without the concurrence of a majority of the assembly so constituted of the two ecclesias fused together in equality of numbers; if one ecclesia exceeds the other in number, the equality to be obtained by counting off alphabetically the excess on whichever side it may be, and not allowing that excess to vote. *The Ecclesial Guide* pgs. 39-38

(October 1897) NEWPORT.—We are sorry to report that we lose by removal sister K. Heaton, who has gone to reside near Bournemouth, and we have also, according to the written word and our Constitution, rule 34 [see above compiler], had to withdraw fellowship from brother Hughes, late of your ecclesia, now at Abergavenny, until he complies with the decision of the arranging brethren of your ecclesia. During the month we have had the pleasure of the company of brother and sister Heard, of Neath, and we received the word of exhortation from brother Heard to do well; and brother Williams, of Pontypool, who spoke words of encouragement to us to be firm and press forward towards the grand mark. Brother Dilling, of Ystrad, visited us, seeking a change of residence, on account of sister Dilling's health as where they are now living is against her health; and Sunday last we had brother Brookes and sister Heard, jun., of Neath, with us at the Lord's table, and proclamation of the glad tidings to the persisting, as in all the other cases; brother James, of Abergavenny, also paid us a visit, and we were glad to have his company as a fellow pilgrim to the promised rest.—E. S. SCHOFIELD.

[The allusion to the attitude of the Abergavenny ecclesia in the matter of brother Hughes' case is not sufficiently clear to publish.—C.C.W.]

(December 1897) PORTSMOUTH.—In my report last month, I omitted to mention that we have removed from Jubilee Hall, to the Templars Hall, Charlotte Street, Landport, the site of the Jubilee Hall being required for business premises. Brother Evans, of London, came down and gave the opening lecture in the new hall, which is situated on a ground floor and more adapted for the invitation of the stranger, and quite a few have availed themselves of the opportunity of hearing the truth, which is being put forth by the brethren. Some younger brethren having taking up the sword in a lecturing capacity, a good variety is maintained. I hinted last month, we hoped for a brighter lining behind the cloud, and I am thankful to say we are beginning to realise it, for besides the lectures being better attended, the Sunday School has been re-organised, and brethren are working with renewed energy, but even this source of joy has not been attained without much pain, for the brethren have been obliged to withdraw from brother and sister Heard, owing to their continuing to utter false accusations against a brother and sister in the ecclesia. Will brethren please note change of address of Hall and the recording brother, who has removed from Waterloo House to 83, Drayton Road, North End.—WILLIAM PEAD.

[Brother A. J. Saunders, formerly recording brother, writes a long letter explaining how the withdrawal of himself and two sisters came about. He does not exactly complain, and no useful purpose would be served in publishing the letter. Granted that there have been wrongs and misunderstandings, the issue in his case is clear. He says:—"I, together with the two sisters—Welsford and Saunders—sent in our final withdrawal, expressing our belief in the non-resurrection of any out of Christ, that is, those who had not passed through the waters of baptism, and also our conviction that there could be no neutrality in the matter whatever." The other matter of the omission of an item of intelligence is but a trifle.—C. C. W.]

## INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL WITHDRAWALS DUE TO DOCTRINAL ERROR

(December 1867) GALASHIELS.—Brother W. Milne writes "We have lost our brother Richard Pearson, through error concerning resurrection and judgment imported from Glasgow, that hot-bed of sedition concerning the truth."

(January 1868) CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.—Brother W. A. Harris, of this place, writing to Brother Andrew, of London, on the 2nd of December, makes the following observations in reference to a division that has recently taken place, among the professors of the truth in that republican city: "We have taken this position, that we will not fellowship those who teach and believe in a superhuman devil, or who do not believe in the saints appearing in body at the judgment-seat of Christ, there to receive the approval or condemnation resulting from our probationary career. This separates us from the mass of those who profess to be of the one faith and also from those in this city from whom we withdrew, who have now taken the position that the saints come up in immortal bodies to receive rewards, and not to the scriptural judgment of life and death. [Compiler's Note: See "the Christianity taught by the apostles" for what "republican city" means under; examples of the likes of the apostasy- external]

(February 1869) CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.—Brother W. A. Harris, writing December 11th, says the Christadelphians who have recently separated from the communion of the Dowieite or Wilsonite party of that place, number 30, sound and true in the judgment of the writer. The Wilsonites he says are intensely opposed to judgment of the saints, and characterize the doctrine as damnable heresy. A recent addition to the Christadelphians from this body had been immersed in a partial knowledge of the truth, and discovering on investigation, that his faith did not embrace all that is included in a Scriptural profession of faith, he determined to be re-immersed, and join the Christadelphians. On discovering the defect of his position before leaving the Wilsonites, he began to urge his conviction upon those with whom he was in fellowship; but met with nothing but opposition from those styling themselves "brethren of the one faith." They, however, preferring unity at any cost, delegated two of the leading brethren to persuade, if possible, Brother Norton to remain in fellowship with them. They said he could stay with them, even if he did not hold their views, "thus," observes Brother Harris, "they were willing to fellowship what some of their body called damnable heresy, rather than allow division to occur. The Christadelphians are unmoved by the bitter things said about them by those they have left, and are only too glad now that they have no connection with such a sickly body, who seek to live in harmony at the expense of the welfare of the truth, and who do not observe the line of demarcation to be broadly drawn in these days between that truth and the apostasy. The Christadelphians know what they believe, and do not hesitate to repudiate any who, under the guise of friends, are in reality most deadly enemies to the truth, and who, 'by good words and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple.'"

(May 1869) TURRIFF.—Brother Robertson transmits a document signed by the members of the ecclesia, setting forth reasons for withdrawing from the fellowship of MARY MONRO. The reasons relate to doctrine and not to character. Mary Monro holding that the belief and obedience of the gospel of the kingdom were not necessary to salvation, the brethren concluded to take the step announced.

(February 1870) INNERKIP.—Brother Malcolm writing Dec. 6th, says “We persevere in our testimony for the truth. There has been no addition to our number lately, but there is a prospect that some will shortly join themselves to the saving name in this community. The ecclesia has thought it a duty to withdraw from one brother on the question of resurrection and judgment; and also its support from the *Marturion*, on account of the course it has pursued of late.”

(Excerpt from December 1873) LONDON. — Although the London ecclesia has not been mentioned in the *Christadelphian*, in reference to the recent controversy which has caused division in several ecclesias, the subject has, of course, not escaped attention here. In addition to the printed matter issued on both sides of the question, which has been circulated amongst the brethren, and read by them, we have had five special meetings for the consideration of the matter, viz. a lecture by brother J. J. Andrew, who afterwards submitted to questioning thereon; a lecture by brother Watts (maintaining the unforfeited-life theory), who also answered questions afterwards; then a meeting at which brothers Watts and J. J. Andrew questioned each other in turn; and finally, a two nights’ discussion between brother J. J. Andrew and David Handley. This discussion is to be repeated at Maldon shortly. At first, many of the brethren were impressed with the ‘uncondemnation’ arguments, but upon further reading and reflection, assisted by the meetings referred to, most of them have come to see that the new theory is opposed to the Scriptures. On the 16th inst., we held a meeting, ‘to take into consideration the question of fellowship in relation to the controversy concerning the sacrifice of Christ;’ when the following resolutions were carried by a large majority (about 12 voting for amendments to the opposite effect):

‘That we believe that the Scriptures teach that Jesus Christ, being the seed of the woman, the seed of Abraham, the fruit of David’s loins, and made of a Jewish woman, thereby inherited the consequences of Adam’s sin, including the sentence of death passed upon the whole race of which he was a member, and that, therefore, he did not possess a life free from the Edenic condemnation; that through having God for his Father, he was enabled, although tempted in all points like as we are, to render perfect obedience to the Divine will; and that in consequence of that obedience, he was raised from the dead and endowed with eternal life by the power of God.’

2.—‘That in view of the apostolic injunctions requiring us to be of one mind, especially in regard to the doctrine of the Christ, those who cannot endorse the foregoing resolution, and believe that Jesus Christ came in flesh free from the Edenic sentence of death, are hereby requested to withdraw from fellowship until they become of the same mind with us on the subject.’”

(Excerpt from December 1873) RIVERSIDE (Iowa).—Brother R. J. Jones reports the declension of brother J. K. Speer, as set forth more particularly in editorial remarks in this number, on “Perilous Times.” Brother Jones says brother Speer ran well for a time, and was dearly beloved by the brethren. He did not keep pace with the brethren generally, but when he began to teach (after his removal to Claremont) that the assembly of the brethren together, for the breaking of bread, was a delusion of the apostacy, and that baptism belonged to the same category, they could bear with him no longer, “so in sorrow we leave poor brother Speer in his own misguided way.”

(May 1874) PHILADELPHIA, Penn.—Brethren Miller and Parker report a sad condition in the ecclesia of this place. There rose up some denying the judgment; teaching that now is the time believers are giving account to God; that the righteous only come forth at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are incorruptible before they see Christ. Thus setting aside the doctrine contained in the words of the apostle: “We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ; so that everyone shall give an account of himself to God.”— (2 Cor. 5:10; Rom. 14; 1. 12.) The chief teachers are Jno. Q. Williams and William Smitheman, and they have carried nearly all the ecclesia. “A few of us,” write brethren Miller and Parker, “who hold fast the doctrine as proclaimed by our Lord Jesus Christ and the apostles, and by our brother

Thomas (whom we know in the flesh no more) in *Anastasis*, have withdrawn from them, and meet at the house of sister Pyle, 403, North 39th street. (Any brother addressing letters to this No. will be cordially received.) Brother Skinner of London, England, was with us during part of the discussion on the subject, and he promised to give you the information on his arrival at home (in London). But as nothing concerning our trouble appeared in the *Christadelphian*, we conclude he dropped the intention. (Brother Skinner fulfilled his promise, but we thought it wise not to publish the bad tidings till the case was past hope.—ED.) We hope our erring brethren may turn from the error of their way, and be accepted in the day of judgment.”

(August 1875) INNERLEITHEN. Bro. Dew reports that one named Stoddart, who was immersed some time ago, has returned like the washed sow to the mire. He is meeting with the Revivalists and otherwise acting unworthily of the truth. Unavailing efforts have been made to bring him to righteous ways; consequently, withdrawal was the only alternative.

(Excerpt from January 1876) MANCHESTER. — Mr. H. S. Sherwood, whose suspension of fellowship with the Manchester ecclesia, in connection with the Renunciationist schism, was reported twelve months ago, requests it to be made clear that he does not deny that the Lord Jesus “came in the flesh;” but suspends his judgment on the question raised by the schism in question, believing the Scriptures afford no answer to it.

(Excerpt from April 1876) SWANSEA.—The brethren here have adopted and printed the statement of the one faith appearing in the *Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia* of 1874–5. They have been compelled to take this step on account of the advocacy of unscriptural views in their midst. The step has resulted in the separation of the Goldie family, and one or two others. Brother Randles, in communicating this result, while deeply regretting it, says the step has been forced upon them in defence of the purity of the faith and the name of the Son of God.

(July 1876) GRANTHAM.—Brother Hawkins reports the return to the world of John Wright, who after a long process of gradual apostacy, with which the brethren have forborne in hope, has finally through drink and other causes, abandoned the life of godliness.

(March 1878) CHELTENHAM.—Brother Gale reports the obedience of Mr. P. BENDALL (29), upholsterer, furniture remover, &c., who was immersed Jan. 28th. He also states that the brethren have had to withdraw from brother Stone on account of his having received the Dealtry heresy, that Jesus was the natural son of Joseph and not the Son of God.—[In answer to an enquiry from brother Gale, we may say that the heresy in question was combatted in a series of articles that appeared in the *Christadelphian* (see 1867 December) ten years ago, under the title, “Who was the Father of Jesus?” Mr. Dealtry’s arguments were all answered in those articles. The exigencies of the case do not yet call for the labour of public debate. What the future may bring forth, no one, of course, can tell. It seems a misfortune that brethren anywhere should have to waste time at such a supremely interesting moment as the present in discussing what the truth is, instead of applying it in that purification which will prepare them to meet the Son of God at his appearing and his kingdom. However, we know it is written: “it must need be that offences come: but woe unto that man by whom they come.”—EDITOR.]

(November 1878) STOCKPORT.—Brother Waite reports withdrawal from fellowship with bro. Bradburn, for slander, and further the withdrawal of brother Beaumont, from the ecclesia, from sympathy with the no-will theory. The place of the latter, however, has been filled by the return of one who had for a while been identified with that same heresy.

(December 1878) GREAT YARMOUTH.—Brother Diboll, jun., writes:—“I am sorry to report that we have had to withdraw from D. Spinney and R. Dyson, on account of an avowal, by them, of a belief in the human paternity of the Lord Jesus. (The foregoing, by an oversight, was omitted from last month’s intelligence.)

(January 1879) BIRKENHEAD.—Brother Collens writing December 19th, reports with sorrow that on the 14th of August last, the ecclesia found it expedient to withdraw from fellowship with brethren R. D. Robertson and Abel Andrew. This action was partly the result of brother Robertson’s own procedure: who demanded a declaration whether or not he was to be at liberty to hold views of history and prophecy respecting the scattered Ten Tribes of Israel, contrary to the views held by the brethren throughout the world. The result was a decision adverse to brother R.’s ideas. Continued efforts have been made to bring them to recognise the truth of the matter, but hitherto without much effect. The action taken by the ecclesia on the date mentioned, did not meet with the entire approval of several members of the ecclesia, and a special meeting was held on the 28th of October, to consider the whole subject, which resulted in the passing of a resolution repudiating the theory which claims for the powerful British nation a possible or probable identity with the scattered house of Israel *alias* ‘the lost Ten Tribes,’ and recording an entire though sorrowful approval of the action of the ecclesia in withdrawing from the two brethren named. On the 6th ultimo, a letter was received from the following members of the ecclesia, viz.: brethren Thomas N. Parker, Clara A. Parker, Annette Andrew, Elizabeth Andrew, and Esther B. Robertson, condemning the action of the ecclesia, and expressing a determination to fellowship brethren R. D. Robertson and A. Andrew, as a matter of comfort to them under the separation. “These troubles” observes brother Collens, “have been exceedingly painful to us as a body; we have as it were cut off our right hand and lost the remainder of the limb from sympathy; but we are confident that we have done that which is right in the sight of the Deity, and still cherish the hope that we may yet be reunited on the sure foundation of the word of life. [Compiler’s Note: Dark gray the result of Bro. Collens]; [underlined Mat. 18:15-18]

(Excerpt from March 1879) MCMINNVILLE.—Bro. L. T. Nichols writes: “It has been some time since I sent intelligence. The reason is, we have been having some trouble. I was in hopes that all would be governed by the truth; but not so. You will recollect that I stated there were two Restitution preachers who had obeyed the truth, and were helping to proclaim the whole truth. Instead of that, they are sowing discord and trouble. We had a five days’ Grove meeting, and I showed that it was wrong to take the *Restitution* paper, and write to it, especially to address them as ‘brethren.’ I wanted them all to take the *Christadelphian*. We have since, withdrawn from, and have no fellowship with, H.C.P., one of the preachers, and several others, who have been agitating crotchets subversive of the truth. When they were immersed, they professed to have given up their crotchets. Paul tells us in 1st Cor. 11:19, ‘There must be heresies among us, that they which are approved may be made manifest.’ How true it has been with us in Oregon. We have just closed an eight-day meeting; and truly the brethren are much more firm and shine the brighter on account of the heresies which have been among us. None of Christ’s sheep will follow after heresies or strangers, but every one will be governed by the truth in all things; and if any will not do this, it is only evident that they are not Christ’s sheep.

(November 1879) SMALL HEATH.—Brother Heeley reports the withdrawal of the ecclesia from brethren Carter, Markley and Parsons, on the ground of their immersion of some persons against the judgment of the majority of the ecclesia, and of their adoption and advocacy of the doctrine that the birth of the Spirit takes place in the present life.

(November 1879) MC.MINNEVILLE, OREGON. — Brother Nichols reports “Since his last communication six more have become obedient to the faith. CHESTER SKEELS, formerly Adventist; T. WALKER, (from Canada, and formerly of the Hacking party); FRANK BORLEN, formerly Catholic; CAROLINE WARK, formerly neutral; NELLIE RIDER, formerly of the Thurman party; and WILLIAM

SAMPSON, son of sister Sampson formerly neutral. The last four were immersed at the close of the Yearly Grove meeting, which commenced on Thursday evening, June 19th, and continued night and day over two Sundays. All were thoroughly pleased with the meetings. Sixty eight brethren and sisters have signed an act of withdrawal from brethren Wing, Skeels and Plummer on the ground of corruption in doctrine and practice. The document has been transmitted to us with the list of names. But this notice of it is sufficient.

(April 1880) CHELTENHAM.—Brother Smith reports the separation from the Cheltenham ecclesia, of Mrs. Stone and Miss Sykes, on account of their acceptance of Charles Dealtry's belief that Jesus Christ is the son of Joseph in the natural sense. Brother Smith says: "We no longer consider them members of this ecclesia, and sincerely trust that none of the other members will be carried away by this heresy." [This intelligence was inadvertently omitted last month].

(Excerpt from July 1880) EDINBURGH.—Brother W. Grant writes: "Since my last communication, we have had several changes in our ecclesia. Brother Culbert removed on 24th May, to Glasgow. We shall miss him very much. On Friday, June 11th, the following brethren and sisters sailed for New York, where they will probably stay for some time, viz.: brethren James Ross, Wm. Wood, jun., John Smith and William Smith, and sisters Cecilia and Jessie Smith.—The two last-named brethren being brothers in the flesh to the sisters. We commend them to the care of those of like precious faith whom they may meet in their new home. Their removal has caused a considerable gap in our Young Men's Bible Class, of which they were all members. Another loss, more serious than a removal, is the withdrawal from the truth, and return to the 'church' of Scotland of sister Annie Marshall. Sister Hogg and sister Annie Hogg from Glasgow meet with us.

(August 1880) GREENOCK.—Brother Monaghan reports the removal of brother Elliott to Bristol; also trouble through the introduction of the Renunciationist leaven. The brethren, few in number, but resolved to hold fast the faith in its apostolic purity, meet in the Baker's Hall, 8, Market Street, and will be glad of the visit of faithful brethren.

(September 1880) WARWICK AND LEAMINGTON.—Touching the non-publication of intelligence from Leamington last month, friends there applied to know the cause. An answer was furnished based on information by brother Herne, of Warwick, to the effect that they had been withdrawn from by those in fellowship with brother Herne, including the brethren at Easington, on the ground of their acceptance of the doctrine that we are now born of the Spirit. Brother Herne says: "It is true that they meet together and receive fresh members, but not on the basis of the truth, as held by you or any community of Christadelphians. So far as I know the truth, I could not hold fellowship with them, as I believe, with the exception of brother and sister Sharp, who are in fellowship with us, they hold a great error, which is the beginning and middle and end of all they teach."

(January 1881) ALBANY (Ogn.).—Brother A. Marshall reports his withdrawal from the L. T. Nichols' fellowship, which he accepted some time back, under the mistaken impression that those composing it were uncompromising friends of the truth. He finds they are Renunciationists.

(March 1881) CUMNOCK.—Brother McDougall reports withdrawal from James Dalglish on the ground of unscripturalness of doctrine.

(January 1881) MUDDIFORD. — Brother John Sanders writes of withdrawal from brother Veysey. He says "I have not heard from Taunton since I last wrote you. Our brother Veysey does not reply now to our questions or letters, we therefore fear that he has or is leaving the truth for fables. In my last to him I told him that we must withdraw from fellowship if he continued to hold the dogmas on the Sabbath and other



questions that he had circulated in the tracts sent out by him. To this we got no reply. We fear that brethren who may come in contact with these papers and doings, may be led away thereby if not warned in some way of the danger.”

(January 1882) GLOUCESTER--The names of the brethren and sisters who ceased to fellowship with us on the 1st of January, of this year (1881), are Frank Forrester, George A. Baker, George A. Thody, Sarah Thody, Emily Baker, Mary Ann Forrester, and Julian Hodges. In consequence of their disorderly walk, we have withdrawn from them. We have also been compelled to withdraw from William Hodges, on account of his adoption of what has been called “Humanitarian Christadelphianism” (the belief that Joseph was the actual father of Jesus.—ED.)—A. H. ROGERS

(February 1883) PETERMARITZBURG (NATAL).—Brother Elliott reports reduction in numbers through division of which it is not needful to give the particulars. Suffice it to say that on the 30th October, Brethren Crichton, Gabriel, and Sutherland were withdrawn from, for their avowed belief that the birth of the spirit is a matter of present experience.

(February 1883) SPOTTSVILLE (KY.)—Brother R. C. Green writes:—Dr. Thomas introduced the truth here some 30 years ago. The good seed soon sprang up, and prospered till the no judgment doctrine came. This caused great trouble among the brethren at the time, and came very near destroying the influence of the truth in a public way. A few, however, remained who, though not in harmony, continued to meet and break bread. A great effort was made on the part of some to hush the matter and prevent further discussion, and thus things have remained, with only an occasional outbreak, until recently. The question of the nature of Jesus, which created so much trouble in England in “1873,” created some little stir, but was not regarded as a matter of much importance, the brethren for the most part, however, inclining to the free life theory. Since “1879,” the two subjects have again been brought before the ecclesia, causing some of us to resolve to unite ourselves on a surer basis of fellowship. With a view to this end, on the eighth of October, 1882, an agreement was presented to the brethren, setting forth that we, the undersigned, agree that the (published) statement of the “one faith” upon which the Birmingham ecclesia is founded, is true and Scriptural, and that the fables specified therein should be rejected, that the above should constitute the basis of fellowship among believers of the truth, and that we hereby withdraw from fellowship with all who will not endorse the above by signing this agreement. This was signed by Jas. W. Griffin, L. M. Griffin, E. J. Griffin, A. T. Green, W. J. Green, R. C. Green, Mary J. Griffin, Sallie E. Lester, Patsie M. Griffin, E. W. Pruitt, Elizabeth Butler, Virginia A. Butler, Sue F. Green, Bettie Cosby, Oma Griffin, J. E. Griffin, W. J. Connaway, G. P. Pruitt. Since the recent agitation previously mentioned, the following named brethren, becoming dissatisfied with their former immersion, have been reimmersed: J. E. Griffin, Jas. W. Griffin, E. J. Griffin, G. P. Pruitt, E. W. Pruitt, Elizabeth Butler, Virginia A. Butler, Bettie Cosby, Oma Griffin. Brother Jas. W. Griffin, who has been a devout member of the ecclesia since its earliest existence, made a very interesting and impressive address at the water’s edge, explanatory of his present action. Brother Pruitt and Sister Elizabeth Butler expressed themselves in a similar manner privately.

Excerpt Oct. 1881 Our soon-to-be Brother, J. W. Joseph, is greatly rejoicing in the light, and we are greatly rejoicing in him. Only a few months back he was trying to become a Free Thinker. On mentioning the hope of the Gospel to him, I found that he was a Jew after the flesh, well versed in the Scriptures, old and new, and that he had given up the Jewish faith some years since, and had taken leading positions in various orthodox faiths. He had left these one after another in disgust, on finding that none of them acted out the part of the book they professed to take as their guide, and so the glorious truths of the Gospel were cast aside. I found him a very able opponent, and he had put to silence orthodoxy, from the minister downwards, but he was greatly surprised to find himself making no headway in his opposition to the truth, but the reverse. We had many animated discussions, generally during business hours, and in the presence of others (of the world). Feeling the weakness of his position one day, he confessed I was the best arguer. I soon put him right on that point, by showing him that it was the slippery ground he stood on that made him feel weak, and the firm foundation the truth gave, that gave my argument force. I saw he was giving in, and that light had dawned. I think it was his next visit, he exclaimed, 'I see it, I see it, I see it all now, as plain as a pikestaff. Ah, well, Mr. Simons, I did want something to anchor to.' Could you have seen the earnestness in which this was said, you would have rejoiced, even as I did, my dear brother, and as I know you have done, many, many times. He is now earnestly and anxiously seeking, and showing the good tidings to his wife (who is suffering from deafness, but gladly receiving them)

(May 1883) OUTRAM, OTAGO.—Brother Simons writes to correct an error, into which he inadvertently fell, in the report of Brother Joseph's immersion in the *Christadelphian* for Oct., 1881. Instead of saying that Brother Joseph himself —had given up the Jewish faith some years since," he should have affirmed this of his forefathers. The mistake was quite unintentional on his part and he much regrets that some of the brethren should have seen in so slight a matter a ground of offence and complaint. Especially now that he is compelled to report withdrawal from said Brother Joseph, which he hopes will prove but a temporary suspension of fraternal intercourse. [Compiler's Note: See text box above]

(January 1884) BRISBANE.—Brother Mitchell, writing from this place, October 10th, reports the withdrawal of the brethren from several whom the brethren found to be in sympathy with Dowieism, and given to raillery against the prominent friends of the truth in its purity. The brethren, who recently emigrated to Brisbane from Leicester. England, have reached their destination. Others from other parts have been detained on board the vessel in which they sailed, in consequence of the quarantine restrictions imposed on the discovery that there were 30 cases of fever among the passengers. No fewer than 13 deaths have occurred on board.

(March 1884) LEICESTER- Brother Gamble reports withdrawal from bro. Baker, who has turned from the truth. Brother Archer has removed to Leicester from Mansfield.

(Excerpt from September 1884) LINCOLN-Brother F. J. Roberts writes:—"We regret having to report the withdrawal of our young sister, Elizabeth Rawlinson, from the truth, to join a sect calling themselves 'The New and Latter House of Israel's Church.' She was baptised last October. Being a domestic servant, she was unable, except at her reception, to meet with us at the memorial feast.—Brother H. H. Horsman, of London, lectured here on Wednesday, the 6th inst., on 'Reform needed in Religious Matters.' About 50 outsiders assembled, when our brother set before them man's nature and the punishment of sin in a very

clear and scriptural manner, with a reference to God's ultimate purpose on the earth. The lecture was much appreciated by the brethren and others.

(October 1884) ABERGAVENNY- The brethren here have had to withdraw from Edward Hill and Mrs. Gronow. The former was one of the first to accept the truth in this town, but having removed to Cardiff, he came into contact with some Spiritualists, and subsequently discarded the truth, as it is in Jesus. Mrs. Gronow has likewise apostatized from the one faith. She has left the Church of Christ, and joined the Church of England, *as by law established*, and, although a middle-aged woman, she recently underwent the absurd and empty ceremony of "confirmation," at the hands of one of the pseudo successors of the apostles. It, of course, gives us much pain to see brethren and sisters fall away from the truth, but these painful incidents should act as an incentive to those who continue to hold it, to remain steadfast and unmovable to the end, remembering that it is written, "God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth, that also shall he reap."—WILLIAM SMITH.

(October 1884) LIVERPOOL-Our intelligence for the past month is of a particularly painful nature; we have had to stand aside from brother George Smith, because he has neglected the spiritual injunction to assemble ourselves together, and from brother Samuel Ashcroft because he too has turned his back upon the table of the Lord to play an organ at a Congregational Church. We do this not willingly but in sorrow, trusting that the scriptural course may have the intended effect, that they also may sorrow unto repentance.—Brother Robert Monaghan has removed hence to Cardiff.

(January 1885) SWANSEA- We have had the painful duty of withdrawing from sister Elizabeth Palmer, for disorderly walking, and from bro. Usher, for publicly expressed disbelief in the inspiration of portions of the Scriptures. These occurrences have caused much sadness amongst us.

(October 1885) Devonport.— Some time ago, bro. Sleep reported withdrawal from bro and sister Locke, and afterwards bro. Pope, on account of their having imbibed a view that led them to maintain that the Christadelphians are not in Christ, and have no hope. The report was delayed in publication till bro. Roberts should have an opportunity of conferring with the sister and two brethren in question. He has had that opportunity, but unhappily without favourable result.—On Sept. 6th, the brethren started a Sunday school with 11 scholars; resolved not to despise the day of small things.

(October 1885) Neath.—Bro. Tucker reports withdrawal from bro. Morgan for teaching partial inspiration; also that an interesting lecture was delivered on Sunday, August 23rd, by bro. Davies, of Mumbles, on "Jerusalem: Past, present, and future."

(May 1886) Lincoln.—Brother Scott (63, Alfred Street), reports that since the resolution of April 12th, 1885, the brethren in Lincoln have found it necessary to declare themselves again in consequence of the presence in their midst of some in sympathy with the tolerators of partial inspiration. The result has been withdrawal from seven brethren and sisters, leaving the following as composing the ecclesia: *Brethren*: Brittan, Elwick, T. Hy. Elwick, Hinch, McDonald, Elwick, T. Scott, Taylor. *Sisters*; Burnett, E. J. Burnett, Elwick, Fleming, Hinch, Reeson, Roberts, Scott, Taylor, and Woodcock. These continue to break bread at the Exchange Arcade.

(July 1886) Pietermaritzburg. — Brother Ker writes:—"I have the pleasure of stating on behalf of the Maritzburg ecclesia that after certain correspondence with brother R. Elliott (representing the Durban ecclesia), a meeting was convened for the consideration of the question of the birth of the Spirit in relation to the withdrawal from brothers Gabriel, Crichton, and Sutherland, with a view to the reunion of the two ecclesias, these last named not being at present in the Maritzburg ecclesia. The following propositions were put to the meeting, and agreed to, on the distinct understanding, however, that all or

any of the three brethren in question would not be refused fellowship if it was clearly shown by them that *their* interpretation of the third chapter of John merely meant a change of mind, and did not at all include anything appertaining to present immortality:—‘1. That we believe the birth of the spirit referred to in John 3:5-6 to imply the change from mortality to immortality after judgment. 2. That we would refuse to fellowship any who believe that the birth of the Spirit—that is the change from mortality to immortality—is a thing of present experience in any sense.’ Another resolution related to the mode of procedure towards the three absent brethren.

(August 1886) Brierley Hill.—Brother H. O. Warrender reports that the brethren and sisters meeting at Brierley Hill have had to withdraw from sister Emily Thorneycroft, who for a long time has been in the habit of attending service at the Established Church—On the other hand, they have been strengthened by the removal to Brierley Hill of sisters Wall and Evans, formerly residing at Bradeley, near Bilston. “We still continue to put forth our feeble efforts week by week to enlighten the minds of our neighbours with a saving knowledge of the truth. We meet with very little success, however. We have tried various forms of advertising, as finger-post distributions, newspaper advertisements, handbills and posters, but it is seldom we get more than two or three strangers present to listen to the good news concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.” [Never mind, brother Warrender, you are saving yourselves by a faithful performance of duty to Christ, and this will appear a very great result when the conflict is finished, as it is certain to be in due course.—*Ed.*]

(March 1888) LOWELL (Mass.)—Since last report this ecclesia has gained two members and lost two. We were obliged to withdraw from a brother for forsaking first principles of the truth. And death has removed from us our brother Henry Hoyle, who with wife and son now awaits the day when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of Man. Mrs. MARY MCLAUHLAN and Miss ANNIE M. COBB were joined to Christ by baptism, January 13th.

(March 1892) ETON (PORT MACKAY).—“Since my last, God has given us two, and through the workings of Satan we have been compelled to withdraw from two. Our number at present is six. I have much admired the stand you took regarding the divinity of the whole Bible. I cannot see how it is possible to receive the Bible as partly divine. Seeing by doing so we are mixing the counterfeit with the true. Where shall we find the man that can separate them, and be able to say this is the kernel and that the husk?”—H. A. BARBER.

(May 1892) ADELAIDE.—We are still meeting for the breaking of bread and proclamation of the truth, but of late there have not been many who have accepted God. A few are searching. We are pleased to record the obedience of WILLIAM ADEY (69), husband of our sister Adey, formerly Congregationalist. During the quarter we have been visited by brother Crealwell; also brother Barton, from Tasmania, on his way to England. We are at present studying “Ezekiel’s Temple,” with the aid of brother Sulley’s work, and a very profitable and enjoyable one it is. Our Sunday School is progressing favourably, and it is surprising to see how easily the children can grasp the truth when they have not had *the lie* first implanted in them. It has been our painful duty to withdraw from brother and sister Ellis, on account of their believing that persons believing the truth, but remaining in fellowship with the churches that deny it, will be saved.—J. BROADBRIDGE.

(June 1893)LIVERPOOL—Brother William Roberts and his sister wife have removed from Warrington to this city. We have had to withdraw from brother Henry Elwell Smith, the ex-curate, who was immersed as lately as September last, as he has returned to the Church of England.—HENRY COLLENS.

(March 1894) BRADFORD -Brother Williams reports withdrawal from brother and sister Webster and brother Norris, for their willingness to fellowship false doctrine. Brother W. Todd, from Birmingham, has settled in Bradford, and is now meeting with the Bradford ecclesia.

(February 1896) HULL-In renewing our subscription for the *Christadelphian* for the coming year, which we hope and believe will be the season of our dear Lord's return, we have to report that our little family of four are all "steadfast in the faith, unmoveable," striving at all times to set forth the truth as opportunity serves, by word and pen, but that so far we do not appear to have been successful in reaching the hearts of any, the reason being, to some extent at least, that the former professors, who were once in fellowship with us, have all gone astray, and have made the truth to stink in the nostrils of the public. "They did run well" at one time, but false doctrine was introduced amongst them by, Charles Dealtry and others, and now, those that we have succeeded in finding out here, are in the position the Apostle describes (2 Peter 2:20-22). They are in a far worse condition than those who have never known the truth, and I suspect that, in some cases at least, they had a very imperfect knowledge of its requirements before they were immersed into the Saving Name.—E. GRIMES.

## INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL WITHDRAWALS DUE TO SPECIFIC DOCTRINAL ERRORS

### PARTIAL-INSPIRATIONISM

*The Christadelphian*, December, 1884, p. 537

#### “CIRCUMSTANCES INTERFERE”

We had intended this month resuming Dr. Thomas’s article on the Abrahamic covenant and its mystery. Circumstances interfere with the fulfilment of this intention, and also with the appearance of Chapter III. of the Life of Christ, “The necessity for Christ, in God’s scheme of history.”

These circumstances have become known to our readers since our last issue. An issue has been raised, in a very unexpected manner, as to whether the Scriptures are wholly or only partially inspired—involving the further problem whether, if they are only partially inspired, they are of any real value to us at all as a guide to eternal life. The circumstances are painful and the issue exciting, and both are such as most of us would have excluded from the category of possibilities.

But God rules in the ecclesias as well as in the kingdoms of men, and in His providence, He has arrested the startled attention of the whole brotherhood to a subject, the full apprehension of which may be necessary for the development of the right type of saintship in an unbelieving age like ours.

---

*The Christadelphian*, January, 1885, p. 84

If the *Exegetist* doctrine is not disavowed, there can be no fellowship. Action will be forced on the friends of the truth.

---

(Except from June 1885) Normanton.—Writing again, bro. Dowkes says:—“At a meeting of the ecclesia, held here on April 23rd, the following proposition was adopted—‘That we believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were, in all parts of them, given by inspiration of God, and that we cannot offer fellowship to any who hold the doctrine of partial inspiration.’”

(June 1885) Nottingham. — Brother Kirkland writes:—“I have pleasure in reporting another addition to our number by the obedience of WILLIAM BORER SANDERS (49), who put on the sin-covering name in the appointed way on May 3rd. It is also my duty to report the withdrawal from us of bro. J. Pepper and bro. S. Richards.” Brother Kirkland, in a later communication, corrects an untrue report which has appeared of the meeting of which an account was given last month (namely, the meeting at which the Nottingham ecclesia adopted a resolution with reference to brother Ashcroft):—“I was at the meeting, and, although I did not count the number present, I am able to say it was an unusually large meeting of the ecclesia. I sat by the side of the chairman, in front of the brethren and sisters, therefore in a good position to judge of the number voting. The following was proposed as an amendment:—‘This ecclesia while expressing no opinion as to the merits or otherwise, of one brother against another in the dispute which we so much deplore, and disclaiming any feeling of partizanship is convinced that the attitude taken by bro. Ashcroft,

as shown by his letters to us, and especially by his refusal to see bro. Roberts when visited by him at our request, is contrary to the precepts of Christ, and if persisted in, it necessitates the disassociation prescribed in the word.' This amendment had previously been considered by the managing brethren, and objected to on the ground that the dispute the brethren knew of, was on the subject of 'Inspiration,' and that if they adopted the amendment, it would appear as if they had no opinion on that subject.—The two brethren who had framed it, said they had no such idea in their minds, and gave it up in favour of the resolution appearing in the May number *Christadelphian*. Notwithstanding this, at the meeting of the ecclesia, the amendment was taken up by a brother, and proposed. I am not aware of any reason why he took this course, but when it was put to the vote (which was taken by shew of hands) I believe four only voted for it. It was then put to the contrary, and a large number voted. The chairman declared it to be lost. The resolution was then put to the meeting. It appeared to me (as I sat) as if all present voted, but I suppose a few (very few) did not vote. The chairman, who was standing on his feet at the time, put 'the contrary.' Not a single hand being raised, he declared the resolution carried unanimously. However, one brother then said he did not agree with the resolution, and withdrew from the meeting. He has since returned, and says he objected to the resolution because he thought brother Ashcroft should have had more time given, but is now convinced bro. Ashcroft maintains a wrong attitude, and endorses the resolution. The above is a faithful and true report of the meeting. The Ecclesia stand firm to their resolution, believing their action is in harmony with the precepts of Christ."

---

#### THE END OF THE INSPIRATION CONTROVERSY IN BIRMINGHAM

We have reached the end of the inspiration controversy in Birmingham. How we have done so, and with what effects will best be gathered from the following extracts from documents:—

64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham, 20th May, 1885.

DEAR BROTHER, —Come and have a cup of tea and a free talk, on Friday next, the 22nd inst., at 6–30, with the object of seeing if anything can be done to restore the unity and cordial feeling which have, to some extent, been impaired by the unhappy controversy into which we have been plunged by the introduction of the doctrine of partial inspiration. Our united repudiation of that doctrine ought to make it possible to get into a happier state. Let us see what we can do. If we talk matters over in a frank and sincere way, good may come of it: no harm can come, at all events. \* \* \* Faithfully your brother,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

About thirty brethren were invited. The result of the meeting was far from satisfactory. While the Ashcroft-Chamberlin theory was nominally repudiated, there was a pleading for the recognition of errors, or the possibility of errors in the Bible (unimportant they were called) in a way that was inconsistent with the hearty recognition of its inspired character. There was also a manifest disposition to tolerate in our midst the theory nominally repudiated. There seemed no alternative but the course resolved upon next day. On the 23rd, the following letter was addressed, through the post, to every brother and sister in the ecclesia:—

DEAR BRETHREN AND SISTERS, *Greeting you in the love of God whose acquaintance we have made in the Holy Scriptures, given by His inspiration. May He extend to us His compassion in our affliction.*

There exists a necessity for the re-adjustment of our ecclesial relations, Our present situation is not conducive to the union, love, and peace that belong to the house of Christ. We are not one as to a fundamental principle of our fellowship. A doctrine, promulgated by brother Ashcroft, and endorsed by

brother Chamberlin (to the effect that the Scriptures are partly human and fallible in their composition), is held by a goodly number in our midst. Past writings among us show that it has been our principle to refuse immersion to any who brought this doctrine with them. It is therefore impossible it can be recognised in our basis of fellowship. I feel truly sorry for many who have embraced it: for I am certain had such a doctrine been introduced to their notice by any one not professedly a brother, they would not have listened to it for a moment.

The question is, what is to be done? Some months ago, we adopted a resolution intended to commit us to an acceptance of the true doctrine of inspiration: but the terms of the resolution (which were sincerely modified to secure unanimity and peace), have been so construed by those holding the partial inspiration doctrine as to express their views. Consequently it has failed in its object, and we are driven to reconsider our position in the interests of that growth in the comfort and knowledge of the truth, without which, an ecclesia exists in vain. No good purpose can be served by glossing over the matter and trying to make it appear that there is no difference. The actual and glaring character of the difference is shown by the way it is regarded among those who are not with us. Atheists rejoice at the new doctrine and call it “progress”: uncertain persons of all sorts have given it a hearty welcome. People who have once been with us and left us on various differences, have been ready with their congratulations; while amongst ourselves, enmity and strife have prevailed ever since its advent. Fellowship in such a situation is impossible. Fellowship is cordial and loving union, springing from oneness of mind in divine things. Here is disunion with reference to that which in modern times is the first of all first principles—viz., the character of the book on which we base all our hopes and principles of life.

We appended to our resolution an intimation that we would not withdraw from any one accused of holding partial inspiration without a formal individual procedure. But this pre-supposed a sincere resolve on all hands to stand by the doctrine intended to be defined in the first part of the resolution. And so far as I am concerned, the addition was accepted with the express reservation (openly announced at the time to those proposing it) that my hands should not be tied with regard to any process that might subsequently appear to be necessary to give effect to the resolution. It has become impossible to carry out the resolution by the process of individual applications. Those who ought to vote for its application are set against it in their minds. The attempt to rectify our position in this way would, therefore, only plunge us into a harassment most destructive to all the objects of the truth. Those who believe in a wholly inspired and infallible Bible are desirous of being extricated in a way that will be thorough and peaceful. Such a desire has been expressed to me: it can be done. The object of this circular is to indicate and open the way.

On the 22nd inst., I invited to a friendly tea-meeting the leading brethren among those who, at the beginning, disapproved of my attitude on this matter. My object was to promote the cordial state of communion that ought to exist among those professedly agreed on the subject, but which has been consciously lacking for many months past. The result was to make it manifest that the doctrine of partial inspiration is held and sympathised with as much as ever. I submitted to them that it was impossible to walk together in such a state of disagreement. I recommended their peaceful retirement. To this they strenuously object. We must therefore attain the same result in another peaceable way. There is no good to be served by any further contention. It is for those who cannot be implicated in the doctrine of partial inspiration to quietly step aside and re-organise themselves in an ecclesial capacity.

As a preliminary to this, it is necessary to find out who are of this mind. This cannot be done by individual canvass. It can be done by the process in which I hereby invite your concurrence. I enclose a post-card on which is printed a statement necessary to be made under the circumstances. I have written your name on the top of the card for the sake of connecting it with you. If you approve, all that will be necessary will be for you to drop the card into the nearest pillar. If you prefer to attach your initials, it would prevent any mistake from accidental posting.



To those who return this card through the post, I will send a ticket of admission to a special meeting to be convened for the consideration of the next step to be recommended. The result, in the end, will be to leave in the Temperance Hall (whatever their number), those who will hold no parley or compromise with the doctrine of a partly-inspired Bible.

I should gladly have followed anyone else's lead in this matter; but, as all have been waiting and expecting, I have had no alternative but accept the onus of moving. Individually, I am resolved on this course, whatever the consequences may be; and I shall be very thankful for the company in it of every one who feels moved to be courageous for God's sake in a day when our only point of conscious contact with Him is in the oracles of His truth, "committed" to Israel ages ago, and committed to the hands of every faithful brother and sister since.

I must submit as patiently as I can to the imputation of unworthy motives which is being freely indulged in by such as cannot read the situation accurately. God knows the heart. Even men of ordinary discernment ought to be able to see that my action is unfavourable to all the objects which some think I am pursuing. It is not a likely way of preserving what they unhappily call "vested interests" but of damaging them disastrously. The only "interest" I am seeking to promote is the interest that God has committed to the hand of every faithful servant. A situation exists which is paralysing spiritual endeavour. A doctrine is in our midst which has power to "eat as doth a canker." With that doctrine, I, for one, can have no connection; and I ask the concurrence contentance, and co-operation, of every man and woman whose enlightenment enables them to form a like determination.

With love to all, and striving above all things to be, in an evil generation, a friend of God and a good steward of the unsearchable riches of Christ,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

The post-card was worded as follows:—"Brother Ashcroft, having publicly promulgated, and brother Chamberlin having publicly endorsed, a doctrine to the effect that the Bible is only partly-inspired, and that there is in it an element of merely human composition liable to err, I recognise the necessity for standing aside from all who refuse to repudiate this doctrine, and I will co-operate in any measures that may be adopted to enable us in Birmingham to do so in a peaceful manner."

An unexpectedly large response, of the right sort, was made; but there were some letters also of a kind that suggested the writing of the following:—

137, Edmund Street, Birmingham, June 1, 1885.

DEAR BRETHREN AND SISTERS,—*Greeting: God be with you.* I have received several letters on the subject of our impending action in Birmingham. Some of them I have answered directly to the writers: the reception of others suggests to me the advisability of addressing a general letter to you all in the probability that others, who have not written, may share the views and sentiments expressed in the letters I have received.

Those letters condemn the proposed course as unscriptural, on the ground that accused persons ought first to be heard. This shows a misapprehension of what we are doing. We make no accusation against persons. We recognise a state of things existing in our community which no form of individual process can deliver us from.—This state of things appears in our eyes a corrupt state of things through the introduction and favourable reception by many, of a doctrine concerning the Bible, which in its latest formulation (by new statement and endorsement of previous utterances) asks us to believe:—

1.—That belief in a wholly-inspired Bible is “a remnant of theological superstition,” “the doctrine of Romanism,” “a credulous opinion,” “a pious sentiment inherited from orthodox sources,” and held in common with “Romanism and the Protestant sects generally” (*AEligion* for May 8, page 252, col. 1, line 34: p. 250, 2nd par., col. 1).

2.—That those who believe it are in a state of “orthodox innocence,” that is, innocence of true knowledge and discrimination (page 250, col. 1, line 12 from bottom).

3.—That is a doctrine that ought to be “reconsidered and reconstructed” (8 lines further up).

4.—That “there is a human element in the Bible, except where matters of revealed truth are concerned” (page 250, col. 1, par. 3), implying a distinction between things in the Bible that are revealed truth, and things that are not: and our ability to distinguish and decide between the one and the other.

5.—That although, in a sense, inspiration has had to do with it all, “inspiration (*securing infallibility*) has *only been given* where it claims to have been given” (*same page* and col., par. 2, at end)—involving the conclusion that when, as regards the rest of the Bible, inspiration is admitted, by inspiration is meant an authorship that is not infallible.

6.—That consequently, though the Bible “*contains* that which was God-breathed” (page 250, col. 2, line 5) large parts of it being histories for which infallible inspiration (!) by this contention is not claimed, are not infallible, and contain in fact “actual contradictions and erroneous statements of various kinds” (*Exegetist*, page 4, col. 1, line 6; page 6, col. 1, line 48: *Æon*, Nov. 21, page 69, line 41; page 70, line 21.)

7.—That while all “Scripture” might be admitted to be inspired, it would take inspiration itself to decide what (in the Bible) constitutes Scripture. (*Bro. Ashcroft’s proposal, per Professor Evans, Christadelphian* for Feb. 1885, page 60, line 25).

I do not think it necessary to show that these principles are destructive of the individual confidence essential to our profitable use of the Scriptures in their daily reading, and of the effectiveness with which we have hitherto wielded the sword of the spirit against various forms of modern error.<sup>1</sup> I take it that you will recognise this, and further that you perceive and feel the dishonour which they cast upon God’s word, to which it is impossible we can reconcile ourselves. The question is how we are to proceed to get rid of them in our midst. In the present form of things, we are helplessly compromised by the presence of many in our midst who either favour those principles or sympathise with and co-operate with the measures of those who have promulgated them.

What we propose to do is to take a line of action that will make no mistake—a line of action that will do justice, first, to the word of God, and, secondly, to every faithful upholder of it. We do not propose to accuse anyone. We propose to rally to the right doctrine, and then to step aside from all who refuse to do this, or (which is the same thing) who refuse to repudiate the error and those who teach it. The community as a community has become corrupt. We propose to cease our connection with it on this account. We will go out in the name of allegiance to the Bible as God’s wholly-inspired and infallible word. This is a Scriptural line of action. To “come out from among them” is a matter of command when a community, as such, has become hopelessly corrupt. We have done it before when we came out of the sects which claim to be Christ’s people. It is the only course that can extricate us from the false position in which we have been placed by the reception of a false and destructive doctrine by so many in our midst. It will inflict hardship on no one who is prepared to be faithful to the oracles of God. It will only exclude those who hesitate, and the exclusion will be their own act.

Those who quote Matt. 18:15–16 must misread the situation or misunderstand the precept. It is no case of trespass by a brother against a brother. It is no case of individual accusation. It is the case of a principle to which as a community we have become unfaithful; and where individual loyalty can only be developed by wholesale action of the kind exemplified by Moses when he stood outside the congregation of *the Lord's own people*, and said “who is on the Lord's side?” The Levites rallied to him. Havoc was introduced into the camp, although it was the Lord's camp.

Men faithful to God gladly rally to imperilled divine interests. If they were not allowed an opportunity of doing so, there would be ground for complaint of hardship. If those who hesitate are hurt, it is not the fault of those who take the right course. They are themselves responsible. Moses will certainly not be held responsible for those who did not come at his call, and perhaps perished in the camp. We have no man of the authority of Moses: but we have sacred obligations which become incorporate in ourselves in proportion as we perceive and accept them. Such an obligation is operative at the present time. Our whole foundation is being tampered with. Those who ought to defend that foundation are in sympathy with and apologising for and helping those who are tampering with it. No voting process can purge us from the spiritual leprosy that has crept in among us, and as for a “hearing,” we have been hearing one another for seven months. If our minds are not made up now, it is not likely that any further hearing will help us. In the judicial sense, it is no case for hearing, because it is not a case of accusation. It is a case of washing our hands in a way that gives every one the opportunity of taking part in it. We affirm a principle of truth and duty; all who are loyal to that principle will rally to it, and if they fail to do so, the result of their failure is their own. Constitutions of our own devising are of no validity when the foundation on which they are built is called in question with the concurrence of a large part of those who constitute our community, or at least, without courageous resistance on their part. The only course is to do as Moses did: to step out and say “Who is on the Lord's side?”

I cannot agree with those who say we should only separate from those who teach error, and not from those who believe it (which I take it is practically the same thing as “refusing to repudiate”). The basis of all fellowship is identity of belief—not identity of teaching—though the latter would follow from the former. Some object to the flower, but not to the root. Let us take out the root of our present distress, and then the distress will end.

Some quote Paul's words, “Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye, but not to doubtful disputation.” The words are not applicable to a case like the present. I understand Paul to be speaking about weakness as to matters *outside the faith* on the part of some in the faith. The context will show that this is the case. But in our case, the weakness refers to the first principle of the faith: for the beginning of our faith is the divine inspiration and consequent infallibility of the Bible. Paul nowhere recommends us to receive those who are in doubt as to first principles. On the contrary, he inculcates jealousy and faithfulness as to these.

Now, we propose to step aside in the name of a wholly-inspired Bible. If some who are “ignorant or uncandid” do so with us (as some say they will), the Lord is their judge, and will not hold us responsible for what we do not know. If others who believe with us are not strong enough to stop with us, but who prefer to remain with those who corrupt the truth by uncertain doctrine, we cannot be responsible for them. They say “God speed” to that which they condemn, and by John's rule they make themselves “partakers of the evil.” What they would have us do would be to stay with them in this evil-partaking association in the name of human “rules” which have become inoperative for the purposes of their adoption, and the attempt to apply which would be to plunge us into a fatal froth-ocean of agitation and excitement.

No; we want to follow peace with those who call upon the Lord out of a pure heart. We are sure about the complete inspiration of the Bible. We don't want, at this late hour, to be laying again the foundation of

this most primitive of all first principles. We want, in love and holiness and peace, to be building ourselves up in the faith which they impart to us, and not to be consuming one another in the endless technical disputations which have been introduced among us.

I exceedingly regret having to take any course that may separate any who have heretofore been in fellowship with one another; but I am helpless. If there were any medium course that would secure the full advantage of a pure and decided ecclesial attitude, while preventing the apprehended isolation of some who are prepared for that attitude, but not to take it in this way, I should be glad to concur in it: but I see none. I cannot but be thankful at the number of those who, up to this date, have sent in their adhesion to the course proposed. I was fully prepared for only a small return of the post cards: whereas, those which have come in represent a majority of the whole ecclesia. There are doubtless others who will make up their minds in a favourable sense before our meeting on Friday week: including, perhaps, those to whose letters I thought this the most convenient form of answer.

Faithfully your brother,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

P.S.—I may say that I should probably have been at the Board School meeting last week (a meeting convened by the disapprovers) if I had not had a previous engagement that took me away on Tuesday morning to Spalding and Nottingham; also that I claim no “authority” beyond that which every man possesses to do the best in his power for God in his day and generation.

#### The Meeting for Action

This was held on Friday, June 12th. The following resolutions were adopted:—

1. That this meeting, consisting of (about 330) brethren and sisters, whose names have been read, and who have signified beforehand their unanimity with regard to the objects for which they are convened, hereby records and professes its conviction that the doctrine of the divine inspiration and consequent infallibility of the Scriptures in all parts of them (as originally written by prophets and apostles) is the first principle of that system of truth which forms the basis of our fellowship one with another in Christ; and that, consequently, we are unable to compromise that principle by continuing in association with those who either believe or tolerate the doctrine publicly promulgated by brother Ashcroft, and publicly endorsed and defended by brother Chamberlin, that the Bible is only partly inspired, and contains an element of merely human authorship liable to err.
2. That, in execution of this determination, we hereby separate ourselves from the organisation heretofore subsisting in the Temperance Hall, on the ground that many in that organisation either hold the doctrine of partial and fallible inspiration, or think it right to remain in association and co-operation with those who do.
3. That a letter be written to those we leave behind, expressing our regret at parting with many among them, and inviting as many as are able to unite themselves with us on the basis expressed in our first resolution.
4. That the following be the letter addressed to them:—(See further on.)
5. That as the legal occupation of the Temperance Hall vests in us, through bro. Roberts, to whom the lease is granted, we cannot but resolve to remain in the Temperance Hall; but desiring to avoid all

discourtesy, even in appearance, we offer to provide a meeting-place for those who come not with us for a period of four weeks, so as to give them time to deliberate and resolve upon their future procedure.

6. That being the greater number (both of the executive and general body) of those heretofore constituting the organisation known as the Birmingham Ecclesia, we hereby use the power residing in the majority, of dissolving the said organisation, and do hereby declare it to be, from and after this date, DISSOLVED.

7. That we recognise the right of those from whom we have separated, to an equitable share in the funds and effects of the late organisation now in our hands; and we, therefore, hereby resolve to make a liquidation of the same, and to offer them a *pro rata* dividend, calculated individually, or (if they prefer it) to hand it over in a sum total, according to the list of names which they may furnish us, constituting their assembly.

8. That we now and hereby re-incorporate ourselves as the Birmingham Christadelphian Ecclesia.

9. That before we re-adopt our constitution and order, a committee (afterwards to be named) be appointed to consider the same in a leisurely way, with a view to the adoption of improvements (if any), which may have been suggested by the experience of the last twenty years.

10. That pending the adoption of such revised constitution, the following brethren be, and are hereby appointed, by the vote of this meeting, to act in the several necessary offices of service, viz.:—(Names follow).

11.—That the presiding and managing brethren be the Committee for the revision of the constitution, as suggested in Resolution IX.

The following was immediately transmitted through the post, to the disapprovers, as

#### A LETTER

*To those who have not seen their way to separate with us from a position of compromise with the doctrine of partial and fallible inspiration.*

DEAR BRETHREN AND SISTERS—The circulars addressed to you through the post will have prepared you for the act which we have felt called upon to perform, and of which we now desire to acquaint you in the spirit of brotherly love. We have to-night adopted the following among other resolutions. (Here follow 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7). With our reasons for the course of action authorised in these resolutions, you have been made acquainted. We need not trouble you with them again at any length. A doctrine was introduced among us some time ago, and received with favour from some, and non-resistance by others, which is calculated, in our judgment, to undermine confidence in the Bible as the word of God. That doctrine is (however disguised it may be in elegant periphrases and plausible disclaimers), that the Scriptures are not wholly reliable; that there is an element of error in them, due to the absence of Divine inspiration in the writing of parts of them, or to the presence of an inspiration that did not keep the writers from error. The doctrine that inspiration may err we regard as the most serious of all the views to which this controversy has given birth. We cannot help feeling that it comes perilously near to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

Many of you say you do not hold this doctrine. At this, we are glad, but your determination to abide by those who do hold it, or uphold those who teach it, makes it impossible for us in our action to make any discrimination between you and them. It is a scriptural principle which commends itself to reason, that he that biddeth a man God-speed, in an evil course, makes himself responsible for that course (2 Jno. 11).

The principle is illustrated all through those Scripture histories which some of you say are not inspired. God said to Israel He would be no more with them until they put away from their midst the offender against Divine appointment (Josh. 7:12). He told them on another occasion, by Moses, that they would be consumed in the sin of Korah if they did not depart from them (Num. 16:24–26). He expressed His approval of Phinehas for his voluntary zeal against the sinners in the camp (Num. 25:10, 12), and of Jehu, for laying a trap for the worshippers of Baal (2 Kings 10:18, 30).

The principle received expression in apostolic times, in Christ's condemnation of those churches that suffered wrong teaching in their midst (Rev. 2:14, 20), and His approbation of those who could not bear the evil, but exposed the pretences of false apostles (Rev. 2:2, 6), also in Paul's command to purge out the old leaven (1 Cor. 5:6, 7), to turn away from those having an empty form of godliness (2 Tim. 3:5) and in the Spirit's summons to "Come out" of Babylon, lest being, by fellowship, partakers of her sins, we receive also of her plagues (Rev. 18:4).

Now, in our judgment, it is not possible for men to commit a greater evil in our age than to corrupt and weaken the word of God by a doctrine that it is not wholly reliable. We do not wish to argue the question with you now: we merely wish to acquaint you with the reason of our present action which is most painful to us. We cannot make ourselves responsible for the dishonour to God's word implied in the doctrine of partial and erring inspiration; nor for the consequences that will certainly spring from it in the workings of things among many. We do not feel at liberty to sanction in our midst any compromise of Paul's statement that all the Holy Scriptures of Timothy's acquaintance were given by inspiration of God. You may believe Paul's statement equally with ourselves, but if you make yourselves one with those who nullify it by the doctrines they hold, you erect the same barrier between us and you that exists between us and them.

We do not say by this that you are not brethren, or that Christ will refuse you at His coming. We leave that. We do not judge you; we judge ourselves. We say we cannot be implicated in the position which you feel at liberty to hold towards the new doctrine that has been introduced. We desire to regard you with feelings of friendship and brotherly love; but so long as you retain connection with a false doctrine of so dangerous a character, you compel us to set aside, in the spirit of Paul's recommendation, which while telling us to count you not as enemies, but to admonish you as brethren, at the same time directs us to have no company while things are on a footing that does not allow of it. We invite you to abandon your doubtful position and unite yourselves with us on the ground we have defined in the resolutions set forth. We do not press you. You must be guided by your own judgments. If you do not see eye to eye with us as to what is expedient to be done, you can but act according to your convictions; but for ourselves, we dare not hesitate longer to adopt a course which we feel is called for by faithfulness and purity and peace. We hope that reconsideration may, by-and-bye, enable many of you to see the matter in what appears to us a scriptural light. Meanwhile, we are compelled to forego your further companionship at the Temperance Hall. When you are prepared to take our attitude, as expressed in Resolution 1, it will be more than a pleasure to us to see you resume your place. With best wishes,

*Signed on behalf of the meeting,*

J. J. POWELL.  
J. E. WALKER.  
R. ROBERTS.

Results

About 330 brethren and sisters have declared for a wholly-inspired Bible as a first principle in our basis of fellowship, not to be compromised by association with believers in a partial and fallible inspiration. These met together in their separate capacity, for the first time, in the Temperance Hall, on Sunday, June 14th. It was necessary to use tickets of admission to the floor for convenience of separation. About 140 of the others attended, and took their places in the gallery as “a silent protest” against the action of the others. That action is called “unconstitutional.” So it is: but it may be something better. There are higher acts than constitutional acts. Constitutionalities are secondary: essentialities come first, and sometimes must overrule the other. What is the quality expressed by the word “constitutional?” That which is according to the constitution. And what is a constitution? The laws or rules agreed to for the pursuance of a common end. They are binding so long as the object of their existence is attainable by them; but when they become an obstacle to their object, they lose their force. There are times in the workings of every form of human society when it is legitimate to suspend constitutional forms. Constitutional forms grow out of vital conditions; and when vital conditions are interfered with, the constitutionalities collapse, whether in individual or corporate life. A man, for example, must have food and air. Interfere with these, and constitutional forms are nowhere. Society must be protected from violence; and in the presence of treason and insurrection, the constitutional forms that are serviceable for times of peace and order, disappear before martial law. A society of people are bound by their laws as long as the principles that underlie these laws are upheld. An ecclesia exists first for the truth of God (which is independent of all constitutions, and cannot be made the subject of legislation, but only of formulation for concurrent agreement); secondly, for the duty arising out of the truth; and thirdly, for its corporate operations as regulated by constitution (otherwise, concurrent assent). The foundation of the whole structure is the truth; and the first part of the truth, in our day, is that the Bible is the wholly-inspired and infallible word of God. The denial, or the toleration of the denial of this, is interference with a vital condition of ecclesial life, and calls for the disregard of human constitutionalities that may stand in the way of its resistance. This is the explanation and the justification of a mode of procedure which will be commended or condemned, according as the spectator sees God or man in the case. A zealous servant of God recognising the principle at stake will readily condone a mere question of mode in view of the vital interest secured. A man having hazy or faltering convictions of the inspiration of the Bible will, of course, lean the other way. The matter in question is not the accuracy of trifling Biblical details—whether genealogical or otherwise. It is the principle which has been laid down to account for supposed errors in these departments that has to be resisted to the utmost—principles which, when fully worked out—(and principles do work themselves out in communities, whether intended or not)—would reduce large parts of the scripture to mere Hebrew literature of questionable reliability; and, by re-action, all the rest as well.

---

(June 1885) Ripley.—Brother Wharton reports the loss of sister Louisa Mitchell by removal to Pittsburg, Pa., U.S.A. Her place has been filled by the removal to Ripley of sister Wood, from Derby, now sister Parkin.—On August 13, the ecclesia adopted the following resolution:—“That we believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were in all parts of them given by inspiration of God, and that we cannot offer fellowship to any who hold or tolerate the doctrine of partial inspiration.”

(July 1888) JACKSONVILLE (FLORIDA).—A letter is to hand from this place signed jointly by brethren Wm. Eastman and W. P. Hooper and sister M. E. Hooper, with reference to their apparently unjustifiable separation from certain in Jacksonville, spoken of in the intelligence in the January number. The matter, as they rehearse it, appears to justify their action. The advent among them of certain from England who were in fellowship with the partial inspiration party, and some of whom “crept in unawares,” under an affirmation of their belief of the full inspiration of the Bible, was the cause of the trouble. These, when it was desired to clearly define the position of the brethren with reference to the inspiration question, strongly objected to a sufficient definition. Hence the separation. This is the substance of the explanation now sent. Perhaps this will be enough to say on it in the way of the offset they naturally desire.

(August 1888) BOSTON.—Brother Trussler writes: Our efforts are now turned to Quincy (a city about 8 miles from Boston). Lectures are now being delivered here every week with fair attendance. We have reason to think this will be a fruitful field. **We have had to withdraw from brother W. H. Forbes for absence, and partial inspiration.** Brother Henry Hartley and sister Adams (both of this ecclesia) have been united in marriage.

*The Christadelphian*, December, 1888, p. 764

C. S. B.—The question that divided the brethren over three years ago is not a question of form, but of substance. Some talk of “theory” as a light matter. Surely it must be for want of thought. Any theory that leaves the door open for the possibility of the Scriptures being wrong in undistinguishable parts is a serious affair. It undermines reliability in the whole. This is the practical outcome of partial inspiration: and practical men look at practical results. We have not stickled for any “theory of inspiration,” except the theory that inspiration is a fact in every part of the Scriptures, and excludes error: and for this we do stickle strenuously, and cannot surrender by a hair’s breadth. Let the three points be granted—that the Bible is all inspired: that inspiration is unerring: and that a recognition of this character as appertaining to the Bible is to be exacted of every one claiming fellowship—and there will be an end to the difficulty that has been created on this subject. Where they are not conceded, there is nothing for it but to walk apart in peace. Nothing is gained by slurring over the issue, or continuing a futile strife of words.

*The Christadelphian*, January 1890, p. 27

A superficial view asks, Who is to blame? This is the question of those who have not learnt, or do not believe, that God rules in the kingdoms of men and brings about His own purposes by the unseen regulation of perfectly human circumstances. Rehoboam may be thought to have been to blame for his rough answer to the ten-tribe deputation; but it was “of the Lord” nevertheless (as it is testified) that He might for His own ends bring about the division of the kingdom predicted by Ahijah, the prophet. So whatever human origin there may be to the circumstances that prosper or that hinder the cause of the truth, an enlightened discernment of things is not prone to ask, “Who is to blame?” It accepts facts, and considers their meaning and effect, so far as these may be discernible in the light of divine principles. Paul declares there is a necessity for the occasional introduction of error among believers, “that they who are approved may be made manifest.” When the time comes for the disciplinary ordeal, agents are needed; and they will be provided; and no doubt when they appear and do their work, they will be much blamed by some. But in fact they are providential instruments, and will be regarded in that light by all who are scripturally enlightened; whose chief enquiry will be, “What is my duty to God in the situation created?” Brethren may blame the introduction of partial inspiration by a man specially commended to their sympathy and confidence by previous circumstances; or, they may blame its instant and uncompromising resistance by such as saw no other course, even if it meant the loss of all friendship and even of life itself; but their personal acerbity will abate with the reflection—that thus as a matter of fact has our fidelity to the highest trust of God to man been put to the test, and that only thus, in our circumstances, so far as we can see, could that test have been severely applied.

(February 1889) Bath – Brother Keepence reports his removal from Bath to 7, Primrose Terrace, Gordon Road, Southtown, Great Yarmouth; where he will be pleased to be visited by brethren who have no sympathy with partial inspiration.



(August 1889) RICHMOND (VIC.)—Bro. Robertson writes: “Last year on 19th Nov. THOMAS STOREY (43), bootmaker, formerly Methodist, was added to our number, by putting on Christ in the appointed way. He has been a long time looking into the truth, but has quietly perserved. WILLIAM TODD (27), gardener, was also united in the Name on the 24th of the same month; both having given evidence that they realized the gravity of the act. We shall be glad of the company of all brethren and sisters who are discerningly in fellowship with you, and whose lot may chance to fall in this city. We tolerate none who are inclined to compromise with the partial inspiration doctrine.”

(December 1892) West Bromwich — The arranging brethren of this ecclesia call the attention of the Pontypool ecclesia to the fact that brother Challenger (printed Challinor), concerning whom intelligence appears in the September Christadelphian, was not of our ecclesia, but was a member of the Partial Inspiration Meeting at Great Bridge. The Lectures for the month have been:—October 9th, brother Mosley; 16th, brother Bower (Birmingham); 23rd, brother Hughes (West Bromwich); 30th, brother Hollier (West Bromwich). We had the company of brother White (Birmingham), on Sunday, October 16th.—GEORGE WALFORD.

(April 1893) Kilmarnock – Brother McDougall reports that the ecclesia here has recently passed through some trouble, arising from the necessity of withstanding the corruptions of partial inspiration and unsound views of fellowship, &c., &c., &c. The conclusion of his report, however, shows the healing of the trouble to some extent. It arose from brother Clelland’s, jun., association with some who are not in a sound position, which led the ecclesia to refuse its fellowship to him. On this his father and mother, brother and sister Clelland, brother and sister McCrindle, sister Culbert, and brother Culbert, junior, left in sympathy. Subsequently brother Culbert took a similar course to brother Clelland, which had to be similarly dealt with by the ecclesia. “Before sending in our report, the ecclesia was willing that an opportunity should be granted to those who had left, of returning to fellowship if an agreement on Scriptural grounds could be arrived at. Accordingly invitations to a meeting for this purpose were issued, to which they responded. This meeting resulted in brother and sister McCrindle resolving to return to our fellowship. They have now come to the conclusion that in order to be in a position to maintain the truth in its purity and entirety, it was absolutely necessary to avoid having association or fellowship with those who were separated from us on the question of inspiration and fellowship, &c., &c., &c., as they consider that to have fellowship with these would be equivalent to having fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, as they had become convinced by what they had heard while with them, that the Truth is not with them. Through lack of understanding the true character of the situation, they had considered the ecclesia had acted arbitrarily and without Scriptural warrant in refusing fellowship to brother Clelland, junior. But having discovered the facts, they have come to perceive that the ecclesia was not only just in its action in this case but had exercised much patience and forbearance.” Brother MacDougall concludes: “I need scarcely add that it gave us great satisfaction and joy to see brother and sister McCrindle in their old places at the breaking of bread on Sunday, 12th March.”

(May 1893) AUCKLAND (NZ).—“I am sorry to inform you that eleven brethren and sisters with myself had to separate from the Auckland ecclesia, owing to their alteration of basis, by cutting out the negative aspects and a belief in partial inspiration of the Scriptures. We meet each first day of the week at brother and sister Walker’s residence, Arch Hill, to remember the death of our Lord. Brother Matthews, originally of Birmingham, is one with us, but has left for Invercargill.”—S. HARRISON.

(January 1894) Stockport—It has been painfully evident to us during the past month that we are not yet beyond the dominion of the King of Terrors. On November 30th our sister, Jane Richardson, fell asleep, aged 26. She has been suffering from illness all the summer which developed into consumption. Our brother, Henry Mead, also fell asleep on December 1st, aged 79. Of him it can be said, he “came to his grave in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in his season.” He experienced the truth of the psalm

concerning those who attain four score years, having for some time been partially disabled by rheumatism. We have laid our brother and sister away, taking comfort in the thought that they had hope of a better resurrection, and that our separation will not be a long one. It has been necessary for us to withdraw from brother Wm. Smith, as we find he fellowships those who support the theory of partial inspiration. The attendance at our public meetings has of late been encouraging.—S. F. WILLSON.

(September 1895) QUEENSTOWN.—It is a considerable time since there appeared any intelligence from Queenstown. We have not been idle, but the reverse. The advent of brother and sister Harper, from Warrington, England, quickened the ecclesia into new life in the direction of a public effort. Hitherto we have not had brethren amongst us who felt equal to lecturing, but for the last three months we have had lectures by brother Harper every Sunday, and several seem interested. There seemed every prospect of spiritual prosperity until three weeks ago, when the inspiration question came to the front with disastrous results to the ecclesia. The origin of the matter was the arrival of a letter from the Secretary of the *Fraternal Visitor* to brother Bushell, enclosing one from a prominent brother intimating his desire to come out to South Africa for health sake if there seemed an opening in a business way. There was also a request for intelligence to be sent to the *Visitor* of the doings of the ecclesia. Objection was taken to the sending of any intelligence to an organ espousing a cause with which we had no sympathy; and while sympathising with the brother and desiring to help him, there could be no question of fellowship with anyone holding the doctrine of partial inspiration. It then became manifest that some in the ecclesia were willing to fellowship anyone and ask no questions on inspiration, and also espoused the cause of the party from whom the ecclesias have separated, contending that the doctrine of partial inspiration was not taught by the party represented by the *Fraternal Visitor*. Several meetings were held, and evidence produced from their own writings endorsing and advocating partial inspiration as the explanation of the errors to be found in the Bible. The upshot of the matter was that brother and sister Harper withdrew from the ecclesia, and followed by three others, brother Bushell retaining our meeting-room and contents. The following are the names of the brethren who are meeting together on the basis of a pure Bible. Brother and sister Harper, brother Aston, and brother and sister Gibson. At present we meet at brother Gibson's for breaking of bread.—GEO. GIBSON.

(July 1888) PEMBERTON- Brother Joseph Finch writes:—Since last we wrote, we have had the painful duty to withdraw from two of our brethren, brother Longbottom, and brother Grounds, on the Inspiration question. It arose out of brother Longbottom getting an invitation from brother Brookfield, of Blackburn, to go and lecture for them. Brother Longbottom went and met with them at Blackburn. The result was, that we had to have a meeting on the subject, the result of which was, that we found both brother Longbottom and brother Grounds very unsound on that question, which caused us to do what we did.

(July 1888) JACKSONVILLE (FLORIDA).—A letter is to hand from this place signed jointly by brethren Wm. Eastman and W. P. Hooper and sister M. E. Hooper, with reference to their apparently unjustifiable separation from certain in Jacksonville, spoken of in the intelligence in the January number. The matter, as they rehearse it, appears to justify their action. The advent among them of certain from England who were in fellowship with the partial inspiration party, and some of whom “crept in unawares,” under an affirmation of their belief of the full inspiration of the Bible, was the cause of the trouble. These, when it was desired to clearly define the position of the brethren with reference to the inspiration question, strongly objected to a sufficient definition. Hence the separation. This is the substance of the explanation now sent. Perhaps this will be enough to say on it in the way of the offset they naturally desire.

For reference to above already added see JACKSONVILLE (Florida).—Referring to the intelligence from this place appearing in the *Christadelphian* for November last, brother Isaac N. Jones, of Worcester (Mass.), formerly residing for a while in Jacksonville, writes: “The enclosed letter was sent to me from

brother Fowler, of Jacksonville, to see if I approved of his communication of so, to forward it on to you. I have carefully read it, and can truthfully do so. It ought to be known that there are more than three children of the kingdom in Jacksonville, Flo. who have given me evidence in a variety of ways of their ardent love for the truth, and the desire to walk worthy of so high a calling. And my incessant prayer will be that all obstacles may be removed from the way as we journey along the road as brethren to the Holy City, into which none will be allowed to carry anything to mar the peace of that holy community.” Brother Jones encloses the letter referred to. It sets forth the basis upon which the ecclesia was organised, which appears perfectly Scriptural; and the facts connected with the separate meeting of brethren Hooper and Eastman, which appear not to justify separation.

(July 1888) BOSTON.—Brother Trussler writes: Our efforts are now turned to Quincy (a city about 8 miles from Boston). Lectures are now being delivered here every week with fair attendance. We have reason to think this will be a fruitful field. We have had to withdraw from brother W. H. Forbes for absence, and partial inspiration. Brother Henry Hartley and sister Adams (both of this ecclesia) have been united in marriage.

(February 1890) DUDLEY -We have decided to hold our annual tea meeting on Wednesday, December 31st; tea at 5.45 p.m.; meeting after at 7 p.m., to close at 9 o'clock. We give all brethren and sisters a hearty invitation. Brother James and sister Pearson have been united in marriage and removed to Birmingham, and will meet at the Temperance Hall. Brother and sister E. Woodall have left us, and now meet with those in sympathy with the partial inspirationists. We desire it to be known that we had to withdraw some months ago from brother Brumfield on account of his uncertainties on the subject of inspiration. He has since removed to Cannock.

[At Cannock, some of the brethren have taken brother Brumfield's part, with the result of a disruption there, in consequence of the refusal to admit the original Scriptures free from error. The withdrawal of Dudley from brother Brumfield was reported at the time, but was not published till brother Brumfield, who objected, should have an opportunity of showing face to face with his accusers that the grounds were insufficient. He refused to meet them after repeated importunity, or to see the editor of the *Christadelphian*, who therefore after long patience, has no alternative but to publish the action of the Dudley brethren. It is wickedness to impute error to inspiration. We must therefore accept any consequences that come from refusal to be implicated in it.—ED.]

(September 1892) WORCESTER (Mass.).—“It is a good while since we sent you any intelligence from this place. We are still earnestly contending for the one faith in its purity, ‘keeping our garments unspotted from the world,’ and preparing ourselves for the return of our Divine Lord, for whose return we daily watch and wait and pray. We continue every first day to remember Him in the appointed way, and to set forth some phase of the glorious promises made of God unto the fathers, and the near approach of our great High Priest and elder brother. The brethren and sisters of this Ecclesia are united in the strongest ties of love and unity, and our prayer is that the Master when he comes will find us a united happy band, having no fellowship with any except those who hold in high esteem the Bible as a wholly-inspired and infallible guide for the children of men. It we are ever taken in on this matter, it will not be knowingly. We wish to acknowledge that we were taken in unawares about a year ago by a brother Healey, of whom we learned afterwards that he was in fellowship with those who believe in a partially inspired Bible. We also had brother Jas. Stokes apply for fellowship, but on being questioned as to his faith we found that he was not a believer in the inspired word of God. When asked if he could prove any of the Bible to be inspired his answer was that he could not, but he thought that the question of inspiration ought to be left an open question. What an absurd position for a man claiming to be a Christadelphian. This Ecclesia could not entertain the thought for a moment. We are in hope of other additions to our Ecclesia soon. We held our annual fraternal gathering the 4th of July, at brother Goddard's, some four miles north of the

city. We had the pleasure of several visitors, namely, brother Joshua Eastwood, and wife of Lawrence Mass, sister Cullingford, of Hitchburgh, Mass., brother and sister Bariow, brother George Handley (and a young man not yet in the faith) of Providence. R.I. Also brother Corney and sister Boynton, of Spencer, Mass. Our morning meeting opened at 10–30. At 7 o'clock we started for home, everyone feeling that we had had a good and a profitable time—a foretaste of the things to come.—C. C. MANN.

(May 1893) AUCKLAND.—“I am sorry to inform you that eleven brethren and sisters with myself had to separate from the Auckland ecclesia, owing to their alteration of basis, by cutting out the negative aspects and a belief in partial inspiration of the Scriptures. We meet each first day of the week at brother and sister Walker’s residence, Arch Hill, to remember the death of our Lord. Brother Matthews, originally of Birmingham, is one with us, but has left for Invercargill.”—S. HARRISON.

(December 1896) FERNDALE. — “Weary, but patient,” the little company of believers here “continue to hold forth the truth to the few people who come to hear. Their hearts have been gladdened by the immersion, on October 17th, of ELIZABETH THOMAS (23), formerly neutral. She made a great effort to know the Divine promises, and to have a part in them. Withdrawal has had to be put in force against brother Elijah Wigmore, for his denial that the Bible is the inspired word of God. This has been a cause of sorrow. We have been visited by several of our lecturing brethren lately, and find their visits upbuilding to us in our labours.” — THOS. RICHARDS.

#### **CLEAN-FLESH, RENUNCIATIONISM, TURNEYISM, J. BELL, G. CORNISH**

(October 1873) NOTTINGHAM.—As the disgrace of division can now no longer be hid, we give publicity to the following communication:—

“53, Marple Street, Nottingham,

September 14th, 1873.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS—The painful duty devolves upon me, as secretary for those who still ‘hold fast the name, and have not denied the faith even in Nottingham, where Satan’s seat is,’ to forward the intelligence respecting the division which has taken place here.

Several of the brethren who accept the new theory, having re-immersed themselves, an ‘Important Communication,’ signed by twelve brethren, was addressed to the ecclesia. The following is the principal portion:—

*‘To the brethren and sisters of the Lord Jesus Christ, meeting at the Christadelphian Synagogue, Shakespeare Street, Nottingham, greeting:*

BELOVED IN THE LORD,—You are well aware that we have lately been disturbed by one coming among and trying to make us doubt whether we be in the faith. This would have mattered little, had not two of our leading brethren—E. Turney and W. H. Farmer—listened to his suggestions. These have not only listened to his suggestions, but have now proclaimed, both by words uttered in our hearing, but particularly by being re-immersed, that they believe the surmises of the said disturber to be true.

This presents before our mind a serious issue upon which you will have to come to some definite decision, one way or other. A considerable section of the ecclesia, some of whom have signed their names to this paper, think it is high time for the body, as a whole, to declare what they think.

The act of brother Turney and brother Farmer is a declaration by them that the rest of us are strangers and foreigners, without God and without hope in the world, because we did not at our baptism, and we are thankful to say, do not now (many of us at all events), believe the heresy taught by one who has crept in among us at unawares. The brethren and sisters must say if this is their mind. Upon their answer will depend the course of that section of the ecclesia already referred to.

If they endorse the action of the two brethren named, and the conclusion that springs from it as regards themselves and us, we have but one course before us, and that is, to accept the exclusion which they will thereby pronounce against us, and to seek in another place to maintain our adherence to the faith once for all delivered to the saints; and to give as strong a testimony as we can against this destroying leaven of heresy which is working evil among us.

If, on the other hand, they do not endorse the action of the two brethren named, we hold them bound, and shall ask them to withdraw from them, as having uttered a grave slander against the brethren, and caused divisions contrary to the apostolic doctrine.

We ask a meeting of the ecclesia to consider and decide this exceedingly important matter.

EDWARD OWEN  
RICH. HOPCRAFT  
HENRY KERRY  
EDWIN BROWN  
WILLIAM MABBOT  
ISREAL LOVETT

SAMUEL RICHARDS  
THOMAS FISHER  
WM. R. DOBSON  
JOHN KIRKLAND  
HENRY SULLEY  
JOSEPH FIDLER.

At a meeting held during the following week, the matter was discussed. The majority not only refused to withdraw from the brethren named, but passed a resolution (proposed by E. Turney), 'That we meet in future on the basis of an uncondemned Christ.' Nothing, therefore, remained but for those who would preserve their standing in Christ, but to withhold themselves from fellowship. Upwards of forty (most of whose names I enclose) have taken this step, and formed themselves into an ecclesia, meeting at present in the People's Hall, to comply with Christ's commandment, in loving remembrance of what he has done on our behalf. We rejoice at the oneness of purpose and desire manifested amongst us, viz., to help each other to continue steadfast in the apostolic doctrine. We feel that the severe trial through which we have passed has had a beneficial effect upon us. We recognise even in this 'our Father's hand,' and our hearts rise in thankfulness that we are still on the side of the truth; and in humble prayer, that being preserved from all error, we may be permitted to eat of the tree of life, and become constituents of that glorious temple builded together for an habitation of the Deity in the future age. I remain in Christ Jesus, your brother,

JOS. BURTON.

The list of names is as follows:—

BROBSON, WILLIAM

KERRY, HENRY

BROWN, EDWIN  
BROWN, LOUISA  
BURTON, JOSEPH  
BURTON, PRISCILLA  
DOBSON, W. R.  
DAYKIN, SAMUEL  
ELSTON, JOSEPH  
ELSTON, M. A.  
FIDLER, THOMAS  
FISHER, THOMAS  
FISHER, M.J.  
HOPCRAFT, R.  
HARRISON, JOHN  
HIGGS, H.  
HIGGS, ELIZABETH  
KIRKLAND, JOHN

KERRY, HENRY, jun.  
KERRY, MARY  
KERRY, CAROLINE  
KEELING, HERBERT  
LOVETT, ISREAL  
LOVETT, MARY  
MABBOTT, WILLIAM  
MABBOTT, NAOMI  
OWEN, EDWARD  
RICHARDS, SAMUEL  
RICHARDS, MARTHA  
RATFORD, LILLEH  
SULLEY, HENRY  
TILLEY, CHARLES  
TORR, WILLIAM  
TORR, ANN  
TURNERY, ANN

(Except from November 1873) BIRMINGHAM.— There has been time enough for the settlement of mature conviction, since this mischievous controversy was originated three months ago. Further delay would only hinder our edification, impede the inquirer, and disgrace the truth. I, therefore, ask you to join me in a general declaration of withdrawal from all who deny that Jesus Christ was God manifest in our mortal nature. I ask you to do so in a manner that will enable us to give peaceable effect to our convictions, avoiding the turmoil of further discussion, which we may well dispense with after the thorough canvass of the question which has taken place, and which could lead to no good result, while it could not fail to be painful to many, and perhaps productive of some things that would be regarded with displeasure by the Master of the household and the Higher than the highest.

My request is, that if you agree with me, you will sign and return the declaration which you will find at the end of this letter. Addressed to me at the Athenæum Rooms it will reach me in my retirement; and on my return, I will ask you to meet me at the Athenæum Rooms, on Thursday night, October 30th, that our united declaration may be promulgated, and that we may take such further steps as the new situation will call for; after which it will be necessary to redraw ecclesia roll, that we may know who thereafter constitute the Birmingham ecclesia, on the basis of the unadulterated truth.

Thus may we hope to secure unity and peace at the table of the Lord, in the company of those who, in all humility before God, and zeal for His name, are waiting for His Son from heaven, in full desire with all diligence to purify themselves from the works of the flesh, and bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, in love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance.

Those who do not join in this act will remain in fellowship with those who deny the truth, and will disconnect themselves from those who may unite in stepping aside from a connection which has become a fountain of every evil work. Please then, if you think well so to do, sign and return (not later than Sunday, October 26th, addressed to me at the Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row), the Declaration on the back of this sheet.

ROBERT ROBERTS. *Tuesday, Oct. 14th, 1873.*

(Excerpt from May 1874) BIRMINGHAM.— The following was (the principal portion of) the answer sent to a letter of the subverted brethren in which they declined to receive their share of what belonged to

the ecclesia on the 30th of October last, giving as their reason that acceptance would commit them to the recognition of the process of dissolution:—

“We regard this refusal of yours as in accordance with what is right; not, however, for the reasons you give. The mode of our dissolution might be open to the objections you urge had we been a secular body, holding existence under rules imposed by the law. We were a body originating in the voluntary acceptance of a system of truth, and whose temporal affairs were altogether secondary and solely dependent on the consent of a numerical majority. From a part of that system of truth, you had departed. By this, a continued corporate existence was rendered impossible and placed outside the category of questions to be dealt with by what you call ‘the legislative functions of a general meeting.’ The only question was how we could be most peacefully and effectually extricated from the false position in which we stood. This question received a satisfactory solution by the course adopted. The majority, with whom lay the power, assembled (not as ‘the friends of brother Roberts,’ but as the friends of the truth from which you have departed,) and peacefully decided on the dissolution of a union that could no longer be continued, whatever ‘legislative functions’ might decide to the contrary; and that it might be free from all reasonable objection, they decided to do that which you had no right to claim—to give you a proportional share of the property which, upon liquidation, might appear to belong to you.

We can understand and excuse your feelings of annoyance at being thus summarily isolated from a connection which you desired to continue; but that you should speak of it as ‘a blot,’ and hint at it as unrighteousness, is itself an act of unrighteousness of which you may have to be made ashamed on a day near at hand, while your misleaders would delude you with the idea of its being far off.

In declining to receive your proffered share, you only act on the principles of common honour; for your contributions while with us were given for the maintenance of the principles from which you have departed in an important element, and, therefore, could not be righteously applied in any other way. We were willing to give you back the money that there might be no impediment to our dissolution and that you might have no occasion to speak reproachfully; but since you refuse to receive it, we can only acquiesce with thankfulness that you have not stooped to an ignoble act, and that the truth is assisted to the extent of your share, over and above what we were reckoning upon.”

(Excerpt from February 1874) LIVERPOOL.—Brother G. Waite writes: “In endeavouring to fulfil the apostolic injunctions which require us to be of one mind and speak the same things, we have been compelled to discontinue fellowship with those who have been bewitched by the Renunciationist heresy. We have had a severe trial of our faith here, as I feel sure all brethren must, who have had to encounter this subtle theory of human invention, which comes to us as an angel of light, and states its case with such an air of plausibility, that if we were not to take our stand upon the revealed truth, we should be entangled into meshes: it is then that we see the theory in its deformity. Ever since brother Ellis embraced this heresy, we have held a meeting every Sunday morning, after the usual morning meeting, for discussing the subject. I thought at first that nearly all the ecclesia would be ensnared, but I rejoice to be able to inform you that there are fifteen in Liverpool who have not defiled their garments by this theory of human origin. We are heartily sorry for the subverted ones, who are nine in number; we hope and pray they may yet return to the path from which they have diverged. The division has weakened us considerably, but I think that we shall soon recover ourselves, for the hearts of the brethren are united and prepared, by God’s help, to meet the difficulty of the situation.

(January 1891) POMONA (Cal.)—Brother Snashall reports trouble here, caused by the old “Renunciationist” heresy in a slightly new dress, taught by Dr. Henry Usher, late of Walkerton, Ontario, Canada. Brother Snashall says: “We still hope, however, that, after mature reflection, some at least may clearly apprehend the character of the error, and have the moral courage to recede from their perilous

situation. Our sympathies for them in their danger, are strong, but we cannot allow our sympathy in the case to outweigh the deeper and stronger convictions begotten of the truth concerning the matter; the duty required of us by the Deity, to separate ourselves when both Himself, and His Anointed Jesus, are dishonoured; and His word nullified by false doctrines. To remove the evil and maintain the ecclesia in unity and peace upon a sound basis of faith, an effort was made in form of short lectures on the subject, followed by questions and general discussion. But the attempt was soon manifestly vain and useless. All therefore, sound in the faith, and possessing the courage of their convictions, decided to withdraw. Accordingly, on Wednesday evening, November 12th, 1890, at a meeting of the ecclesia, a paper was read expressing our dissent and separation, and declaring our basis of fellowship identical with that set forth in the Ecclesial Guide. At the same time we authorised the treasurer to turn over to the others all money on hand, also the janitor to deliver up the key of the house occupied, viz., the 'Universalist Church Building.' We then quietly retired, glad to be free from the strife, but sorry to be forced to such an issue, for which there was no lawful alternative. The names of those now in fellowship on a sound basis are—H. J. and Katherine Moore, J. H. and Eva J. Moore, Lillie C. Moore, John Holman, Tilman and Susan Elam, John J. and Lucy J. White, Addison T. White, A. and Alice G. Snashall."

(Excerpt from April 1893) GLASGOW- Brother Campbell adds that while thus strengthened by addition, the ecclesia has been reduced in number by having been compelled to withdraw from brother and sister Carmichael, sister Hamilton and brother McNeilage for their espousal of Renunciationist doctrines; and sister Napier sympathising with them, has withdrawn from the ecclesia. "This," says brother Campbell, "is a loss in numbers, but a gain in unity." The following are some of the extraordinary assertions the exigencies of their theories called for, namely:—That Christ, though human, and the son of a daughter of Adam, was not the son of Adam; that he was mortal but not liable to die for himself; that he was of the seed of David, but was not seed of David; that he was of the seed of Abraham, but was not seed of Abraham; that he repudiated sonship in relation to David when he asked the Jews—"How is he then his son?" that he had no brethren; and that the "fellows" above whom he was anointed with the oil of gladness were the angels; that he was never tempted, and could not be tempted; that temptation implies sin, and Christ never having sinned, the temptation to which the scriptures declare he was subjected was merely trial, and ought to be so understood if not translated; that Adam was 'mortal' before he fell, and Christ was 'mortal' in the same sense. To such straits are men brought by the maintenance of error, that even our very English language is turned topsy-turvy. Notwithstanding these views, the holders of them have received "a warm welcome" in another meeting where the truth is still professedly held, but rather, I fear, at a distance. And so the "downgrade movement" speeds apace in certain circles.

(June 1893) GLASGOW-It is with pleasure I report this month another addition to our number in the person of JOHN GILLESPIE, the father of our brother Robert Gillespie. At first somewhat antagonistic to the view of things religious taken by us, he has given such attention to the Scriptures as has at length enabled him to see where lies the truth. We rejoice to have been privileged to assist him into the sin-covering name of Jesus. Referring to my last month's intelligence respecting our withdrawal from certain for the assertion of Renunciationist doctrine, I have been shewn a contradiction of what I stated communicated by a third party to another journal. Notwithstanding that contradiction, I repeat on behalf of brother George Dick and myself the statements made last month *en bloc* [as a whole] and would add that the admittedly absurd views specified therein are not, as seems to be imagined, "deductions" from beliefs expressed but beliefs *actually expressed*, or assented to by the parties concerned.—D. CAMPBELL (removed to 6, Park View, Longside.)

(February 1896) BOSTON, MASS.—On November 4th A. P. G. Pinel and sister A. G. Peterson, of this ecclesia, were united in marriage. We are sorry to report the falling away of brother W. J. Smith and sister-wife to the "Free Life" theory and other abominations mixed with it. On the 25th of December the Boston ecclesia held their annual Bible School entertainment, when the scholars received prizes for the



year's work, and were encouraged to continue in the study of the words of life; and through the hard work of some of the members of the ecclesia, it was made one of the most pleasant and enjoyable meetings we have ever had of the kind. One of the features of amusement was a Graphophone, which gave selections of instrumental and social music, reproduced just as delivered by the band, instrument, singer, or speaker. It could be heard all over the hall, showing the possibilities of the age to come. It was new to many of us, and highly interesting. Lectures have been delivered in Arcade Hall, 7, Park Square, on the following subjects during the month of December:—1st, "The End of Gentile Times" (brother A. Pinel); 8th, "Who will Solve the Political and Social Problems of the Day?" (brother E. F. Mitchell); 15th, "The Bondage of Corruption" (brother C. J. Fairbrother); 22nd, "The Songs of the Angels on the Plains of Bethlehem" (brother Joseph McKellar); 29th, "Does the Bible Solve the Eastern Question?" (brother F. C. Whitehead).—JOHN B. RILEIGH.

(April 1897) BOSTON (Mass.).—Brother Rileigh reports: "We have gained by letter brother Dick McConnell, from Ansonia, Con., and Mrs. ADA ESTELLE RILEIGH (22), immersed on the 24th, after a good confession."—On the other hand, he mentions quite a number from whom the ecclesia has had to withdraw on account of their espousal of the cross-nullifying doctrine that there is no sin in the flesh.

## THE SPIRITUALISTS

(May 1889) STOCKPORT- "I am sorry to report that after long forbearance we have been compelled to withdraw from brother and sister Jonah Clarke, who have not assembled with us for some months past, and have finally identified themselves with the Spiritualists. It is indeed very sad to find those once so near the kingdom wallowing in the mire, and losing confidence in the Book which contains such exceeding great and precious promises for man."—W. NORMAN.

## TURNEYISM A.K.A. CLEAN-FLESH

(Excerpt from May 1879) HUDDERSFIELD.—Bro. Heywood reports the withdrawal of brothers and sisters Taylor and Scholefield, on the ground of their denial that the Lord came in sinful flesh, and their want of liberty to teach their idea. The incident has filled the brethren with sorrow, but they accept the situation with resignation.

(May 1895) BOSTON (Mass.).—Brother McKellar reports a visit from brother Paul, of Waterloo, who stayed a few days, and spoke words of comfort at the Sunday and week-day meetings; also withdrawal from sister Margaret Brown, who has embraced Renunciationist views; also the sudden death of brother William H. Forbes, who left his home on Friday, the 22nd, in good health, and died of heart disease within 30 minutes afterwards. This was a great shock to his sister-wife, who is left with three children. Lectures for March were as follows:—3rd, "The Coming of Christ: Signs that the great event is near" (brother W. P. Hooper); 10th, "The Devil and Satan" (brother Jos. McKellar); 17th, "Hell; what it is and where" (brother E. F. Mitchell); 24th, "Will the dead rise?" (brother Alfred Pinel); 31st, "The Destiny of the Earth and Man" (brother C. I. Fair-brother).

## INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL WITHDRAWALS DUE TO DISORDERLY CONDUCT

(Excerpt from October 1869) BIRMINGHAM. — During the month, the ecclesia have seen it their duty, by unanimous vote, to withdraw from WILLIAM FIELD, *quasi* attorney, Church Street, Birmingham, as a brother walking in disobedience.

(November 1870) OLDBURY.—The brethren here have been compelled to withdraw from brother Cheshire, on account of his unworthy course.

(Excerpt from February 1871) BIRMINGHAM.—The past month has witnessed an incident which, for some reasons, it would be better to say nothing about, but which, for others, requires mention. A letter was read to the ecclesia announcing that a number of the brethren and sisters—whose number was afterwards reported to be twelve—had held a meeting, and resolved to open a room in Bradford Street, and establish a branch ecclesia there; and asking the countenance and co-operation of the brethren and sisters at the Athenæum. A meeting was called to consider the matter, at which brother Roberts submitted reasons why the proposed branch ecclesia should be treated as a faction and not as a fraternal movement. Chief among these were warnings from Dr. Thomas, read from three several letters received a considerable time before, to the effect that a certain brother, who had gone to America with him in the *Idaho*, and had been expelled from his house in disgrace, had returned to England, and would, on his arrival in the latter country, seek to enlist the sympathies of envious or disaffected persons, and set up a rival meeting. This brother was one of the twelve. As an illustration of the sort of procedure that had led to his expulsion, brother Roberts read from the said letters an account of how the said brother (James Martin) had, while in charge of the Dr.'s house in his absence, opened and made a copy of, and re-sealed a private letter, addressed by the Dr. to his wife, who happened to be out at the time, and to whom the said James Martin handed the closed letter on her return, as if nothing unusual had happened. On hearing this, the meeting was adjourned for three days to allow of brother Martin's attendance to hear and explain the matter, and one of the brethren was deputed to proceed, at the expense of the ecclesia, to Hereford, where brother Martin happened to be, to give him notice of the adjourned meeting and its purpose. At the adjourned meeting (Thursday, January 12th), brother Martin being present, brother Roberts went into the whole matter from the commencement, and concluded by proposing that all taking part in the proposed Bradford Street meeting should be considered as brethren walking disorderly, and withdrawn from. This proposal was not voted upon, as another was submitted and adopted, to the effect that they be not withdrawn from at once, but that time be given them to manifest the nature of their procedure. As to brother Martin, who spoke at considerable length in his own defence, it was decided to withdraw from him at once, as a mischief-worker and a person of proved untruthfulness and dishonour, two only dissenting. On the following Sunday, at a full meeting of the ecclesia, a brother while concurring in the estimate formed of brother Martin, desired the brethren to recal their withdrawal from him, and re-consider the matter, on the ground that the suddenness and unexpectedness of the decision would establish a bad precedent. Two only voted for this course. About twelve voted for time being given to brother Martin to repent, upon which a brother cogently remarked that he had time to repent in the isolated position in which he had been placed, and could reinstate himself at any time by due acknowledgment, and request for forgiveness. The rest of the ecclesia, in an overwhelming vote, refused to go into the matter again, and re-affirmed withdrawal from James Martin.

(September 1871) WESTON-SUPER-MARE.—Brother Gratz, in the course of business, has moved his temporary residence from this place. Brother Newport says the brethren and sisters miss him much, he was so useful among them, particularly in the lecturing department. The attendance at the morning meetings is steady and punctual, and the prospects of the infant ecclesia are cheering. The brethren and sisters number about twelve, and several strangers are interested. The expenditure and income of the ecclesia is getting more equal than to start with. Last quarter they got £6., and spent £7., which included

£4. for the purchase of a harmonium. During the month, the brethren were favoured with visits from brother E. Turney, of Nottingham, and brother Goldie and family, from Swansea. The only drawback to report is that brother Smith, whom the brethren some time ago held up as an example for sacrificing his position as organist in a parish church for the truth's sake, has gone back to his position and forsaken the assembly of the saints. At this they are disappointed, and have been obliged to withdraw from him.

(October 1871) SWANSEA.—The condensed correspondence held over from last month, we will publish as a separate article in a future number.—The ecclesia have seen fit to withdraw from brother John Morgan, for disorderly walk.

(Excerpt from November 1871) BIRMINGHAM. — On the previous Monday, the annual meeting of the ecclesia was held, when the usual annual appointments of managing brethren, presiding brethren, secretary (bro. Whitcomb), and treasurer (brother Smith), were made. On the same occasion, the ecclesia withdrew from Harry Taylor, for continued disobedience of the injunction to assemble with those of like precious faith; as also (last quarterly meeting,) from William Henry Barnett, for a similar reason. A recommendation to withdraw from brother John Turney, for intemperance, was allowed to lie over till the next quarterly meeting.

(August 1872) GRANTOWN.—Brother McIntosh announces withdrawal from James Gordon, for disorderly walk, rightly adding that we ought not to be cast down at the failure of any to walk in the Spirit, seeing there always have been and must be such till the day of the Lord, who will sit as a refiner's fire.

(October 1872) GRANTOWN.—Brother McIntosh announces withdrawal from brother James Gordon for disorderly walk.—He also reports that brother Robertson and brother James Grant, sen., visited New Mills of Keith, on Sunday, July 28th, and assisted two young men to put on the covering name, viz., ROBERT GREY, farm servant, and WILLIAM SUTHERLAND, farmer's son, both formerly attendants at the established "Kirk." A few in the district are enquiring, and it is hoped may become obedient. In the evening, brother Robertson lectured to an attentive audience in brother Smith's house. Arrangements are in progress for a lecturing visit to the parish of Deskford.

(Excerpt from February 1873) BIRMINGHAM.—The quarterly meeting held Jan. 7th, showed a satisfactory state of things as regards provision for the increasing outlay connected with the operations of the truth in Birmingham. Current expenses had been met (without leaving a balance it is true), and the fund provided Sunday by Sunday for the dissemination of the truth, notwithstanding a heavy drain, showed an encouraging balance in hand. These facts appeared on the report of brother Whitcomb, secretary, and brother Smith, treasurer. The business of the meeting included withdrawal from brother James Beddoes, of Sparchford, Bromfield, for walking in disobedience, after prolonged endeavour to induce him to alter; also the consideration of the adjourned question of whether there is to be a Fraternal Gathering in 1873, which after discussion, was decided in the negative; the proposal being to issue an invitation for 1874, should the Lord's absence continue. [Compiler's Note: Bold Mat. 18:15-18]

(April 1873) MUMBLES.—Brother D. Clement announces that the ecclesia have withdrawn from brother William Clement, for a variety of reasons which made the step imperative, and as brother W. Clement holds the chapel as trustee under the deed, the ecclesia have removed from that place of meeting, and have resolved upon the erection of a building of their own. Meanwhile, they are meeting in a private house.

(October 1873) HUDDERSFIELD.—Sister Fraser announces the withdrawal of James Voyce, whose astrological practices had been condemned by the brethren. Sister Fraser adds he has so much faith in this false science, that there is very little hope of him seeing how sinful it is.

(June 1874) LIVERPOOL.—Brother Waite reports the withdrawal of the ecclesia from sister Sarah Fowler for disorderly walk.

(Excerpt from April 1876) MANCHESTER.—Brother Trueblood reports withdrawal from William F. Roche, because of disorderly walk.

(Excerpt from May 1876) LEICESTER. — We regret having had to withdraw from brother Burbank, on account of intemperance.”

(Excerpt from September 1876) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland reports the withdrawal of brother J. Harrison from the Nottingham ecclesia; also the withdrawal of the brethren from brother Hoe, for disorderly walk and conduct.

(Excerpt from June 1877) ABERDEEN. — Brother Anderson likewise reports withdrawal from brother James Anderson for intemperance.

(January 1878) BOURTON – ON – THE – WATER. — Brother Hopcraft writes that brother Chandler has been reinstated in fellowship, after six months separation through intemperance

(Excerpt from February 1878) BEECHWORTH.—Brother Ladson writes: “We have lost two of our number during the last few months—one by conduct inconsistent with the position of a believer, and the other by removal to another part of the colony

(Excerpt from September 1877) LEEDS.—Brother W. H. Andrew reports that brother Willis is out of fellowship for a time on account of serious misconduct.

(Excerpt from September 1878) NOTTINGHAM.—Bro. Kirkland reports the adoption of a resolution at the last quarterly meeting of the ecclesia, condemnatory of the marriage of one of the brethren with a wife not in fellowship with the truth. The matter had been first dealt with in private in the proper manner. To the resolution, this clause was appended: “We pass this resolution, not with any desire to cut off brother Keeling from fellowship, but that we may not be partakers of his sin.” At a meeting held two weeks later, brother Keeling being present, another resolution was passed, expressing the conviction of the brethren that the brother in question ought not to be offended, but ought, if in a proper state of mind, to resume his place at the table. Brother Keeling has since withdrawn from the ecclesia. [Compiler’s Note: Underlined Mat. 18:15-18; not with any desire to cut off, Br. Keeling is still in fellowship with Nottingham at this point]

(October 1878) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother H. H. Keeling, who has withdrawn from the brethren here on account of their condemnation of his marriage outside the truth, wishes to consider himself in fellowship with the brethren elsewhere; but he will probably find his wish cannot be reciprocated. True brethren everywhere are one; and if their company is repudiated in one place because of a testimony against evil, it is repudiated in every other. Private breaking of bread does not preserve a fellowship elsewhere which is broken in one’s own town. [Compiler’s Note: See September 1878 Nottingham under independent ecclesia]

(Excerpt from November 1878) MANCHESTER.—Brother W. Smith announces that on Sunday, Sep. 29th, the ecclesia withdrew from Frederick Leary, *alias* William Entwistle, *alias* Thomas Metcalf, &c., for imposture and villany in general. The case—a painful and a saddening one—forms a very curious chapter in the history of the truth, going to show that imposture sometimes assumes incredible and scarcely-detectable forms, and that previous experience is not always a guide. [Compiler’s Note: See Examples of the likes of the Apostasy / Internal for full correspondence]

(November 1878) TAUNTON.—The brethren here have withdrawn from brother CHARLES DOE, for a walk unbecoming the gospel.

(Excerpt from December 1878) SWANSEA.—Brother Randles reports the withdrawal of the brethren from S. W. Blight *alias* Richards, for prolonged and systematic imposture. Ever since his immersion, some nine months or so ago, he has talked of legal prospects, about to be realised, which would secure him an income of £140,000 per annum; and the great things he would do for the truth when he came into possession. Meanwhile, he was leaning, considerably, in a quiet way, on some of the brethren. His story, which was very circumstantial and adorned with letter-posting, and reported visits of legal persons to Swansea, which never took place, has been found, on investigation, to be a complete invention. The case is quite phenomenal, and has distressed the brethren greatly.

(Excerpt from September 1879) WARRINGTON.—Brother C. Roberts reports withdrawal from brother Phillips for intemperance.

(Excerpts from September 1879) BALMAIN (SYDNEY, N.S.W). — Brother Hawkins writes:—“Our communications are not at all frequent. Changes have taken place in our midst, deaths, removals, withdrawals, &c., We have had to reject the fellowship of several from the ‘old country.’ We have had to withdraw from brother Charles Jones, for adultery

(Excerpt from November 1879) BRISTOL.—Brother Baker reports the removal of brother Curry to Tamworth, and sister Ciements to Dudley. A third loss has resulted from the withdrawal of the ecclesia from brother Nutt, for disorderly walk.

(November 1879) MANCHESTER.—Brother W. Smith writes—“We have this month to report our loss of the association of brother and sister Clark, through their removal to Frome (Somerset), where brother Clark has found employment. We hope they will be the same strength there as we have experienced during their sojourn in Manchester. We have likewise to report the withdrawal from brother Thomas Holland—for disorderly walk—in endeavouring to entice brethren and sisters from the fellowship of this ecclesia, and in opening another room a short distance from the one at present occupied by the ecclesia. Several brethren and sisters sympathizing with him had resigned prior to this action, their resignations being accepted in the hope that at least some of them may see their erroneous position and return. One sister has already signified her desire to return.”

(December 1879) MANCHESTER. — Brother Holland denies the truth of the statements appearing in the communication from this place last month. He has no desire, however, to have the matter debated, but is willing, as the others implicated with him are, to have the matter investigated. Having published the statement, we publish the denial, and there we must leave it, making it a rule never to open the pages of the *Christadelphian* for the discussion of personal differences. [Compiler’s Note: See Manchester above; also see the heading examples of independent ecclesial actions / resolutions by ecclesias for more history]

(Excerpt from December 1879) GREAT BRIDGE. — We have been under the necessity of withdrawing from brother Page, who is walking disorderly.

(Excerpt from January 1880) BRISTOL. — “We have withdrawn from brother Monney through his disorderly walking.

(April 1880) RIDDINGS.—Brother Wragg, writing of the work at Bagthorpe, Nottinghamshire, says, “Our week-night lectures having an average attendance of forty strangers, and owing to the interest taken by them in the truth, our brothers Marshall and Robinson will henceforth meet to break bread at Bagthorpe, some of the Riddings brethren promising their aid and support. The brethren have had to withdraw from brother Joseph Tatton, and also from brother Joseph Short, for disorderly walk.”

(June 1880) SHIPSTON-ON-STOUR.—Brother Pym reports withdrawal from Thomas Rawlings on account of continued bad conduct.

(Excerpt from August 1880) SWANSEA. — We regret to announce withdrawal from brother Tucker on account of intemperance.”

(September 1880) HAMILTON.—Brother F. W. Vossmer reports the obedience of EDWARD HENRY WHITECROSS (36), who after much search for truth found and confessed the same, and was gladly assisted, on Good-Friday last, in putting on the name, by which he is now of another seed, even Abraham’s.—Brother Vossmer also reports the withdrawal of the ecclesia from Mr. T. S. Doe and wife for disorderly walk.

(September 1880) DUNEDIN.—Bro. Miller, jun., announces the immersion of JAMES WARBURTON, formerly of India, where he had read some of the books sent to him ten years ago, by an uncle—a brother in the faith. Brother Miller also says: “I am instructed by the managing brethren to draw your attention to the fact that brethren from the old country have come out here and have never been near the Dunedin ecclesia, and as no notice of their coming has been sent to any of the ecclesias no one has gone to meet them when they arrive; while some who have been withdrawn from by the ecclesia for disorderly conduct have had notice of their coming and have kept them apparently in ignorance that an ecclesia of twenty-five members exists in Dunedin, but have taken them away to Caversham, which is about two miles from Dunedin. Therefore so as to obviate this in the future the brethren would feel extremely grateful to you if you would insert the following statement in the *Christadelphian*.

The Dunedin ecclesia meets every Sunday at the Oddfellows’ Hall, Rattray Street, at 11 a.m., and 6.30 p.m., and if any of the brethren or sisters were coming to Dunedin, and they would write to the Secretary, addressed as follows, Alex. Miller, jun., Roslyn, Dunedin, we should be only too glad to go and meet them when they arrive.”

[We cannot explain the circumstance referred to except on the score of the prominence of brother Holmes’ name for many years, and ignorance in Britain as to the precise position of affairs in Dunedin. That some disorganisation exists is about the most that is known; the cause and merits thereof are not exhilarating subjects of enquiry in the midst of so much that is otherwise depressing and trying to the faith. How important it is for brethren to dwell together in unity, not only for their own sakes, but for the sake of all who stand related to them who are liable some time or other to be distracted by their misunderstandings if they are not sifted and buried when they arise. How can edification and purification and preparation for Christ make progress in the midst of strife? Only misery and destruction come of it.]

(October 1880) CREWE.—Brother Malliber reports the obedience of Mrs. COOPER, who put on the saving name on August 14th. He also refers to the withdrawal of the brethren from brother Booth, remarking that they would have preferred the notice to appear in the inside of the *Christadelphian* among the usual intelligence communication instead of on the cover. The reason of its appearing on the cover

was that the intelligence was made up for the month before we possessed sufficient certainty of information to make us feel justified in publishing so serious an announcement. On attaining that certainty of information, rather than delay it another month, we inserted it on the cover, which comes last in the preparation of the *Christadelphian*. They wish the announcement to appear, that brother Booth has been withdrawn from on account of intemperance and obtaining money under false pretences, and embezzlement.

(January 1881) DUNEDIN.—Brother W. Holmes transmits a lengthy rejoinder to the notification appearing in the September *Christadelphian*. He asks for the contradiction of the statement that he and another have been “withdrawn from for disorderly conduct.” On the contrary, he says he and those with him withdrew from the meeting, sending the notice in question in consequence of falsehood and heresy. With this statement, the matter must be left so far as the *Christadelphian* is concerned. It is impossible to judge at a distance. It is a calamity there should be anything to “judge.” The only course for visitors to the colony is to satisfy themselves by personal investigation. The Lord will judge all when he comes, and in the recollection of this, every just man will find consolation.

(Excerpt from February 1881) LEICESTER.—Brother Dixon reports withdrawal from brother Noon for disorderly walk.

(Excerpt from February 1881) LIVERPOOL. — Our number has also been increased by the removal of sister H. M. Young from Warrington to Birkenhead, while sister C. Lucas, whose name has been for a long time on our books in the expectation of her return, has taken up her residence permanently in London.—The Ecclesia has been obliged to withdraw from brother F. Daniel Parry on account of disorderly walk, also from brother and sister Milne for continued absence from the table.

(May 1881) CUPAR.—Bro. Archibald Dowie writes: “Some time ago the ecclesia in Cupar had to withdraw from Mrs. GARLAND for disorderly conduct. It is very sad when those who make the good confession fail to carry out the instructions of Our Lord and Saviour. Still such things have been from the beginning, and we should all take warning—flee from the very appearance of evil. Let each of us bear in mind that our safety is in the Lord, and in the truth, intelligently and lovingly beloved and held fast.”

(August 1881) ALFRETON.—Brother Turner, of this place, reports on behalf of the brethren at Riddings, Ripley, and Swanwick, that after long patience they have withdrawn from brother Vernon, for violent and unbrotherly behaviour.

(October 1881) JUMP (NEAR BARNESLEY) The brethren meeting here are sorry to have to report the loss of Sister Ward, whose immersion was reported in the *Christadelphian* for May, this year. Inconsistency of character is the reason she has not broken bread since her immersion was reported—J. WALKER. [Compiler’s Note: Does not outright say that the ecclesia withdrew but that appears to be the case]

(January 1882) GLOUCESTER--The names of the brethren and sisters who ceased to fellowship with us on the 1st of January, of this year (1881), are Frank Forrester, George A. Baker, George A. Thody, Sarah Thody, Emily Baker, Mary Ann Forrester, and Julian Hodges. In consequence of their disorderly walk, we have withdrawn from them. We have also been compelled to withdraw from William Hodges, on account of his adoption of what has been called “Humanitarian Christadelphianism” (the belief that Joseph was the actual father of Jesus.—ED.)—A. H. ROGERS

(Excerpt from June 1882) SWANSEA—On March 13, we had the pleasure of receiving into fellowship THOMAS DAVIES, son of Brother and Sister Davies, of Cwmamman, near Aberdare, who had been

immersed after a satisfactory examination in the one faith, on the previous evening. The brethren have withdrawn from Brother Jenkins for disorderly walk.

(July 1882) NEW WOMBWELL—The brethren here have withdrawn from brother Francis, for continuous behaviour unbecoming a saint. They fear he may seek to impose on other ecclesias. Hence this announcement of withdrawal; and, if need be, they will furnish particulars to any ecclesia calling upon them so to do.—Apply to J. Walker, 4, Barnsley-road, Wombwell, near Barnsley.

(October 1882) BAGTHORPE—Bro. Wharmby reports withdrawal from Bro. Elam Smithurst, for continued absence from the breaking of bread, aggravated by enrolment in the “Blue Ribbon Army.”

(October 1882) GLASGOW—Brother Leask reports withdrawal from Richard Shepherd for serious misbehaviour, of which particulars are furnished; also, a visit from Brother A. Andrew, of London, and Sister Hopper, the former of whom gave a very fine forenoon address, and lectured in the afternoon to a very good audience. Brother Robertson, of Arbroath, who is here on a visit with Sister Robertson and family, lectured on the following Sunday.

(Excerpt from December 1882) EDINBURGH—Brother D. A. L. Gascoyne has been arrested at the instance of his employers for embezzlement and breach of trust, and, having pleaded guilty, has been sentenced to nine months’ imprisonment. Had the Word been his counsellor, this sad report would have been spared to the feelings of the writer and reader.

(Excerpt from April 1883) LIVERPOOL—Brother and Sister Wilkinson, though nominally members of the Liverpool ecclesia, have for their own convenience (as they live on the Cheshire side of the river) broken bread with the Tranmere ecclesia for the last eighteen months, and have now decided to continue to do so, which, under the present circumstances, necessitates our standing aside from them.

(Excerpt from July 1883) JERSEY CITY, N.J.— Brother James Phillips, of Warrington, England, after having been in our fellowship for over a year and a half. left suddenly for Liverpool without communicating with any of the brethren. He was received into the fellowship of the Jersey City ecclesia without much enquiry into his antecedents which, it has since transpired, were not of a character becoming the gospel. His conduct since has resulted in the withdrawal of the brethren from him. Brother C. P. Rowley has returned to Washington.

(August 1883) JERSEY CITY (N.J.)—Brother Washburne reports the immersion of Mrs. HENRIETTA HEPZIBAH COLE, on June 28th. Mrs. Cole has been earnestly seeking the way of life for some time. Our number has been further increased by the removal here of brother James Jarvie, late of Glasgow, who has obtained employment in New York; also brother Edmond Edgcomb, late of Boston. The friends of brother Walter Andrew, of Leeds, will be pleased to here that he has safely arrived in these parts, and already found employment. The members of our ecclesia are gratified at the accession of these young brethren from abroad. Brother William Brittle, of St. Nicholas, Pa., recently paid us a visit, and delivered two very instructive and able lectures. Our ecclesia now is in an exceedingly healthy condition, and we pray the Father that we may thus continue.—JAMES M WASHBURNE, Secretary, 278, 7th Street, Jersey City, N.J.—P.S. Brother Washburne, in a separate letter, states that the brethren here have been shamefully deceived by so-called brother Ware, formerly of London, who came to New York with a letter of introduction from the brethren at Wellington Hall, but has been detected in flagrant immorality and imposture. The Jersey City brethren having discharged their duty in withdrawing from him, wish to apprise all others of the fact.



(Excerpt from December 1883) WESTMINSTER ECCLESIA. — Unscriptural conduct on the part of brother John Barlow has compelled the brethren to withdraw from him.

(Excerpt from February 1884) BIRMINGHAM- The quarterly business meeting took place on the first Thursday in the year. The presiding brother emphasised (not unduly) on the necessity for keeping in view the future to which the gospel introduces us in order rightly to regard the humdrum duties of the present, of which our quarterly meeting was one. The Scripture reading of the day from Matthew was a pleasant preface in this sense.—Brother Bishop then read at length the report of our various doings for three months past. The treasurer's report, while telling us of large receipts, informed us of equal disbursements, with this result, that while in the first collection account we had gained about 30s., in the second account we had lost ground to a similar extent, so that we were just equal to level the state of things at the beginning of the quarter. We had nothing to show for a quarter's spendings, but a quarter's activity. This, it was observed, would be reckoned a poor state of things if we were a secular society, or operating with financial aims; but as a community endeavouring to fulfil the laws of Christ, in the midst of a large and dark town, the case was different. It meant that we were doing our duty and answering the end of our existence. Our spendings were wastings from the earthly standpoint; but from the heavenly, they were savings—treasures laid up in heaven.—The case of brother Jones supplied a painful sequel to the meetings. For three years or more, patience and exhortations and entreaty of the most brotherly character have failed to help out of the ways of intemperance. The managing brethren considered that the last point of forbearance had been reached, and that Paul's express words in 1Cor. 5:13, required them to recommend the ecclesia to withdraw.—Brother Jones attended, and pleaded pathetically for another quarter's trial.—Brother Shuttleworth proposed he should have it.—Brother Hadley thought a limited withdrawal would be a greater help to brother Jones. He proposed three months, at the end of which brother Jones should be at liberty to apply for the re-instatement in case of reformation.—This proposal was adopted.

(February 1884) DUNDEE-Intelligence is to hand from the brethren meeting at 72, Overgate, in this place, stating that the ecclesia has been compelled to withdraw from bro. James Mortimer, for flagrant offence against even Gentile morality. Bro. Mitchell has been appointed secretary in his stead. The brethren desire to keep themselves unspotted from the world. It would be a comfort to them to have a visit from some capable brother who could present the truth in an efficient manner.

(January 1885) SWANSEA- We have had the painful duty of withdrawing from sister Elizabeth Palmer, for disorderly walking, and from bro. Usher, for publicly expressed disbelief in the inspiration of portions of the Scriptures. These occurrences have caused much sadness amongst us.

(July 1885) Thrifty (TEX.).—Brother W. H. Wolfe writes: "The ecclesia here have not withdrawn from brother Chaddick, but from H. H. Reynolds for disorderly walk."

(September 1885) Derby.—Bro. Chandler reports the obedience of THOMAS COTTON (20), whose immersion took place on July 21st. He has attended a good many of the lectures for the past three years, and gave evidence of an intelligent understanding of the truth. After long patience, the ecclesia, at a special meeting held on August 14th, resolved unanimously to withdraw from bro. Grimes for disorderly walk. The lectures are fairly well attended.

(September 1885) Liverpool.—We have been reluctantly compelled to withdraw from bro. William Riding for absence from the table and disorderly walk, also from bro. McKnight for prolonged absence from the ecclesia's meetings.

(September 1885) Huddersfield.—Bro. Heywood reports withdrawal from bro. Sanderson for striking a brother. On the other hand, two brethren protest against the withdrawal, on the ground that the offending brother sincerely repents of his offence, and has asked forgiveness, which they contend ought to be granted. The brethren everywhere will be glad if such a dispute is settled as it ought to be—in patience, forgiveness, and love.

(Excerpt from July 1886) Melbourne -- “During 1885, our history has been as follows:—On the 24th February, we withdrew from brother J. J. Schneider for behaviour unworthy of the name of Christ. This has caused us much trouble. Sister Schneider absented herself in consequence, and on 10th April, we had to withdraw from brother and sister G. C. Hodgson, and brother and sister Van der Grient, who sympathised with brother Schneider in a wrong course. On the 12th May, we had to withdraw from brother E. Hall for refusing obedience to Christ’s law of offences in Matt.18:15. On 25th July JOSEPH ALFRED LOVELL (26), from Pieter-maritzburg, South Africa, obeyed the truth in baptism. He had learned the truth in South Africa. On the 22nd Sept. brother E. Osborne, and sister Osborne his wife (formerly sister E. Marriage) left our fellowship for the Melbourne Ecclesia; and on 25th Nov. brother F. C. Arnold did the same. Some attempts towards a reunion among the ecclesias here have been made, but without success, and our attitude remains the same. Since last writing, we have advertised *Christendom Astray* freely, both by a standing advertisement in the paper and by house-to-house distribution of over 25,000 handbills (reprints of the one you issued). The visible results, however, of this and other work are almost inappreciable. But that is to be expected.”

(June 1887) Lincoln.—Brother Dracup reports that the brethren have had, with grief, to withdraw from brother F. J. Roberts for continued intemperance.

(July 1887) Portland (Ogn).—Brother McCarl says:—“The truth is not making much progress here. The people are careless, and live but for to-day. Withdrawal has taken place from brother Snashall, in accordance with Paul’s instructions in James 1:26 and 1 Cor. 5:11, which reduces the numbers of those who meet together every first day to remember the Lord’s death till he come.

(August 1887) Thrifty (Tex.) Brother Wolfe reports that “the ecclesia have had to withdraw from brother R. C. and sister Martha Chaddick for disorderly walk; also they have lot by removal brother and sister Maxwell. We desire to say that we are not ashamed to be called Christadelphians, and also that we are with you on the inspiration of the Scriptures, and desire to be remembered in the petitions of all the faithful in their approaches to our heavenly Father.”

(February 1888) DEVONPORT-Brother Sleep reports that, though the brethren here escaped the troubles caused by the inspiration controversy, they have recently had to suffer from other causes, such as refusal to acknowledge Scripture teaching concerning marriage with the alien, absence from the breaking of bread, &c., in consequence of which withdrawals have taken place. “We have been visited by sister Brabyn, whom we are always pleased to see; and brother Guest, who is likewise always welcome. He lectured on “The Destiny of Britain Revealed in the Scriptures.” A few strangers were present. Our week-night meeting is now held on Thursday, when we have decided to study brother Sulley’s work. On Tuesday we have our *Elpis Israel* Class at brother Hosking’s.”

(June 1888) SWANSEA-*Albert Minor Hall*.—We have been favoured with a visit from brother Sulley, of Nottingham, accompanied by sister Sulley. Their visit was on the occasion of two lectures given by brother Sulley on the “Temple of Ezekiel’s Prophecy.” A special effort was made in advertising, &c., the result was largely increased audiences. The brethren were greatly interested and instructed by the lectures and the splendid diagrams. Since our last report we have had to withdraw from brother Wheel for disorderly walking. Brother Allen, after a short sojourn with us, has removed to Cardiff. Our lectures have

been as follows:—April 15th, “The Baptist Union Split and the Doctrine of Eternal Torments” (brother George Palmer); 22nd, “The Return of Christ” (brother Jas. Evans); 29th, “The Armed State of Europe;” May 6th and 8th, “The Temple of Ezekiel’s Prophecy” (brother Sulley); 13th, “Visible signs of the early erection of the Temple and the second Coming of Christ.” — THOMAS RANGLES.

(April 1889) DUDLEY-Brother Jakeman reports a continuance of the truth’s work here, and some encouragement in the matter of good attendance at the meetings. The lectures for the past month have been by brother Woodhall, junr., Dudley; brother Allen, Lichfield; brother Dawes, Rugeley; and brother Roberts, of Birmingham. Brother Roberts’ lecture was well attended by strangers, who manifested an interest in his remarks upon “The True Church, How it is to be known; the purpose it serves now and hereafter.” The brethren have had to withdraw from brother and sister Smith, of Woodside, Dudley, for disorderly walk. Brother Jakeman remarks—“We are obliged to do this unpleasant work and at the same time take a lesson from it ourselves.” “Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.” He further remarks that since the introduction of the truth to Dudley, nearly 200 persons have accepted and obeyed it. Some have left for foreign parts. From most of those on the American side of the Atlantic, the brethren remaining in Dudley should be pleased to hear. “An attempt has been made for unity with those brethren from whom we separated upon the Inspiration question, but without success, as they wanted us to agree for them to have the liberty of fellowship with those who are not in fellowship with us. To this we could not agree.”

(October 1892) KILMARNOCK-Brother Macdougall reports the separation of brother J. Mitchell on account of marriage out of the truth; also of brother Aird on the ground of our refusal to fellowship the Partialists.

(October 1892) NEW ROMNEY -During the month, we have had visits from the following brethren and sisters which have contributed in no small measure to cheer, comfort, and edify us: brother Purnell from Hastings, sister Fleming from Dover, whom we were pleased to see benefit so much physically by her visit; brother and sister Cook and their two little girls from Leeds. Brother Cook, by his lecture and Sunday morning exhortations, made us feel the richer in the best of all riches, and thus added profitableness unto our little meeting. I am deeply grieved to have to report our necessity of withdrawal from brother Daniel Horne on account of misconduct whilst staying in Dover. We trust, however, that sincere repentance may be made by him, and complete forsaking of evil habits will follow.—WM. WHITEHEAD.

(January 1893) LEEDS-I regret to report that we have been obliged to withdraw from brother Wood on account of disorderly walk. In my last letter I made a mistake. I said brother W. Fidler and sister E. Booth had been united in marriage: this ought to have been brother Thomas Fidler and sister Ada Elston.—R. W. THORP.

(July 1893) LINCOLN-Masonic Hall, Sundays, 10.30 a.m., 6.30 p.m.—Brother Green reports withdrawal from brother Dracup, for disorderly conduct on Sunday, May 28th. **The brethren send a full report of the particulars, but it is better that these should be privately communicated where the knowledge of them may be necessary.** They are such as to justify the brethren in their act of withdrawal from the brother in question. Brother Fidler, of Nottingham, lectured on May 28th, on “The Prince of the Kings of the Earth”; June 11th, “The Serpent’s lie,” brother Walker, of Newark. The other dates have been filled by local brethren. Brother Rednall has removed to Grantham, and will meet with the brethren there.

(October 1893) LEAMINGTON-Brother Willitts reports that three persons have submitted to the requirements of the truth in taking upon them in the waters of baptism the only name under Heaven whereby men can be saved. Namely: RICHARD WEAVER (37) and JESSIE, his wife (41), formerly

neutral, who were immersed at Birmingham on August 24th. Also on August 31st, GEORGE KNIGHT (77), formerly Wesleyan. Also that the brethren have been obliged to withdraw from brother Butler on account of unruly walk.

(October 1893) NOTTINGHAM—Since last report the truth has been well upheld before the people by local speakers. Attendance, considering the hot weather, has been good. We hope the seed sown may be prospered and show results later on. On October 5th, we hold a tea meeting, to which we extend a cordial invitation to any brethren or sisters who may be able to attend. From many towns and districts trains at reduced fares will be running. We regret the loss of one of our number, formerly known as sister E. Turney, who, not discerning the duty of the faithful in relation to marriage, has left the meeting, and become united to one not holding the truth as it is in Jesus.—S. RICHARDS.

(Excerpt from December 1893) GLASGOW—Writing again a month later, brother Campbell says:—“Since I wrote, on the 17th ultimo, the brethren here have had the pleasure of assisting two others into Christ, namely, Mrs. BOYD and Mrs. WILLIAM HOSIE, the latter a sister-in-law of brother Robert Hosie. Neither had had her attention first directed to the truth in Glasgow, the former having had it brought to her notice in Greenock some years ago; the latter in Melbourne, Australia, also some time since. We rejoice, nevertheless, in having been privileged to assist in that specially prescribed act of obedience, without which there is no passing from Adam into Christ, from death unto life. We regret having had to withdraw from sister Cameron on the ground of disorderly walk.”

(December 1894) DERBY *Athenæum Rooms*.—Brother J. W. Dorricott reports that the “Rev.” Hewitt, mentioned last month, has been approached by brother Gamble, of Leicester, with a view to debate the subject: “Does the Bible Teach that Man has an Immortal Soul?” with the result that Mr. Hewitt declined the proposal on the ground that Christadelphian teaching tends to Atheism and Infidelity! We can only lament the mist that seems to gather thicker and thicker round the Word of God, and resolve to cling more tightly to the One Hope that is imperishable.—Brother and sister Sturgess have removed from Birmingham to Derby. The brethren and sisters of Birmingham will know how acceptable an addition they will be to our number. We have had to withdraw from brother Fitchett and sister Palmer, who, for the sake of parents (not in the truth), persisted in being married at the Church of England, thus giving countenance to the false pretensions of a class of men whom enlightenment compels us to regard as ecclesiastical sorcerers. The ecclesia passed a resolution on the occasion.

(Excerpt from April 1894) BRISTOL *Oddfellows’ Hall, Rupert Street, near Christmas Steps. Sunday mornings at 11; evenings at 6.30.*—On February 21st we sorrowfully stood aside from brother F. A. Collens for disorderly conduct arising out of complicated troubles in connection with marriage with the alien. Whilst we are dutifully compelled to measure his conduct by the inflexible rule of Christ, we hope when again he can claim our right hand of fellowship to say that kindly word of encouragement which is but little

“When we think how much our Father  
Has forgiven and does forgive.”

(April 1894) BOURNEMOUTH (WINTON)—Our numbers have been decreased by the removal of sisters Butts and Taylor to London, and brother and sister Parsons to Derby. Sister Lennard has removed from Portsmouth to Bournemouth. We have withdrawn from brother J. Randell, senr., for conduct contrary to the law of Christ. Brother Frank Witheridge has resigned through sympathy with him.—J. WILKINSON.

[A communication from those who are separated announces an immersion which the brethren had previously refused to countenance—evidently for Scriptural reasons. It cannot, therefore, appear in the *Christadelphian*.—EDITOR.]

(June 1894) NEWPORT (MON.) Brother Collard reports the immersion during the month of five candidates for life eternal, viz.:—BEATRICE NOAKES (16), daughter of brother Noakes; ALICE COLLARD (32), wife of brother Collard, formerly Wesleyan; FRANK LANDER (15), son of brother J. Lander; JOHN H. COLES (31) and FREDERICK COLES (two brothers in the flesh), who were both formerly neutral. We have also immersed two brethren from Pontypool, whose names will appear in the correspondence under that heading. Brother C. W. Heath and his sister-wife have removed to Pontrhydyrum, also sister Amy Stillman. We have been obliged to withdraw from brother H. Holder, who has violated the commands of Christ in marrying one of the alien. Our lectures have been as follows:—April 15th, “Neglected Bible truths” (brother C. W. Heath); 22nd, “The terror of the Lord in the time of the dead” (brother J. Lander); 29th, “The Laodicean State” (brother W. Collard); May 6th, “The Mission of Christ—its destruction, and constructive character” (brother T. J. Cross); May 13th, “Palestine—the purpose of God inseparably connected with it, Bible pictures of its coming condition and glory as the centre of the kingdom of God” (W. Collard).

(August 1895) NEWPORT (MON.) -With sorrow we have to report withdrawal from brother John Coles, for disregard to the Master’s commandments. Our brother W. F. Skinner has removed to Sheffield, and will meet with the brethren and sisters of that ecclesia. Our brother and sister S. Jeffreys have also removed to Morrision, and will meet with the brethren and sisters there. We hope that holding fast that which we have heard, we may all meet and be accepted at last in the beloved. The lectures have been as follows:—Brother Schofield, “Human Nature”; brother J. Lander, “Faith, Hope, and Charity”; brother Cross, “Christendom Astray”; brother Collard, “Daniel’s Vision of the Night.”—E. S. SCHOFIELD.

(November 1895) HANWELL-We are still endeavouring to bring before the minds of the people in this place the knowledge of the truth, but we find the soil very bad. It is rumoured by clerical authority that we are destined to die a natural death in twelve months. Several, however, have evinced interest in the truth, and we have hopes of their acceptance of it. We are sorry to announce that brother Quincy, through unequally yoking himself with the world, has had to be withdrawn from. We are still meeting at brother Trig-well’s house, at 1, Boston Road, Hanwell, and shall be pleased to see at any time visitors this way, on Sunday evenings at 7, and Thursdays at 8.—G. H. PHILLIPS.

(March 1896) NUNEATON-Many will be sorry to hear that duty compels us at last to withdraw from our brother Turney, on account of long-continued absence from the table and marriage with an alien. This action to us is very painful, but duty and the truth demand it. Lectures:—January 12th, “Angels: Their Nature and Mission” (brother Bower); 19th, “Looking for Redemption in Jerusalem” (brother Hands); 26th, “Jesus Christ the Faithful Witness” (brother Warrender); February 2nd, “Zion’s Sure Foundation” (brother Rollason).—W. G. HANDS.

(April 1896) MANCHESTER *Geoffrey Street, off Shakespeare Street. Meetings at 3 and 6.30 p.m.*—It gives us great pleasure to have to report that another has been added to the household of Faith in the person of Miss MARGARET ELIZABETH BANKS (19), formerly Church of England, and daughter of sister Banks, of Droylsden. Our young sister is in service at Knutsford, and it was somewhat difficult for her to get away for the necessary interviews before her admission. It was arranged that she should come to Manchester on Sunday morning, March 1st, and meet the brethren at the house of brother King, where, should the examination be deemed satisfactory, she could be immersed, and afterwards be received into fellowship at the afternoon meeting. Accompanied by her mother, and in the presence of several of the brethren and sisters, Miss Banks was interrogated by brother Morris, as to her knowledge of the first

principles of Divine truth. Her confession was most satisfactory, and there being no reason why we should “forbid water,” she was immersed into the Saving Name, and was subsequently received into fellowship. On the other hand, we have to report the withdrawal of the ecclesia from brother J. F. Roberts for intemperance and conduct inconsistent with the profession of the truth. We are striving to attain to a more harmonious attitude with the precept of the word and that conversation which becometh the Gospel. Lectures are being regularly delivered, but the attendance is small. It is intended to hold a teameeting on Good Friday, to which all brethren who can make it possible to attend are heartily invited. Tea begins at 4–30, to be followed by a meeting, at which suitable addresses will be given.—A MORRIS.

(April 1896) MERTHYR—It is my painful duty to report our withdrawal from brother Samuels, in consequence of his persistence in making charges publicly against a brother, in opposition to the law of Christ. Our numbers are small—only five, but could be augmented if we would but lower the standard, and admit the advocates of partial inspiration. Though few in numbers, we feel individual effort to be as necessary as in larger ecclesias. We are still in our hired room, 51, Castle Street, where we meet every first day of the week to exhort one another, and “to shew forth the Lord’s death till he come.” We also do what we can to train up our children in the way of life, and sow the good seed on alien soil as opportunity offers. For two years we have kept before the public a standing protest against a false theology by advertising *Christendom Astray* in our local paper, with what results we know not; but this we know, no one has disputed the truth of the advertisement. Sister Jones, of the Mumbles, recently on a three weeks’ visit to relatives at Merthyr, has been one with us during her stay, and has cheered us by her presence. So would all others of like precious faith visiting here.—A. JONES.

(April 1897) OLDHAM.—“On Monday, February 22nd, SUSANNAH HARTLEY passed through the water of baptism, and gave another addition to the household. Against this I have to report withdrawal from brother G. Rosssen., for disorderly walk. On February 16th, brother Harold Todd and sister Ada Clalford were united in marriage. Our lectures for the past two months have been by brethren Bellamy and Lake, of Stockport; Morris, of Manchester; Battersby, of Droylsden; and brethren Ross, Clalford, Ormerod, and Bamford, of our own meeting.”—J. E. BAMFORD

## INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL WITHDRAWAL DUE TO ABSENCE FROM THE TABLE

(Excerpt from July 1870) BIRMINGHAM. — At a special meeting held on the 20th ult., the ecclesia withdrew from the fellowship of William Allen, joiner and contractor, who had been absent from the table for many months

(Excerpt from August 1870) BIRMINGHAM. — During the same period, the ecclesia has seen fit to withdraw from JOSEPH LEA, who has been absent from the table eighteen months, because his wife was considered unready for immersion

(August 1872) BIRMINGHAM.—The attendance at the Sunday evening lectures has revived under the stimulus of advertising. There have been no cases of obedience during the month. On the contrary, at the quarterly meeting of the ecclesia held on Tuesday, the 2nd ult., withdrawal was made from Robert John Barratt, Thomas Copham and his wife Mrs. Copham, and G. F. Hopkins for prolonged non-attendance at the breaking of bread. The absence in nearly all cases has exceeded a year, and has been associated with disorderly walk. Many attempts have been made to bring the erring to a sense of their duty, but without effect. The extremity of withdrawal has been resorted to after long and fruitless patience and entreaty.—Preparations are being made for the presence of over a hundred visitors for four days in August.—(See

Fraternal Gathering.) The extent of the gathering exceeds all expectations, but the brethren hope to get through it somehow. [Compiler's Note: Dark gray Mat. 18:15-18]

(Excerpt from December 1872) NOTTINGHAM. — Brother and sister Phelps having remained away for a long period, a special meeting, to which both brother and sister Phelps were invited, decided that the managing brethren had done all in their power to induce a return; consequently nothing remained but to recognise withdrawal as accomplished [Compiler's Note: Bold Mat. 18:15-18]

(Excerpt from October 1876) WHITBY.—Brother Clegg reports the withdrawal of the ecclesia from brother Mankin for persistent absence from the table; and from sister Tiplady, for the same reason, aggravated by attendance at and identification with the Church of England. He details the facts and correspondence, which it is not necessary to publish.

(Excerpt from November 1876) BIRMINGHAM. — The annual meeting was held Oct. 5th, at which the usual appointments of serving brethren by ballot were declared. Sister Turney was elected superintendent of the Sunday School, by 124 to 34. On the same occasion, the following persons were withdrawn from, after long and ineffectual attempts to induce obedience to the commandment to forsake not the assembling of ourselves together:—Brethren George Robins, Joseph Kirkbride and Edward Hall. The elder of the two young brethren Mawson, sent in his resignation after having been waited upon as to a prolonged absence from the table. Brother James Murcourt also resigned, alleging unworthiness to fellowship the brethren. The resignations were accepted in sorrow. [Compiler's Note: Bold Mat. 18:15-18]

(Excerpt from March 1879) MANCHESTER.—The brethren suffer the loss of brother Dixon by his removal to Leicester, where he enters the employment of brother Collyer. He had received notice to leave his Manchester situation consequent on the commercial stagnation of the times. Since writing the foregoing, a letter from brother Smith says, “We shall miss his association much, as will many of the brethren in neighbouring towns with whom he has shared the public labours of the truth. We bid him God speed and may he in his new abode be of as great service as he has been in this district. We have lost another member but in a more melancholy manner, the ecclesia having been compelled to withdraw from the fellowship of sister Sherwood, who has abstained from the breaking of bread for many weeks, and ultimately declared her rejection of the Bible as the word of God.

(September 1879) MANCHESTER.—Brother Smith reports:—“The ecclesia in this town have, after long forbearance, been compelled to withdraw from Thomas Henry Dillon, for continued absence from the breaking of bread.”—Brother Clarke appeals on behalf of a sister deserted by her husband, with five children to support. She cannot cope with the difficulties of her situation, and the few brethren in Manchester have done all they can.

(Excerpts from October 1880) LEICESTER.—Brother Dixon reports that the matters which have been agitating the meeting here have been satisfactorily settled, for which we are all thankful. The following brethren and sisters have been withdrawn from on account of continued absence from the table: Brethren Armstrong, McAdams, Baker, Coleman, J. T. Cooper, and sister E. Dunmore. Brother A. W. Warner has returned to fellowship.

(Excerpt from February 1881) LIVERPOOL. — Our number has also been increased by the removal of sister H. M. Young from Warrington to Birkenhead, while sister C. Lucas, whose name has been for a long time on our books in the expectation of her return, has taken up her residence permanently in London.—The Ecclesia has been obliged to withdraw from brother F. Daniel Parry on account of disorderly walk, also from brother and sister Milne for continued absence from the table.

(Excerpt from October 1881) CREWE Brother Malliber reports the obedience of Mrs. ADAMS, wife of Brother Adams, formerly neutral. She was baptised into the sin-covering name on the 15th August. He also reports the withdrawal of the brethren from Sister Berrisford, on account of long continued absence from the table. He also adds “no doubt you will be glad to hear that, notwithstanding the very depressing circumstances under which the brethren in Crewe have been placed, we have steadfastly maintained our ground. It is with feelings of pleasure that I can inform you the ecclesia is now out of debt. [Compiler’s Note: See October 1880 Crewe for history]

(Excerpt from May 1882) DUDLEY-We have had to withdraw from Bro. and Sister Cooper and Sister Piggot, of Sedgley; also Bro. Piggot, of Coseley, for continued absence from the Lord’s table.

(Excerpt from June 1882) GLOUCESTER-Brother Rogers reports withdrawal from Brother Job Mayo, for continued absence from the breaking of bread.

(June 1882) SWANWICK-Brother Draycott reports the withdrawing from Brother Smith, for continued absence from the table. Brother Atkin has returned from America. The brethren are making strenuous efforts to bring the truth before the people, in the shape of out-door lectures, which have been interrupted by the Primitive Methodists singing and preaching.

(August 1882) DONCASTER - Brother Edmonds reports that Brother Aspin is not now in fellowship with the brethren, on a variety of grounds, but chiefly because he objects to the presence of any stranger in the same room while the brethren are met for the “breaking of bread.”

(September 1882) WARRINGTON- Since last I wrote we have given up our Sunday evening lectures on account of poor audiences and want of funds, but we are hoping to begin again as the season advances, if the Lord delay his coming. We have also withdrawn from Brother Benjamin Sawdon for non-attendance at the table.—C. ROBERTS.

(October 1882) BAGTHORPE-Bro. Wharmby reports withdrawal from Bro. Elam Smithurst, for continued absence from the breaking of bread, aggravated by enrolment in the “Blue Ribbon Army.”

(January 1883) SPALDING- LECTURES.—The following lectures have been delivered during the past four weeks:—Nov. 19, “Sin: its origin, history, and end” (Bro. Edwards); 26, “Earth burning, a delusion” (Bro. Tyler); Dec. 3, “The soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind” (Bro. T. Royce, of Peterborough); 10, “O, death where is thy sting? O grave, where is they victory?” (Brother Edwards). We are pleased to announce an improvement in the attendance at our lectures, consequent upon a special effort we have made on the occasion of the lecture by Bother T. Royce, when the Temperance Hall was comfortably filled by a most attentive audience, and several appear to be interested through it, and are now looking into the truth. The lecture was reported in the local papers. We had a fair attendance on the 10th inst. We hold a Bible class every Wednesday evening, at Brother Jane’s house, at 8 o’clock, which we commenced on Nov. 1st. The subject we have on hand now is “The Commandments of Christ.” May the Lord still continue to prosper His work in this town. We are sorry to have to state that through the continued absence of Bro. Allenson, we have withdrawn from him.—J. WILKINSON

(February 1883) NOTTINGHAM- Brother Kirkland reports the obedience, on January 1st, of EDWARD HEMINGWRAY (19), formerly Wesleyan. Also, with sorrow, he notifies the withdrawal of the ecclesia from Rufus Godfry Jones, on account of his disorderly walk and continued absence from the table. Sarah Ann Turney is now no longer in the fellowship of the brethren, she having united herself to a number of people calling themselves “Christian Brethren.”



(July 1883) EDINBURGH- Bro. Wm. Grant reports **that, after much endurance**, the ecclesia here have withdrawn from Sister Gaskin and Brother Chisholm, for long-continued absence from the table.—On Sunday, May 27, the annual meeting of the ecclesia was held, and passed off in that orderly and calm spirit which becometh those in Christ.

(December 1883) STOCKPORT- We have had to withdraw our fellowship from sister Hannah Wood, on account of continued absence from the table of the Lord. Bro. Norman, of Manchester, has removed here. Bro. Baker and sister Walker have united in marriage. We have had two week-night lectures each, from brethren Ashcroft and Chamberlin. The attendance at the former was good, the latter only moderate.

(January 1884) DUNEDIN.—Brother Holmes announces the obedience of Mrs. JANNET B. ALLEN (41), formerly Episcopalian: also that of her daughter, MARGRET M. REID (19). Their acquaintance with the truth was brought about mainly by the efforts of sister Roslyn. The brethren have felt compelled in sorrow to withdraw from Robert J. Atkins, for constant neglect of the table. This step has been taken after repeated remonstrances, which unhappily have proved of no avail. “Free thought” ideas, it transpires, have been the means of his corruption.

(April 1884) SWANWICK-Bro. Drycott reports the removal of brother and sister Turner to Low Gates, and the withdrawal from bro. Slater, for absenting himself from the “breaking of bread”; also the addition of Mrs. CANT, wife of bro. Cant, who was immersed Feb. 23rd.

(May 1884) NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE-Brother Leadbitter reports that the place of meeting is now No. 1, Strawberry Lane, Gallow-gate. The brethren have withdrawn from George Hall and Edward Luke for continued absence from the table; and from William and Ellen McAlpine. Thomas and Catherine Davison, of Gosforth, have left; also Jane Orrick. Brethren Orrick and Fox became dissatisfied with their immersions on the ground of an insufficient understanding of the first principles of the truth at that time, and were, at their earnest request, reimmersed on March 9th and 16th respectively.

(September 1884) NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE-Brother W. Leadbitter reports that brother and sister Forbes, brother Jno. Leadbitter (brother Leadbitter’s father), also his mother, brother, sister and self (all in the faith), have been prevented from breaking bread with those hitherto constituting the ecclesia. They now, with sister Thompson, of Birmingham (who is here for a few weeks), brother Mann (who is here from Maldon), and brother Little (having no other alternative), break bread at 40, Cottenham Street, expecting that by the first or second week of September they will enter upon the possession of a spacious and elaborately fitted room in the Royal Arcade, where, to the best of their ability, they will hold forth the word of life in its purity. This is a large and populous town (says brother Leadbitter), and the friends of the truth few and feeble, so we would be glad of the assistance of a visit from any brother who is able to lecture. Newcastle seems a good field for the sowing of the good seed. In fact, there are several interested, whose immersions we hope ere long to report.

Brother Harker, referring to the foregoing, speaks of them as withdrawals, and adds the name of brother John Wilson as breaking bread at the house of brother Leadbitter.

(September 1884) ST. JOHN (N.B.)—We have the pleasure of reporting the obedience, on June 15th, of ROBERT TURNER (43), stove-fitter, formerly Episcopal, and, on June 22nd, THOMAS O. DOWLING (24), clerk, formerly neutral. These brethren have been studying the Scriptures of truth for the past two years with the above result. We have also to report our withdrawal from brother Robert Craft for continued absence from breaking of bread.—B. J. DOWLING.

(November 1884) CREWE- Bro. Wharmby reports the immersion of JOHN ASTON (25), formerly of the Church of England, on the 5th of October, after having made a satisfactory confession of the one faith; also of Miss MARTHA ATKINSON (20), neutral, daughter of bro. and sister Atkinson. The brethren have found it necessary to withdraw from bro. Wm. Walker, on account of his continual absence from the breaking of bread. Bro. Wharmby says—“Although there has been no report for a long time past, we have continued to proclaim the truth to the best of our ability, and are getting better audiences than usual. The brethren who have taken part in lecturing are Atkinson, Burden, Cuningham, Maliber, and Wharmby.”

(January 1885) BLACKPOOL- We are still holding forth the “Word of Life” to all those who come to hear us. There are several interested, and we hope ere long to have some of them in the household. It is with sorrow we have to report that owing to continued absence from the table, we have to withdraw from bro. John Booth.

(February 1885) Derby.—Brother Chandler says: “We are encouraged, when we look back a few years, to think of our members being increased to so great an extent. Of course, it is the experience of most ecclesias that all the ground receiving the seed does not turn out to be fruitful. Some receive it gladly enough at first, but soon get careless, and cease to come to the breaking of bread. Others have cares and anxieties, which make them gradually fall away. But, allowing for all that, we have to thank God we can number 71 members, who attend pretty regularly at the meetings.—On Friday evening, January 2nd, we held our annual business meeting, at which the serving brethren for the year were elected. It was unanimously resolved to report in the *Christadelphian* that brother and sister Broughton had ceased to be in fellowship with us, through long absence from the table.”

(February 1885) Great Bridge.—Bro. W. H. Hardy reports withdrawal from bro. Griffiths for continued absence from the Table.—On the evening of Saturday evening, Jan. 3rd, we assisted Mrs. H. HUGHES, daughter of bro. Hollier, to become connected with the truth by baptism. Our new sister is living in isolation at Shrewsbury. Her husband is much interested and we hope soon to report his obedience.

(March 1885) Dudley.—Bro. Hughes reports withdrawal from two sisters for continual absence from the Lord’s table, namely, sister Raybould (who has changed her name to Hill, through marriage with the alien), and also sister Gee, wife of bro. Gee. Many efforts were previously made to brine them to a sense of duty.—Sister Blount mentions having heard of the death of bro. Scarfe (originally of Dudley), who emigrated to Australia at the end of last spring. He died in November last.

(Excerpt from March 1885) Mumbles. — The next piece of intelligence we would, if we pleased ourselves, omit, namely, we have had to withdraw from brother and sister Ridding, for behaviour unworthy the name of the Lord, and brother Lincoln Behenna for continued absence from the Lord’s table.”

(September 1885) Liverpool.—We have been reluctantly compelled to withdraw from bro. William Riding for absence from the table and disorderly walk, also from bro. McKnight for prolonged absence from the ecclesia’s meetings.

(December 1885) Leicester.—Brother Gamble reports an increase by the removal to Leicester of brother and sister Branscombe from Derby; also withdrawal from sister McAdams for continued absence from the table.

(May 1886) Leicester. — Bro. Gamble writes: “Since my report last month our number has decreased by two. Bro. Curry has resigned his connection with the ecclesia, and we have been compelled to withdraw from Bro. Gibbins for continued absence from the table. Our number is now 64.—On Sunday evening,

April 11th, a lecture was delivered in Glenfield (the village where Bro. Collyer's farm is situated) by Bro. Gamble, on 'The glorious gospel of the blessed God.' Bro. Collyer is well known in the village as a Christadelphian, and through his conversation, several of the villagers wanted to hear more of what we had to say. Hence this lecture, which was delivered in the Co-operative Hall. Although a fair audience was anticipated, we were scarcely expecting to see so many as we did. The hall is only a moderate size but was packed in every part. Every seat was occupied and from 20 to 30 had to stand up and some few were not able to get into the room. Altogether there were about 150 listeners. Bro. Collyer who presided, asked the audience to inform us by a show of hands whether they would like us to go again and tell them more of our belief, and in response, nearly every one held up their hand, so that, if the Lord will, we shall continue to hold meetings there as often as we conveniently can, hoping that the Lord may have some people in that place."

(November 1886) Crewe.—Brother Heath reports withdrawal from brother Wakefield and sister Burden, because of continued absence from the established assembly for the breaking of bread. The brethren, amid discouragement, continue their endeavours to awaken an interest in the truth, by lectures every Sunday evening, and the distribution of *Finger-posts*, from door to door. "Noah," say they truly, "laboured longer than we have done, with no more encouraging results, so we are hopeful, very hopeful, that our efforts ere long will be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Christ."

(November 1886) Ripley.—Brother Wharton reports the obedience of WILLIAM CAULTON (18), formerly neutral; also withdrawal from brother Brown, brother Mcore, and sister Turner for long-continued absence from the table.

(November 1886) Whitby.—Brother Clegg writes:—"Would you be kind enough to inform the brethren who may visit Whitby, that we have removed our place of meeting from 14, Silver Street to St. Ann's, Staith, to the room occupied during the week as the Y.M.C.A. Reading Room. Meeting for the breaking of Bread in the morning at 10–30 and in the evening for the public at 6–30. I am very sorry to report the withdrawal of the ecclesia from sisters Beadnells, for long continued absence from the table of the Lord. A family of three makes a gap in our already thin ranks. We regret these things much, and are hereby reminded of the necessity of a patient continuance in well-doing, if we would realize the promised blessings. We are still doing what we can to spread the glad tidings of the Kingdom, and although we get few strangers to our meetings yet we ourselves feel strengthened and built up in our most holy faith, by our assembling together, and we are eagerly watching for the return of him who 'shall put down the mighty from their seats and exalt the humble and meek.'"

(Excerpt from May 1887) Keighley.—Brother Roe, after reporting withdrawal from brother Elias Greystone, on account of absence from the table,

(September 1887) Melbourne.—Brother R. Robertson reports various items concerning the Balaclava ecclesia, amongst others the obedience in November, 1886, of ALFRED RILEY (26), State School teacher, Caramut, Victoria, who, as previously reported, had found the truth through an advertisement in *The Age*, leading to his perusal of most of the truth's publications. About the end of December brother C. C. Walker left, going to Daylesford (some 70 miles from here), where he stays until his prospected departure for England, on which he purposes to start about six weeks hence, if the divine will so permit. During his stay in Daylesford he has succeeded in rousing the people through lectures and newspaper correspondence, which is bearing some visible fruit. This is also the first known breaking of the ground for the truth in that town. On 1st January, 1887. ARTHUR RATTEN (27), school teacher, Kew, put on the name of Christ in the appointed way after due proof of his understanding. About this time several meetings were held to attempt a reconciliation between the three ecclesias in Melbourne and suburbs, which resulted in unanimity on all doctrinal points, saving that of the temptation of Christ in the

wilderness (as to whether it was external or internal). Several meetings were held without attaining unity, at that time, but at a later period, namely, in the month of May, brother E. Waite, from Brisbane (visiting Melbourne in search of employment, which he did not obtain), was asked to put the question again before the ecclesias in its true bearing. At this meeting, the opposition so strenuously maintained previously against any second person in the temptation incident had abated. As a result the way was paved for re-union, and we have deemed it wise to unite in order that all may be done for the furtherance of the truth, which we are highly favoured in this dark age to know. On February 12, 1887, WILLIAM WALLIS FARMER (25), of Caramut, having come to a knowledge of the truth, in conjunction with brother Riley (whose wife has also become obedient to the faith), and having given proof of his understanding of his position, was introduced into the name. "On April 5 sisters I. and A. Magallan were withdrawn from for continued abstinence from the assemblies of the brethren; also brother Lovell, 10 months previously for another cause."

(September 1887) Lowell (Mass.)—Brother Clough reports that the brother and sister who were withdrawn from for continued absence from the table have returned to their duty. Brother Jones has removed from Boston to Lowell, has become a member of this ecclesia. We have had two additions by immersion: ANDREW BOILS, formerly Adventist, and ALFRED THOMPSON, formerly Baptist. The ecclesia now numbers 15, and is working together harmoniously for the advancement of the truth. We have taken a public room for our Wednesday evening Bible classes. Lectures for the past month (which have been well attended) are as follows: July 3rd, "Ail Shaddai, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;" 10th, "The efficacy of Christ's Sacrifice unto Death;" 17th, "Is Baptism a Saving Ordinance?" (brother MacKellar); 24th, "Jesus Christ as a Prophet;" 31st, "Jesus Christ as a Priest."

(April 1888) PETERBOROUGH—Special efforts were made by the brethren on March 4th, when brother Sulley, of Nottingham, visited to lecture, subject, "The temple of Ezekiel's prophecy: an hitherto inscrutable mystery solved. A vast structure one mile square, comprising gates, chambers, courts, towers, &c., suitable for a house of prayer during millennial times." There was a large audience, including a reporter from one of the local newspapers. Some were quite interested with the charts after lecture. We have had to withdraw from brother H. Clarke for continued absence from the Lord's table.—A. BRUCE.

(July 1888) ROCKHAMPTON (QUEENSLAND).—I have much pleasure in informing you that since we last wrote our numbers have been much increased. On the 20th November brother and sister Braginton arrived from Kidderminster, England, and were received into our small ecclesia. Also the seed so long sown has begun to spring up among us. We have had the delightful duty of receiving into our fellowship our sister, MARY ANN CLARK, who has been brought to the knowledge of the truth, chiefly through reading our works lent by sister Cook, and for some months past she has not only searched rigorously herself for the truth, but has exerted such an influence upon others around as to induce her husband, her mother-in-law, and a friend, our present brother Church, to search for and find the narrow way to life, renouncing the superstitions of the world. Our sister and her three fellow-travellers were passed through the watery tomb of transgression, thus gaining admission into the sheepfold of Christ through the only door. We had this day the pleasure of receiving into our fellowship ARTHUR CLARK (35), formerly Wesleyan Methodist; SUSAN CLARK (71), mother of Arthur Clark, and formerly Wesleyan Methodist; also MARY ANN CLARK (27), wife of Arthur Clark, and formerly Baptist; and GEORGE HEAD CHURCH (29), formerly Church of England, all of whom passed a most searching, single-file examination, and have entered the race with a thorough knowledge of the course and determination to gain the crown of immortality. We have also several others who are anxiously inquiring the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward. We thank our Heavenly Father for all the gold He chooses to send us, and we must be content to accept our share of dross or alloy with it. We, therefore, note our sister Prideaux has cooled off, not having been to the table for two years, and stating that she renounced Christadelphianism, and contemplated burning her books. We wrote to her, but failing to receive any

reply, have considered her to have withdrawn, and, therefore, have omitted her name from our record. Another calamity is that our brother Braginton is in very delicate health, his lungs being so unsound that scarcely any line of employment is suitable to him. We have, therefore, procured for him a situation involving very little exertion. Our Colony opens a wide field to robust and energetic people who cannot do well in the old country, but only to such as are able and willing to battle with the difficulties which present themselves on any change of location and circumstances. To such we offer a hearty welcome.—WALTER COOK.

(July 1888) LEAMINGTON—Since my last report the interest created in the minds of the visitors attending the lectures has in no way abated and results generally are very encouraging, and we hope to be able to report more additions to our number in my next. We have decided to hold another tea and fraternal gathering next Bank Holiday, August 6th, and shall be pleased to have the company of all brethren and sisters from a distance who can make it convenient to attend. I deeply regret to have to report the withdrawal of the ecclesia from brother James Murcott, owing to continued absence from the table of the Lord.—JOHN HUDSON.

(July 1888) BOSTON.—Brother Trussler writes: Our efforts are now turned to Quincy (a city about 8 miles from Boston). Lectures are now being delivered here every week with fair attendance. We have reason to think this will be a fruitful field. We have had to withdraw from brother W. H. Forbes for absence, and partial inspiration. Brother Henry Hartley and sister Adams (both of this ecclesia) have been united in marriage.

(March 1889) BOSTON (MASS.).—Brother Trussler reports withdrawal from brother J. F. Stone for continued absence from the Lord's table. Soon after his immersion he married into the world and never attended the meetings regularly. No doubt this is the cause of his falling away. Lectures go on as usual.

(December 1891) LEICESTER—Since our last report we have had the following additions to our ecclesia:—Brother and sister Branson, by removal from Loughboro'; and by immersion into the only saving name, EDITH MAY WESTON; JOSEPH VICCARS COLLYER; ELIZABETH MORLEY CLARKE, and WILLIAM DARKER. These are all young in years, but have an intelligent appreciation of the goodness of God as manifested through his well-beloved son. On the other hand, we have been compelled to withdraw from brother Hunt for long-continued absence from the table; brother T. J. Thorneloe has resigned fellowship and returned to the "weak and beggarly elements" of the Apostacy; brother Wollan has removed to Bolton, and death has deprived us of our much-loved sister Noon. In the list of additions I omitted to say that sister Oakley has returned to fellowship. The ecclesia now numbers 80, and we are pleased to say that peace and brotherly love prevail.

(March 1892) SWANSEA—In our January intelligence, it should have been noted that brother John Palmer had ceased to be in fellowship through continued absence from the table. We have also lost sister Winstone and her son-in-law and daughter, brother and sister Mead, who have gone to the other meeting.

(November 1892) WARRINGTON—During the month we have had the pleasure of assisting another into Christ, CHARLES OGDEN (35), formerly congregationalist, who passed through the waters of baptism on October 7th. May he walk worthy of his high vocation. I regret to have to announce our withdrawal from brother Brown, for continued absence from the table. Brother C. Young and sister Ruth Roberts have been united in marriage. Our lectures for the past month have been by our own brethren.—J. HARPER.

(January 1893) HUDDERSFIELD—I omitted to inform you last month that brother Harry Drake and sister Eusebia Cheetham have been united in marriage. We have a few interested in the truth and hope for

results shortly. We have had to withdraw from brother Ben Jessop, on account of long continued absence from the Lord's Table, after repeated visits and admonitions. He could give no satisfactory reason for his absence. — JOE HEYWOOD.

(December 1893) BOURNEMOUTH-Brother Wilkinson reports the following additions:—On September 28th, NELLIE FRY (19), daughter of brother and sister Fry; on October 20th, Mr. STONE (33), formerly Baptist; and on October 27th his wife, Mrs. STONE (29), of the same faith. He adds that visits have been paid them by brother and sister Lammerton, of Birmingham; brother and sister Barton, of New South Wales; brother Dorricott, of Birmingham; also brother Davies, of Southampton. The brethren have withdrawn from sister Thorne for continued absence from the Lord's Table.

(December 1893) LEICESTER-In consequence of long continued absence from the table of the Lord, we have been compelled in sorrow to withdraw our fellowship from brother Bruin and sister Wilber. We are pleased to notify that KATE GOULD, after a good confession of the faith, was inducted into Christ on October 1st. We are trying the effect of week-night lectures in the outlying districts of the town. The first was given in Belgrave Board School by brother Gamble, upon the Second Coming of Christ, and the object of that coming. A fortnight later brother Collyer lectured upon the same subject in the Co-operative Room, Clarendon Park. In each case there was an interested audience. Our Saturday evening lectures have been as follows:—October 15th, "Where are we to look for a sure and certain Hope of Salvation" (by brother Challinor, of Birmingham); October 22nd, "God and Man, a mighty contrast" (by brother Collyer); October 29th, "The binding of the Devil for a thousand years" (by brother Porter, of London); November 5th, "Why we believe in the Divinity of Jesus" (by brother Weston); November 12th, "Does it matter what we believe?" (by brother H. H. Collyer).—We have a tea meeting in the Co-operative Hall, High Street, on December 26th, and shall be pleased to have the company of any of like precious faith.—THOS. W. GAMBLE.

(April 1894) SOUTHAMPTON-On February 26th, we immersed into the sin-covering Name JAMES VINCENT BLAKE (30), and his wife, KATE BLAKE (25), formerly Primitive Methodists. It has been our painful duty to withdraw from brother Bartlett on account of his continued absence from the breaking of bread. Brother and sister Wyllie have left us for Australia. They were to sail from London on the 9th of March with brother and sister Davies, and brother and sister Barton. Though they have gone, we still hope to let the truth shine forth in Southampton. Brother Sherry, of Winton, and brother Davies, of Newbury, have kindly offered to come and lecture for us occasionally.—JAMES JUDD.

(May 1894) BATH-During the month, we have held our usual meetings assisted by the brethren from Bristol and Bradford-on-Avon. We had a tea meeting on Bank Holiday, when we had some 16 brethren and sisters from Bristol after tea. Brethren Holder, Sargent, Miller, Bradley, and Morris spoke to our edification and comfort. We are sorry to report the withdrawal from brothers E. and G. Daniels, also sister G. Daniels for continued absence from the Lord's table. While we regret this, we are encouraged by the addition of sister BEATIE PRATTEN (18), who made an intelligent confession of the faith, and was immersed into Christ on Sunday, April 8th.—J. THOMAS.

(May 1894) LEEDS *Wellington Road.*—It is with regret we report our withdrawal from brother Steel on account of continued absence from the table, &c. Our Sunday evening discourses have been fairly well attended lately, and we hope the feeble efforts which we make may be of service for the Master's cause. The lectures have been by brethren Geo. Pickles, Turner, R. Smith, Suggitt, and Iredale. I have also to report a loss to our number by sister Clement being united in marriage to brother Grimes, of York.—G. B. SUGGITT.

(March 1895) SHEFFIELD -We are pleased to record two more further additions to the household, viz., on January 26th, CHARLES HENRY BRUNT (23), formerly neutral; and on February 14th, FREDERICK HEWIN RIDING (20), formerly neutral. After witnessing good confessions they were baptised into the all-saving name. Brother Matthew Killain has withdrawn himself from our meetings by non-attendance.—H. W. LEAH.

(November 1895) BRADFORD-For the information of the various Yorkshire ecclesias, I have to report that the Bradford ecclesia has withdrawn from fellowship with brethren Shaw and Stonier for continued absence from the table of the Lord and irregular conduct, trusting that the few who are still contending for the faith may be kept faithful and gain that incorruptible crown. Lectures for the past month have been given by the following brethren:—September 1st, brother Booth; 8th, brother Wadsworth; 15th, brother Whitaker; 22nd, brother Sutcliffe; 29th, brother Darlow. During the summer months there seems to be a falling off of the attendance of strangers at our lectures, but it is gradually increasing again now.—E. WILLIAMS.

(November 1895) PLYMOUTH *Foresters' Hall, Octagon. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.; Thursdays, 8 p.m.*—Our beloved brother Atkin has found a new home at Horrbridge, some twelve miles from here, so that now we shall rarely see his face at the breaking of bread. His place around the table has been filled by brother John Archdale Jones, from Birmingham, who has come to reside at Plymouth. On July 14th brother Haughton, of Irving, Scotland, broke bread with us, and on August 14th and 21st brother Wells, of Stadhampton, together with his son, brother Ernest, cheered us on our way, and lectured on the “Songs of the Bible.” We also have had a visit from brother and sister Joseph Walker, of Birmingham, and sister Birchall, of Liverpool, on September 8th. Our brother gave us an exhortation at the breaking of bread, bidding us weigh our little trials with those of Paul, enumerated 2 Cor. 11:23–28, as a good remedy for heart-weariness. These rays of sunshine have not been without clouds, for we have been compelled to act in accordance with the commands of Christ as recorded through Paul in 2 Thess. 3:6, and withdraw from brother Baser and brother Perry for long absence from the Lord’s table and other causes. Lectures have been as follows:—September 15th, “The dead unconscious till the resurrection, and consequent error of popular belief in heaven and hell going at death” (brother Finemore); 22nd, “The coming of Christ: the signs of his coming: the object and its bearing upon the world” (brother Peline); 29th, “The Gospel of the Kingdom stultified by popular preachers” (brother Sleep); October 6th, “The Trinity: is the doctrine Scriptural?” (brother Finemore).—SAMUEL R. WILLIAMS.

(January 1896) NORMANTON -We have nothing special to report this month, but we wish all the Yorkshire brethren to know that we are steadily pressing forward (though under great difficulty) towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God. We have been compelled to give up our Sunday evening lectures on account of our own uncertainty of being there, but we hope in the near future to be able to commence again. I have to report, for the guidance of all brethren, that we have withdrawn from brother John Mann, who has absented himself from the table for over nine months, and who now is living in open rebellion to the commands of Christ. Our brother came from Durham to our ecclesia some three years ago.—S. K. EAMES.

(February 1896) BEDFORD-It is now some time since you had any news from this place, but we are doing our best to spread the good news of the Kingdom. We have had a special course of lectures during the past quarter, and thanks are due to the North and South London brethren who have so kindly helped us in the proclamation of the truth. Subjects were as follows:—“The Immortality of the Soul” (brother T. Boshier); “Everlasting Burnings” (brother W. H. Bolton); “Where are the Dead?” (brother A. J. White); “The Earth and its Future” (brother H. Eastwood); “The Time of the End” (brother J. M. Evans); “What Must I do to be Saved?” (brother Lethbridge); “God’s Purpose in the Earth: Great and Glorious” (brother Bellamy). Brother Bellamy, during his visit, examined a candidate, one whom we thought would be a

great help to us. But when asked for date of immersion, he said he must consider, as he did not believe in doing spiritual things hastily, so we are waiting for the result, knowing all things work well together for those who love and fear the Lord. We have had to withdraw from sister Rose Bye, for continued absence from the Lord's table.—W. MATHER.

(February 1896) PONTYPOOL—Since last report from this place, we have had the sorrowful duty of withdrawing from our sister Lewison, for disobedience to our Lord's command in the breaking of bread. For the benefit of those who are constantly enquiring, I may say our aged brother Coles is still in the land of the living, but it is with great inconvenience that he attends the meetings, presides, and lectures. His desire is not to see death now the Lord is so very near. The brethren here are stirred up in anticipation of the Lord's return. We shall be removing during the month of January to larger and more commodious premises, the Hanbury Assembly Rooms. We have had the use of the rooms temporarily on the occasion of the visit of brother B. Hughes, of Birmingham, who lectured to the best audience we ever had on "Closing Moments of Gentile Times, and what it means to the Human Family." They (the alien) seem interested, but freely express the doubt that it can be in our day. Why not in our day? Does it not show lack of faith in what has been already done?—C. W. HEATH.

(March 1896) ALDERLEY EDGE -We have arranged to hold lectures in Alderley at the Public Hall until the end of March. The meetings have not been very well attended; but we do not despair, knowing that the time is not far distant when the mighty shall be cast down from their seats, and the humble exalted. It is with sorrow we report withdrawing from sister Pickering and sister Gibbons for absence from the Lord's table. Recent lectures have been as follows:—February 2nd, "The God of Israel" (brother S. Willson, of Stockport); 9th, "Jesus Christ" (brother E. Bellamy, of Stockport); 16th, "The Spirit of God" (brother J. Battersby, of Droylsden).—J. GARNER.

(March 1896) NUNEATON—Many will be sorry to hear that duty compels us at last to withdraw from our brother Turney, on account of long-continued absence from the table and marriage with an alien. This action to us is very painful, but duty and the truth demand it. Lectures:—January 12th, "Angels: Their Nature and Mission" (brother Bower); 19th, "Looking for Redemption in Jerusalem" (brother Hands); 26th, "Jesus Christ the Faithful Witness" (brother Warrender); February 2nd, "Zion's Sure Foundation" (brother Rollason).—W. G. HANDS.

(May 1896) RUARDEAN—We are sorry to have to report that we, brother and sister Brain, brother and sister Jordan, and brother George Brain, have withdrawn from brother and sister Meek through inconsistency to the truth and absence from the Lord's table.

(October 1896) DUDLEY.—Brother Hughes reports the removal of brother and sister Bennett, of Sedgley, to Wolverhampton; also that sister Golder, jun., has removed from Birmingham to Dudley. Brother and sister E. Woodall have returned to fellowship after meeting for a time with the partial-inspiration brethren, which they now regret. The brethren have been compelled to withdraw from brethren Bennett, Williams, and Goodwin, for prolonged absence from the table.

(August 1897) LONDON (NORTH). — *Temperance Hall, Chwch Passage (adjoining Parish Church), Upper Street, Islington. Sundays, 11 a.m. (Breaking of Bread); 3 p.m. (School); and 6.30 p.m. (Lecture). Wednesdays, Bible Class, at 8 p.m.*—Since last report, we have held our usual summer excursion, when about 100 adults and children spent a brief, but very enjoyable time, among decorations and illuminations in nature, far surpassing all Jubilee efforts of man.—Our annual business meeting was held on Wednesday, 7th July, when reports were given as to the state of the ecclesia, and serving brethren appointed for the ensuing twelve months. We are sorry to have to mention the withdrawal on this occasion from sister Smale, for long-continued absence from the breaking of bread.—Sister Lewis gives



us to understand that she will shortly be removing, and will in future meet with the brethren at Brixton.—  
WM. FORD.

## ECCLESIAL MEMBERS WITHDRAWING FROM AN ECCLESIA

### GENERAL CASES

(July 1866) GLASGOW—The news from this quarter is not cheering. Brother J. MULHOLLAND reports his withdrawal, along with another, for the following reason:—“Because when we set forth the truth, and contrasted it with the ‘damnable doctrines’ extant, we were accused of ‘railing against the sects,’ and driving visitors away from the meeting, and thereby doing much harm. We are both now out of fellowship, as there is no meeting in Glasgow, at present, who hold the truth unadulterated by the commandments of men.”

[MAKING every allowance for a possible excess of zeal on the part of our two brethren, (in which remark we may, from ignorance of the facts, misjudge them), it certainly indicates an unsound state of things, when in the professed “church of the living God,” which ought to be “the pillar and ground of the truth,” the earnest contention for the faith once delivered to the saints is discouraged and condemned. No genuine friend of the truth would find fault with another for speaking against the “sects,” seeing “the sects” are the strongholds of superstition and error, and the strongest barriers in our time in the way of the truth’s progress. If visitors cannot stand an honest testimony on the subject, let visitors be driven away; for visitors who require to be propitiated by a craven mincing of the matter, would be worth very little, as friends of the truth, when got. A church based on this craven policy, if it be a church, is “ready to die.”—  
EDITOR.]

(Excerpt from July 1866) BIRMINGHAM.— Brother and Sister E. TRUEMAN have withdrawn (after eighteen months’ controversy) on account of the refusal of the brethren, by unanimous vote, to agree to the proposition that it is sin to touch alcoholic liquors at the table of the Lord, or anywhere else.

(September 1866) GLASGOW.—We have two letters from this place, in reference to the question raised in the communications which have already appeared. They are both lengthy, and it is therefore impossible to do more than indicate the substance of them. The first is from brother Mullholland, who holds to his original statement, that “there is no meeting in Glasgow at present, who hold the truth unadulterated by the commandments of men.” He states that the meeting referred to in the remarks of bro. Clarke, published last month, is held at Govan, which is not Glasgow; and that until those remarks appeared, he was ignorant that the same meeting assembled every alternate Sunday, at 251, Parliamentary Road, Glasgow. He then complains of a want of reciprocity on the part of the said meeting, in reference to a proposal on the part of himself and a few others (having left the fellowship of the truth corrupters at Stockwell-st.), to amalgamate with them, and form a meeting on a sound basis. Brother Clarke replies to this in a long letter, in which he asserts that the refusal of the Govan meeting to treat with the others *en masse*, for amalgamation, arose from a want of confidence in the disposition of some of them to be faithful to the truth: a want of confidence which he says is justified by the fact that they have since formed a compact with certain of the old leaven, on the basis of holding in abeyance such questions as the personality of the devil, the pre-existence of Christ, the burning up of the earth, the resurrection of idolators, the re-building of Babylon, &c. Of the issue between the two, it is impossible for brethren at a distance fairly to judge, and therefore, so far as the *Ambassador* is concerned, we think it wise to say that the question must be left where it is. Since the above was written, a third letter has come to hand, signed “W. GORDON, ” requesting on the score of “justice,” the fact to be published that the meeting left by brother Mullholland, and described by brother Clarke, meets in “Carrick’s Temperance Hotel, Stockwell Street, Glasgow.”

(June 1867) BIRMINGHAM.—The course of twenty-four lectures having ended, the general exposition of the word, read in regular course, has been resumed without any falling off in the attendance. During the month, there have been three additions by immersion, the obedient believers of the truth being EDWIN CALDICOTT, (30,) ornamental engraver, and his wife, ELIZA CALDICOTT, both formerly undecided, but in attendance among the Baptists, and MARY ANN MAY, (19,) formerly Church of England. Brother and Sister T. WALLIS, having (after dissociating themselves from the ecclesia in Birmingham, and transferring their countenance to the God-dishonouring operations of George Dawson, M.A., a quasi-clerical lecturer of the humorous sort, who is popular in Birmingham and throughout the country, for his power to entertain the fleshly mind; who after the Colenso school, pretends to be a preacher of Christ, while denying Moses and the prophets, and, in a manner peculiar to himself, deceives the understanding through the sheer force of dogmatic sarcasm; appearing to teach wisdom, while, in reality, inculcating principles that lead the ignorant into the certain paths of destruction, or rather make their escape from those paths a matter of impossibility;) the two persons in question having, in addition to this treacherous act, removed to Edinburgh, and there joined themselves to those who are unfaithful to the truth, viz., the Dowieites, their names have been struck off the roll of the Birmingham ecclesia. During the month, the ecclesia has been visited by brethren Tait and Paterson, and sisters Tait and Smith, of Edinburgh.

(October 1867) ABERDEEN.—Brother Gill, writing Sep. 10<sup>th</sup>, reports the defection of Alexander Clark, whose heart, it appears, has for a long time been with the Irvingites, with whom he has now declared himself one. Brother Clark, who has thus fallen into the error of the wicked—a victim, probably, to the double influence of Irvingite seduction and Aberdeen frigidarianism—has been connected with the ecclesia from its origin, many years ago, but has latterly shown an entire lack of interest in its proceedings. This could scarcely have happened, surely, if the root of the matter had been in him. Even the coldness of the north cannot extinguish the fire drawn from the oracles of the living God.

(February 1869) EDINBURGH.—The intelligence from this place is not good. There has been a disruption of the ecclesia upon questions both of doctrine and practice, resulting in the separation of sixteen in connection with brother Ellis. Proper parties, who desire to know the bearings of the controversy, will be furnished with a printed statement on the subject, on application to brother R. Patterson, 12, Montague Street, Edinburgh. The separated brethren have formed a new meeting at Leith.

(June 1869) LEEDS.—Brother A. P. Willis reports division among the heretofore friends of the truth in this place, on the subject of the judgment. Four—including brother Willis—left the others, and have engaged a room for regular meeting. He says “I feel more free now than I have done ever since I received the truth. I am glad we have got the old scaffolding down. We shall be very careful for the future. It is astonishing the opposition we have had to meet with from those we have left. They are like old stiff oaks, hard to bend, and so seasoned with error that the truth cannot penetrate. We are now peaceable. If you ever come again, you will find a different state of things here, and not as before time. We hope to increase our numbers with those who will give a certain sound as to the hope that is within them.

(Excerpt from October 1869) DIXON (Lee Co., Ill.)—“I am for the whole truth. I could not occupy an equivocal position on the subject of resurrection and judgment, and therefore severed my connection from the interests of the *Herald*. It is my desire to be found at all times and on all subjects pertaining to the truth, thinking and acting in harmony with the Deity. Some ten years ago or upwards, I set my face for the truth, regardless of consequences, and from that time to this, have been progressing in knowledge. Finding it necessary twice to withdraw from those who professing to be of the truth, found occasion to oppose whatever they did not learn at first. It is natural for religious bodies to settle down like stagnant water, unconscious of their foul and corrupt condition, and when made to see it, even then they hate to be stirred up to the degree that results in purification. When a religious body becomes thus lethargic and

indifferent, one has to watch himself closely, lest the same contagious spirit gets possession of him, and so benumbs his spiritual sensibilities, and so morally debilitates him, as to make him practically unfit for the Master's use."

(Excerpt from November 1869) BIRMINGHAM.—A painful case of withdrawal has occurred during the month, viz., that of FRANCIS AUGUSTUS CHATWIN, a promising youth of 16 (of clerical family connection), who had made himself valuable in the Sunday School and Young Men's Class, and whose future was regarded with expectation. The painfulness of the case is aggravated by the cause of it. If he had gone back to orthodox circles from a conviction that the Christadelphians were wrong, the admiration of his consistency would have mitigated the disappointment of losing him, but he has gone back without professing such a conviction. He is a prey to family pressure, clerical influence, and professional interest: the power of which on so young a man is not a surprise. "Learned" relations pressed him, and have muddled his mind; companions laughed at him, and have stung him; and professional prospects—he is following the law—frowned, and have frightened him. The combined effect has been to turn him upside down, and resolve him to risk all on a venture. He has gone without being able to say that he thinks the clergy right and Christadelphians wrong. He first alleged as a reason for resignation that he had found there were doctrines in the Bible that were rejected by the Christadelphians. Called upon in conversation to point them out, he cited the well-known "orthodox" passages in support of immortal-soulism and the Trinity. These were explained to his entire professed satisfaction, while testimonies were submitted to him on the other side which he could not explain in harmony with clerical doctrines. On this, he withdrew his resignation, and made a new start, promising that he would not come to an adverse conclusion without first giving the brethren an opportunity of removing difficulties. Five days after this, he again sent his resignation, insisting on its being received at once, and refusing to see anybody or to have any correspondence on the subject. Bent, then, upon protecting the truth, as a straying sheep could no longer be reclaimed, the Editor, by the exercise of some determination, obtained an interview. The foolish young man said he distrusted his own judgment in such matters, and that his not being able to answer the arguments for the truth, was no evidence that they were sound arguments, but a mere indication of his inexperience. He preferred relying on the experience of those who had studied such matters for a lifetime. The Editor here renewed a previous proposal to which brother Chatwin had assented, viz., to converse with any or all of his clerical relations in his presence, or with any person he might select as, presumably, capable of defending clerical orthodoxy. To this, he now gave a prompt refusal, adding that none of them would consent to meet the Editor. The Editor in vain pointed to the absurdity of being guided by them under such circumstances, and finally obtained his signature to a paper worded as follows, being compiled from brother Chatwin's letters and statements: "In leaving the Christadelphians, I, Francis Augustus Chatwin, hereby acknowledge that I do not do so because of any conviction on my part that they are wrong. I am not prepared to allege that they teach error; still less am I able to prove it. I leave simply and purely because my nearest relations advise me to do so, and because I think it strange that God should have kept millions of honest people in the dark. If the Christadelphians are right, I cannot help it. If they are, I hope Christ will have mercy upon me. I refuse to have any conversation with any of them on the subject, and I decline any further correspondence."—F. AUGUSTUS CHATWIN."

(follow up on Brother Chatwin from above) requests us to state, in reference to our remarks on his withdrawal in the November number, that though "companions laughed," their laughing never "stung" him: and that though "professional prospects frowned," the "frowning had no effect in "frightening him." His withdrawal, he alleges, had nothing to do with the laughing of companions or the threatening aspect of professional prospects

(May 1871) GRANTHAM.—Brother Joseph Wootton, writing Feb. 19th, reports the obedience of JOHN THOMAS WRIGHT and his wife EMMA WRIGHT. The latter is sister to brother HOE, the blind brother

at Nottingham. They were of no former religious profession. The ecclesia now numbers 12 persons. Writing later, brother Wootton reports the withdrawal of brother Spriggs, and the two sisters Jenkinson.

(July 1873) DEVONPORT—Brother Dashper reports that five friends who had separated from the South Street meeting, on the nature of Christ, have now returned to the fellowship of those who assemble there, the latter having approximated to the views of the former on the subject—all now believing that Jesus was the Word made flesh.

(August 1873) KEIGHLEY—Brother Townson reports that William Watson has withdrawn, the majority of the brethren and sisters refusing to sit at the Lord's table with him. "Our ecclesia," says brother Townson, "now numbers eight; four brethren and four sisters, sister Blenkam, though at Morecambe for a time is still with us in spirit, and longs for the time when she can be with us altogether. Brothers Dugdale and Keighley and sister Keighley, have left Keighley and are in America. I trust we are somewhat earnestly and devotedly fighting for our Lord and Master."

(Excerpt from December 1873) MUMBLES.—Brother D. Clement reports the opening of the New Hall which the brethren have been compelled to build for their meetings, owing to the chapel being in the hands of Mr. W. Clement, from whom and a few sympathisers, the ecclesia some months ago withdrew.

(Excerpt from January 1875) BIRMINGHAM. — Duty has compelled us, in grief, to withdraw for a season from brother Thomas Davis, for a serious breach of the law of Christ.

(Excerpt from January 1875) MANCHESTER—Brother Wareham also reports that the recent adoption (reported September last) of an explicit declaration of Christ's participation in our common nature in the days of his flesh, was not shared in by several members of the ecclesia, who have, consequently, since that time withdrawn. Their names are John Teasdale, William Carr (and his wife), Henry S. and Arthur Sherwood. [Compiler's Note: See heading EXAMPLES OF INDEPENDENT ECCLESIA / RESOLUTIONS BY SAID ECCLESIA]

(September 1876) SWANSEA. — Brother Messenger reports the immersion of WALTER RENDELL (23). The all important choice of putting on the the saving name of Christ was made early on Sunday morning, the 8th inst., in the presence of several brethren and a few interested friends. Brother Rendell was formerly connected with the Baptists, among whom he was an earnest and regular Sunday School Teacher, and a zealous and popular open-air preacher. The channel through which God's blessing in bringing brother R. to the knowledge of the truth was conveyed, was the sincerity and constancy of brother Evans' advocacy of the truth. We hope the truth in his hands will command a fair hearing among the crowds who listened so willingly and patiently to his advanced views whilst a Baptist.

From another communication it appears that the division caused some time ago, by the refusal of certain to consent to the adoption of a complete definition of the faith on which they stood, (a division which had been recently healed,) has again ensued from an attempt on the part of those who objected to the statement, to get rid of the statement which had been adopted. Those who abide by the whole truth stated and professed as the basis of the fellowship, are associated with brethren Randles and Evans. The others cannot complain if the friend of the truth elsewhere takes sides with the truth where unmistakably professed, to whatever personal issues it may lead. For people to say they make the Bible their basis, is not in this day of religious confusion to say enough as regards indicating their whereabouts. Every religious person says he makes the Bible his basis: we find out the truth of his profession by putting to him a definition of what it teaches, and where people are against either putting or submitting to such a definition, it is a sign there is something unsatisfactory at the bottom. At all events, those who take such a position cut themselves off from the faithful friends of the truth.—ED.]

(Excerpt from January 1877) ROCK FERRY. — “We are just trying to endure, as seeing him who is invisible. Sometimes a little light gleams on our pathway, only to be soon obscured. Yet our faith fails not. We know what and whom we have believed. Our sole anxiety is to walk honestly towards them that are without, and to keep ourselves unspotted from the world. I have decided to withdraw from the Waterloo scheme next month. Nothing very definite has taken its place, in my thoughts, but I have placed an advertisement in one of the papers signifying my desire to hear of any non-clerical position that might be adapted to me. To this advertisement, I have already (in a single post) received an answer which promises fairly.”

(June 1877) BOURTON-ON-THE-WATER.—Some time ago it was thought desirable to put forth extra efforts to proclaim the truth in this place. Consequently, brother Habgood of Birmingham was invited to give open-air addresses, there being no public room that could be obtained for the purpose. Three sermons having been preached and published by the vicar of the village against the doctrines held by the brethren, it was suggested that the reviewing of the said sermons should be the basis of brother Habgood’s public addresses. This suggestion was acted on. So far, two several times have been occupied in the work with apparent favourable results; and please God, the brethren will go on until their work is done. Brother Habgood adds a fact which is the opposite of encouraging, viz: the brethren—few in number—have had to withdraw from brethren Chandler and Masters, on account of their association with public-house goers, and their participation in public-house habits, to the disgrace of the worthy name by which they have been called.

(May 1877) MUMBLES.—Brother Michael reports the removal of sister Thomas to Brecon, where are now brother Baker, late of Swansea, and sister Thomas’s daughter. He also desires it to be notified that the following are not in fellowship with the ecclesia: Walter Winstone and wife, Thomas Behemia and Morgan Rees, sen. The intimation would have been made before, but that hopes were entertained of things coming right.

(June 1877) LIVERPOOL.—A dissolution of the ecclesia has taken place here, so far as previous organization is concerned, in consequence of the existence of differences which it was found impossible otherwise to compose. The result has been the formation of an ecclesia at Birkenhead, on the other side of the Mersey, to which several of the members of the old Liverpool ecclesia have joined themselves on a right basis. A few of the remaining members have reorganised themselves in Liverpool, professedly on the right basis, having adopted the London definition of the faith; but so far as some are concerned at all events, the statement seems to have been adopted unintelligently; for, in conversation with the Editor, two of those who have adopted it, avowed Renunciationist doctrines, while disclaiming connection or sympathy with Renunciationists. The situation is lamentable, but cannot, at present, be remedied.

(June 1877) MUMBLES.—A communication from bro. Winstone states that while it is true that he and the others mentioned last month are not in fellowship with the brethren in Mumbles, they have not departed from the faith or practice of the truth, and that the withdrawal has been on their part and not on the part of the others. [Compiler’s Note: See May Mumbles above]

(Excerpt from June 1877) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland reports the return of sister Mary Pepper (wife of brother Pepper) to fellowship with the brethren who held fast the truth concerning the Lord Jesus Christ at the time of the division (caused by its renunciation). He says: “Our sister, who is naturally of a quiet and retiring disposition, was much grieved in mind, and was so prevented from looking into the subject causing contention and strife among the brethren at that time. She was, therefore, left at the synagogue. However, having been led to examine her position, she found it impossible to remain any longer there. She informs us that other forms of error have been introduced, and are tolerated since the

renunciation of the truth concerning the sacrifice of Christ, making it impossible for any one with any realization and love for the truth to remain. This is as we expected.

(Excerpt from December 1878) EDINBURGH.— Brother Grant, writing again Nov. 11th, says: “Since our last communication two others have accepted God’s invitation to His kingdom and glory, viz., WM. SAUNDERS (28), who was immersed on 24th October: and MARY MARTIN (19), on the 9th Nov., both of whom made very intelligent confessions of their faith. Brother Saunders, when the truth was first presented to him, was an ardent believer of Mr. Hine’s ten-tribe theory, but a study of *Elpis Israel*, the *Twelve Lectures* and other works, has induced him to discard it as worthless. We have also added to our number brother JAMES GRANT, jun., Grantown (brother in the flesh to the writer), who has come to reside here. On the other hand, bro. Melrose has removed to Glasgow, brother James Smith to Moffat, brother Wm. Gordon to Ballindalloch, in consequence of the depression in trade, and sister Joseph Kirkwood to Stockport, owing to ill-health. Sister Susan Miller has withdrawn from our fellowship, declining to give any reason for so doing, further than that she considers we do not teach the truth.

(June 1879) HUDDERSFIELD.—There is trouble here through a mistaken conception of duty. It is to be hoped reflection will bring rectification before the matter becomes too old for cure and makes trouble elsewhere. The ecclesia has rightly decided to respect the withdrawal from a brother, resolved on by another ecclesia, and several in Huddersfield are standing aloof in consequence. This is a mistake. When an ecclesia withdraws from a brother, it is only right that no neighbouring or other ecclesia should receive him until at all events a properly conducted and concurrent examination of the matter have taken place by both ecclesias, if the second ecclesia sees reason to ask for it. If a concurrent investigation is asked for, it ought to be granted. If it is not asked for, the first decision ought to be respected. In any case, the first decision should be respected till it is set aside by a joint decision. The joint decision, whatever it is, should govern all. Those who disregard such evident rules of just government put themselves in the wrong with brethren everywhere else, and sow the seeds of endless difficulties for themselves and others.

(July 1879) EATINGTON.—Brother William Castle has resigned connection with the brethren, and refuses to give any reason beyond the statement that he has “fully made up his mind to stand unfettered and free for the future from all professors of any party, sect or name.” This is a very serious resolution. The brethren of Christ in every age since the apostolic appointment are a sect, under obligation from Christ to assemble periodically, and consort one with another for the various purposes specified in his commandments. To stand “unfettered and free” is to place oneself above these commandments. It may be convenient and comfortable at present to take this position. It doubtless is so: and if we were at liberty to take it, there are more than brother Castle who would not long remain out of it. But how about meeting Christ at his coming, which we shall be compelled to do, even if we were to make away with ourselves altogether? What a poor account to have to give of ourselves that we preferred to stand “unfettered and free” from those things which he has commanded us for our trial, also for our benefit, to fetter ourselves with. The commandments of Christ are given for probation, not for comfort: and it is to him that overcome, in the patient observance of them, in spite of the disagreeables, that the crown is to be awarded. The man who acts otherwise has before him “a certain fearful looking for of judgment which shall devour the adversary.” Perhaps brother Castle will think better of it. It is not yet too late.

(September 1879) SHEFFIELD.—Brother Wilson, replacing a former (lost) letter, reports the obedience of EMILY WARD (22), formerly of the English Protestant Church. After hearing the lectures, and searching the Scriptures, for about six months, she became desirous of becoming one of the heirs of that great salvation which the prophets desired to see. Brother Neale, having given up his faith in the Scriptures, has withdrawn himself.

(Excerpt from April 1880) BIRKENHEAD AND LIVERPOOL. — Fellowship has ceased on the part of brother George Andrew and sister F. A. Robertson.

(Excerpt from August 1880) GLASGOW. — Brother Nisbet reports: “Since I last wrote, we have had several additions and several losses—by removal and otherwise. To begin with our losses: brother and sister Biggar have gone to Springfield, Mass., U.S.; brother and sister Hogg, with their daughter Ann, have removed to Edinburgh; and brother Robert Wallace has made shipwreck of his faith. On the other hand, we have been strengthened by various additions—brother David Culbert having removed from Edinburgh to Glasgow, forms a valuable accession. [Compiler’s Note: See below]

(September 1880) GLASGOW.—The case of shipwreck of faith referred to last month, was a case of ceasing to believe in the divinity of the Scriptures. There is no worse form of shipwreck than this. A man abandoning himself to immoral courses is more offensive to human feeling, it may be: but such a man is but a confessed victim of human weakness. The man who rejects the Holy Oracles of God confided to the nation of Israel, may be looked upon more leniently by fellow men, but his offence toward God is greater than that of the other. He gives God the lie, and lifts the presumption of a shallow intellect against God’s great and wonderful ways. His offence, while respectable among men, has a very bad character in the eyes of God and those who are zealous for Him. This will be seen by all when God’s Majesty is realistically revealed in power and great glory, at the reappearing of Christ. The affinities of personal acquaintance will vanish then.

(Excerpt from October 1880) SPALDING.—Brother Jane reports two withdrawals, viz., “brother Allenson who has not assigned any reason; and brother Simpson, from whom we had to withdraw on scriptural grounds.

(Excerpt from December 1880) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland reports the addition of three by removal, viz., brother and sister Sharp and sister Birch, from Leicester. Against this, there is a loss of two, sister Gent having removed to Leicester and sister Richards having withdrawn from the ecclesia.

(Excerpt from January 1881) CUMNOCK.—Brother Macdougall reports unpleasant circumstances here, which it is not necessary to set forth in detail. Suffice it to say, that sister Dalglish is withdrawn from, and that others stand aloof in sympathy. Brethren Wallace and Wilson have been withdrawn from, because of their intemperate habits. Let us hope that time and wisdom may heal the wounds of the present moment, which cannot but cause grief to every heart sincerely rejoicing in the hope of Israel.

(Excerpt from February 1881) CUMNOCK —[Sister Dalghesh denies that she was withdrawn from, alleging that the withdrawal was on her part by a letter dated a considerable time before the act of the brethren, setting forth the ground of her retirement. Brother Robertson writes on the same subject, alleging that his standing aloof is not out of sympathy with sister Dalghesh, but for other reasons which he mentions. We cannot make the *Christadelphian* a medium for the ventilation of personal misunderstandings. They are hurtful to all concerned, and will be regretted in the day of Christ.]

(Excerpt from June 1881) GLOUCESTER.—In consequence of the managing brethren here declining to be compromised by public association with the name of J. C. Phillips (the publisher of a weak and untrustworthy paper, called *Testimony*), a few have left the meeting with him, and are now meeting separately out of fellowship with the brethren.

(Excerpt from August 1881) AYLESBURY.—Brother M. Wheeler (formerly in fellowship with the brethren in London) has been here for five years, but most of that time separated on account of the London division. There are now others besides himself professing the Truth. There are ten brethren and

sisters in all. On June 26 they were visited by brethren Horsman and Whitehead, of London. "After a careful consideration of the matter," says brother Wheeler, "we found that we were as one on the question of sin and its condemnation, which had been the cause of separation. And as we have no desire to be isolated in any way, we wish to be in fellowship with the brethren in other places.

(Excerpt from November 1881) LINCOLN- Brother Wright has left the meeting, declining to see any of the brethren as to his reason.

(December 1881) TIMARU.—Sister Williamson writes to contradict the assertion made in the July *Christadelphian* by the Sydenham Ecclesia, that they had had to withdraw from her, whereas she says it was she who felt constrained to withdraw from them, through their continual discord.—[We publish the disclaimer as a right claimed, and not because we know which side is right in the matter. Where we have personal knowledge, we can take ground; when we are ignorant, we can only give each side the same voice, unless we decide, which we shall very likely do some of these days, not to publish withdrawals at all except when the intimation is accompanied with justifiable reasons, with evidence, and an assurance that the constitutional course has been taken towards the accused.—EDITOR.]

(Excerpt from April 1882) GLOUCESTER- In the January number of the *Christadelphian*, the announcement appeared, from the secretary of the Gloucester ecclesia, that the brethren had, "in consequence of their disorderly walk," withdrawn from a number whose names were given. During the last month we have been threatened with legal proceedings on account of said announcement, which is alleged to be a defamatory libel. The words complained of are the words "disorderly walk." This is assumed to mean drunken and immoral behaviour, and all Gloucester is appealed to in disproof of a charge never made. The parties mentioned (Frank Forester, Geo. A. Baker, Geo. A. Thody, Sarah Thody, Emily Baker, Mary Ann Forester, and Julian Hodges) are hereby absolved of all imputation of drunkenness and immorality. What was meant was their abstention from assembly with the brethren.

One of them, Mr. Frank Forester, caused a lawyer's letter to be sent to us, demanding an apology and payment of costs, on pain of an action for libel. We wrote the lawyer to tell him there was no libel to apologise for, but the publication of a report of ambiguous wording, written and published without malice; and that any detriment arising from its uncertain terms would be remedied by the publication of his client's disclaimer, which would also be an entire satisfaction of the law of libel, as amended during the last session of Parliament. The lawyer forwarded a document written by his client for publication, which he called our "apology." We wrote him we did not publish it as an apology, but as his client's version of the case, which is as follows. With legal bludgeon in his right hand (a most disorderly attitude for anyone professing subjection to Christ.—1Cor.6:1-6; Matt. 5:39-45; Rom. 12-19; 1 Pet. 2:21-23; 1 Thess. 5; 15),

Mr. Frank Forester Saith

"Mr. Frank Forrester, of Gloucester, complains of the paragraph on page 45, January number of *Christadelphian*, headed "Gloucester," in which he is said to have been withdrawn from for disorderly walk, the same not being correct as to facts, and is a libel on his character. The facts of the case are as follows:—On January 1st, 1881, Mr. Forrester, with others (having charged the managing brethren at Gloucester with unscriptural conduct) withdrew from them and their sympathisers only, and communicated the fact, and copy of the withdrawal, to the *Christadelphian*, which paper declined to recognise the withdrawal, but stated that we had isolated ourselves from the brethren everywhere, thus judging before hearing. Mr. Forrester has never since been in fellowship with the managing brethren at Gloucester individually, because of their persistent unscriptural conduct; consequently, he was not in a position in which he could be withdrawn from by them at the time the report was sent from Gloucester;



and having never been charged with disorderly walk by the brethren at Gloucester, or elsewhere, he is in fellowship with true brethren everywhere, not having withdrawn from the whole body, nor having isolated himself, as would be gleaned from report in the *Christadelphian*. His position, therefore, is that, not having been withdrawn from, he is in good standing, and within the ecclesia, and those withdrawn from are without; to place the matter in any other light, is untrue and unjust.”

#### THE EDITOR REJOINS

Mr. Forrester’s statement is only part of the truth. The omitted facts are as follows:—The managing brethren at Gloucester, after a certain time, declined to accept the services of a lecturer approved of by Mr. Forrester, on account of the reproach brought on the truth by said lecturer’s name. For this reason, Mr. Forrester and the others separated from the meeting, and sent to the Editor of the *Christadelphian* a report of their proceeding, as an act of withdrawal from the brethren. The Editor of the *Christadelphian* replied that before he could use their report, he must have the opportunity of judging whether it ought to be published, as it was open to doubt whether it was valid. This opportunity he asked in the shape of a personal interview with them and the parties affected. This they declined, consequently, there was no other course but to refuse to publish, and to accept their act as an act of self-isolation from the brethren in Gloucester and therefore from the brethren everywhere else, for the brethren are one. If this was “judging without hearing,” whose was the fault? It was in fact not judging, but accepting facts. It is Mr. Forrester who would judge in saying that the brethren in Gloucester from whom he separated, are “without.” They are not “without,” but in fellowship with the brethren everywhere as earnest, righteous, worthy men, submitting themselves to the will of God in their day and generation. Those who cannot claim such a position are those who disregard the commandments of Christ, and seek to avenge themselves by taking or threatening legal proceedings.

(June 1882) BLANTYRE-Brother Wilson reports the addition of SAMUEL NILSON, who has decided to cast in his lot with the brethren at Stonefield.

(August 1882) LEICESTER- Since my last report, Brother T. W. Gamble has returned from Brentford to Leicester. During the same period we have lost by removal Brother and Sister Cox, who have gone to Chesterfield, and Brother and Sister Porter, who have gone to Portsmouth. We have also lost, by voluntary withdrawal from fellowship, Brother and Sister Dunmore and Brother Wm. Pickering. After making allowance for these losses, etc., we now number about 70. We have just decided to make a special effort to reach our townsmen by means of out-door services in various parts of the town. This is a very marked feature in Leicester religious life, and we are about to adopt similar methods for the accomplishment of a far different purpose, *i.e.*, of making God’s truth known to the people who dwell in darkness and in the shadow of death. Our first out-door service takes place on Sunday evening, July 16th, and, as aids in this important movement, we shall press into service large quantities of *Finger Posts* and other tracts.—F. S. HERNE.

(Excerpt from May 1883)DERBY-We learn from Brother Chandler and Brother Coates, that the division existing here for the past three months is now at an end; this does not refer to the prior division of some year or two ago which, unfortunately still continues. The brethren are to be congratulated on so much of healing as has taken place. Nothing but evil comes of division when it is the division of people who ought to be united.

(July 1883) CHELTENHAM- Brother Bradley reports that Brother and Sister Mitchell have withdrawn from the meeting on account of their sympathy with the Conditional Immortalists, to which body they formerly belonged; also that on Sunday afternoon, June 3rd, there was an open-air address by Brother Otter, at a village called Shurdington, three miles from Cheltenham. Subject: “The Kingdom of God.”

There was a very good attendance of villagers, who manifested great attention to the glorious news proclaimed to them. Brother Bradley adds: "We intend, if possible, to follow up this effort in that and other villages."

(April 1884) NORTH LONDON.—(On Sundays, Wellington Hall, Wellington Street, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; on Wednesdays and Fridays, Upper Street Hall. 8 p.m.—Brother Owler reports the following additions by immersion:—On February 17th, MARY ANN HARRIS, formerly neutral; on February 19th, JOHN STOKES (husband of sister Stokes), formerly Primitive Methodist; on February 24th, FREDERICK CHARLES JEFFS, brother in the flesh to Brother Jeffs; on February 26th, CLEMENT HENRY WALKER, and ELIZA, his wife, and Mrs. SARAH NEVE, all formerly Church of England; on March 2nd, Mrs. FRANCES HARWOOD; and March 12th, Mrs. ELIZA EMMERSON. Brother Frank Horsman, and Emma, his wife, have thrown in their lot with the Islington brethren, and left those who hold erroneous views on the taking away of sin.

(April 1884) SYDNEY.—Brother Clark reports the formation of a new ecclesia at Newtown, a suburb of Sydney, in consequence of the action of the Sydney ecclesia (numbering 75 brethren and sisters) in withdrawing from ten who are not able to see that unbaptised and knowing rejectors of the truth are responsible. But for this action, they would have remained. The action having been taken, they had no alternative. It seems a pity to make the fate of the rejected a cause of rupture where first principles are not compromised. It is the glad tidings of salvation, and how it is to be attained that is the basis of union in Christ, and not the details as to how the disobedient are to be dealt with, so long as it is recognised that death is the upshot of disobedience. Granted that responsibility should be preached; but it is a point on which there should be patience with those who do not see the full extent of the responsibility. No one can say where among the rejectors of the word, responsibility exists. We can only recognise the general and reasonable principle that light, when seen, makes responsible.

(Excerpt from November 1884) NORTH LONDON. — (Brother Owler regrets to say that two brethren—E. Gunter and J. W. Abbott—have given up the Bible as an inspired book, and have withdrawn from fellowship).

(February 1885) Blackpool.—Bro. J. Booth, referring to the notice from Blackpool last month, says it is he who has withdrawn from the meeting at Blackpool, and that he desires to be considered in fellowship with the brethren elsewhere. We publish this as a matter of right, without desiring to enter (in the *Christadelphian*) into the merits of the misunderstanding.

(May 1885) Leeds.—"Three more have come out from the Gentiles and put on the saving name in the appointed way. On March 18th, JAMES BETTS (22), printer's machinist, and ALICE WILSON, both formerly neutral; and on March 26th, ELIZA BATTYE (26), wife of bro. Battye, formerly Methodist Free Church. Bro. Betts first heard of the truth in Birmingham, where he lodged with a brother, and attended the lectures. On coming to Leeds, he attended our meetings regularly, with the result named. Sister Wilson had come to a knowledge of the truth, but did not know of our meeting until we advertised the opening of our present meeting room, so that this addition is a direct result of the change we have made. We have lost bro. Wilby, who, without assigning any reason, has ceased to fellowship, and refuses to see or communicate with the brethren.

(Excerpt from August 1885) Nottingham. — In addition to those named in the resolution, about 13 others have left us, and formed themselves into another meeting. Their names are as follows:—Sister Kerry, brother and sister Rose, brother and sister Hind, two sisters Ellis, brother Berry, brother Harris, brother Leverton, brother Tudor, brother Harrison, and brother Mabbott.

(January 1886) Huddersfield.—Brother Heywood reports that brother and sister Morton have resigned membership in the ecclesia. The cause is a matter in which they were requested, by letter, to conform to the scriptural rule of action, which they refused to do.

(Excerpt from May 1886) Melbourne.—Brother Chas. Tucker writes: “I am instructed by the brethren in Williamstown to write to inform you that the undermentioned brethren and sisters have withdrawn themselves from the Melbourne ecclesia, and have formed themselves into an ecclesia in Williamstown, meeting at brother Gee’s house for the present—Brother and sister Tucker, brother and sister Gee, brother and sister Nunnerley (formerly of Liverpool ecclesia), brother and sister Pearce, sister Jackson, and sister Fincher.

(July 1886) Normanton.—Brother Warwick writes:—“Since our last report, Sister Ward has gone to live at Rothwell (near Leeds). She thanks the Leeds brethren and sisters for their kindnesses to her. We have also lost brother Bird and brother and sister Nixon, who have exchanged our fellowship for that of the Partialists here. Our number is therefore reduced to three, viz., sister Clarke, my sister wife, and myself. However, we are thankful to the Father for enabling us to keep up the public proclamation of the truth, and pray that our feeble efforts may be of service to such (if any) as shall be saved from this place. The lectures for the past month have been “Lessons from the life of the Apostle Peter” (May 16th), “Christ’s Parable on the Mount of Olives” (on May 23rd. by brother Barraclough, of Heckmondwike), “Hell and the devil” (May 30th), “What must I do to be saved?” (June 6th), “The great cloud of witnesses” (June 13th).

(December 1886) Spalding.—Brother Ward, late of Sheffield, writes:—“You will remember me writing you in reference to affairs in Spalding. Your advice was to examine for myself and form my own judgment. I have carried out that advice, and after sifting the matter I have found that the brethren meeting at the Liberal Club rooms, in connection with brother Jane, are striving to maintain the truth against much disorder. I have therefore thrown in my lot with them, and met last Sunday for the first time. I am sorry that a reconciliation could not be effected. We had a lecture from brother Elwick, of Lincoln, on October 31st, subject: ‘Christ our Life.’ There were about eighty persons present, who listened with the utmost attention. Also on Sunday last, November 7th, brother Jane lectured on ‘Nebuchadnezzar’s Dream.’ We should be pleased to have the services of any true brethren to give us a lecture, as we have only brother Jane to depend upon.

(January 1888) WOODSIDE (Outram).—Brother Joseph reports that brother Simons has removed to Dunedin. Brother Dackers has left our Lord’s truth, to all human appearance, to walk no more with us, so I am left alone now as an orphan, but I intend sticking to it as long as it is the Lord’s will to leave me in the flesh. I never had any real pleasure in my life till I became a Christadelphian. With much pleasure I have read a great deal of dear brother Dr. Thomas’s works and yours. I have read the *Trial*, and with the help of God I think I thoroughly understand it. I read dear brother Andrews’ letter and your rejoinder. When I commenced it I had serious doubts in the beginning that he was inclined to lean upon the other side, but soon saw he was on the Lord’s side, and my earnest prayer is that he will preserve you and brother Andrews to stand in the gap to preserve his truth against heresy till He returns to take up His Kingdom on earth. It has been painful to me to find that the controversy lasted so long, but it has been joyful that the Lord has strengthened you to overcome. Dear brother, it has seemed very long without my *Christadelphian*. I always got it through brother Simons for some years. I sent for one myself in order to have two coming at one time so as I could give one to others, but I did not get above three or four copies of the last sent for before it was stopped. I thought there might have been some mistake with the last one, so I waited on and time went past, so I send for another now. I sow the seed here according to my feeble efforts, but I can see no real fruit appearing. I live in a very bad atmosphere here for truth; there is nothing

here but Presbyterians and Salvationists, so I feel quite satisfied in the truth till the Lord comes. I break bread alone every Sunday. God bless you and strengthen you.

(May 1888) ABERDARE—Brother John Pugh reports that brother Roper has again separated himself and keeps sister Roper from attending the meetings. Perhaps he may see more clearly by and bye. Lectures during the month have been:—March 18th, “The covenant with Abraham” (brother John Pugh); 25th, “The things concerning the Kingdom of God” (brother Jones, of Merthyr); April 1st, “The resurrection” (brother G. Haines; 8th, “The Christ of the Bible” (brother Jones, of Merthyr). The quarterly meeting took place on Sunday, the 8th, when the children received their prizes.

(February 1893) SHEFFIELD—On Wednesday in Christmas week we held our annual fraternal tea meeting, followed on the Thursday by the children’s tea. The attendance at the former was not so good as we had hoped, but there was a fair muster on the second occasion. Prizes were distributed, and the children were afterwards entertained by magic lantern views. We are sorry to report the withdrawal of sister Lee, who has joined fellowship with the Church of England. We yet hope that she may be brought to see the error of this course, and find her way back before it is too late. Brother Whitaker has removed from Sheffield to the neighbourhood of Cardiff, Wales. Our lectures are fairly well attended.—F. MARSDEN.

(March 1893) RIPLEY —Since our last, we have been encouraged by the obedience of MR. JOSEPH BIRKS, of Heanor, who put on the sin-covering name on the 10th of September. Previous to his immersion, he was a member of the Church of England, brother H. Moore, also of Heanor, has returned to fellowship, after an absence of six years. On the other hand, we have been very much distressed by the resignation of Brother W. Mitchell, and sister S. Mitchell, who say:—That as a body, the Christadelphians do not regard prayer as a necessity (This is not true.—ED.), 2nd, that when they do pray, they stand (they do so in public. In their private devotions, they always kneel: Both attitudes are scripturally exemplified; Mark 11:25; Acts 20; 36. It is a question of time, place, and convenience, which we are left to judge. There is no command or direction. The objection is frivolous. ED.)—That as a body, they do not hold the whole unmutated and uncorrupted truth. (This is vague and incapable of demonstration, and would imply that the critic in the case does himself do what he thinks those with whom he finds fault do not do. We fancy we know the root of the false accusation. Every man can only act according to his own judgment, however sound or otherwise this may be. The judge will settle all presently.—ED.) Fourth, that had he known that the Christadelphians were so opposed to progression, he would never have joined himself to them. (Ha! “Progression” is a fine word. Friend Mitchell is not the first who has used it. Movement is not necessarily progression. It depends upon the direction. The Christadelphian motto is “Be steadfast, unmoveable.” Truth is a fixed thing. A man may not have the faculty of discerning it. He may be of those of whom Paul speaks, “ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.” In this case, he will always be groping, always investigating, never certain about anything, and in this case, steadfastness of faith will seem non-progressiveness. Well, everything will appear in its true light by-and-bye.—ED.) Brother Caulton continues: “We also report withdrawal from sister L. Hall, and sister A. M. Mitchell, daughters of brother Mitchell, for continued absence from the breaking of bread. The few of us that are left are endeavouring so do our best for the truth, remembering our Lord’s command that we are to endure unto the end if we would be saved.”—WILLIAM CAULTON.

(June 1893) AUBURN (N.Y.)—Brother Andrew Jno. Turner reports that his mother, sister, and self, have been compelled to separate from the other professors of the truth in this place, because the word does not say, “Be ye conformed to this world” but “Be not conformed to this world but transformed by the renewing of your mind.” Despite this discouragement, he says, “I have been sowing the good seed in a decent way, not going headlong into the swine and rejoicing because they turn and rend me. The re-

appearing of our Master, the Judge of the quick and the dead, cannot be far distant. Therefore it should behove us to awake to righteousness and discretion, lest he come suddenly and find us asleep in sin and darkness.”

(August 1893) HAMILTON (ONT.).—Brother Parkin reports the immersion of PHOEBE ADELAIDE GRUITT (21), the daughter of brother Gruitt, of London, Ont., who paid us a visit on Sunday, June 25th, to be present at the immersion which took place on that date in the waters of Burlington Bay. Brother and sister Gruitt, of Plymouth, Eng., will no doubt be pleased to read this good news. Eleven of us standing aside from a body become corrupt through the toleration of theories subversive of a correct understanding of the prophetic word, are helping each other to prepare for the consolation of Israel. We meet every Sunday for the remembrance of Christ’s death; also in the evening we interest each other by reading “Nazareth Re-Visited,” and on Wednesday we meet to read the Doctor’s expositions of Daniel. We have cause for rejoicing that we are all of one mind.—E. H. C. PARKIN.

(April 1894) LEEDS 81, *Great George Street*.—Brother Thorp reports an addition of three, by the immersion of CHARLES MAURICE ROWBOTHAM (27), formerly Church of England, and the return of brother and sister Philpotts from Keighley.

Brother Suggitt reports the marriage of sister Ashby to brother J. Bradford, of Halifax, to which place she now removes with the best wishes of the brethren. Brother and sister William Thomas Miller, who for a long time associated with those in fellowship with Bedford Square, Halifax, having accepted the Leeds “statement of faith,” have now united themselves with the brethren there. The lectures have been by brethren Iredale, Pickles, Shaw and Suggitt.

(May 1895) SPALDING—We had a visit from brother Viccars Collyer, sen., of Leicester, on the 24th of March. He exhorted us in the morning with refreshing and stimulating effect. In the evening he lectured on “Devils, Ancient and Modern.” There was a goodly number of hearers. We regret to report that brother and sister Ward have gone back to the Wesleyans, and brother A. Andrew has connected himself with the Free Methodists.—A. JANE.

(May 1896) WINTON (BOURNEMOUTH)—It is with pleasure I report the following additions to our number:—April 1st, Mr. BAKER (40), formerly Wesleyan; Miss GILLIAT (23). April 11th, Mr. WHEATELY (52), Mrs. WHEATELY (50), wife of the former, both formerly Wesleyans. These are encouraging fruits for our labours in the Lord’s vineyard. It is my painful duty to report that sister May has returned again into the mire, out of which she came but a short time ago. Her associations with the truth was one reason Mr. Cleal made his attack upon us. Sister May expressed the way was too narrow, it did not admit her husband and children. Visitors during the month have been:—Sister Shelton, of Bedford; sister Churcher, sister Mounday, of Southampton; sister Owen, sister Taylor, of London; brother Reeves, Salisbury.—J. WILKINSON

(June 1896) BRISTOL *Oddfellows’ Hall, Rupert Street, near Christmas Steps. Sundays, 11 a.m.; 6.30 p.m.*—Brother Frederick Wm. George Saunders removed to Birmingham in April. Brother J. White resigned fellowship on January 26th, on seeing that the ecclesia’s forbearance with his rare attendance at the “breaking of bread,” extending over a very long period, had been exhausted, and that we were determined to withdraw from him. All exhortation has proved of no avail. On May 3rd we were cheered by a visit from brother F. R. Shuttleworth, who exhorted us in the morning from the portions of the day, and lectured in the evening. We hope to see good results from the effort in due time, to the honour and glory of God. Visitors during the month, besides brother Shuttleworth, have been brother Green, of Birmingham; sister Mills, of Clevedon; and sister J. Thomas, of Bath. Lectures:—April 12th, “The Devil” (brother G. H. Sargent); 26th, “The Church and Her Head; their Present and Future Union” (brother J.

Thomas, of Bath); May 3rd, “The Beginning and End” (brother F. R. Shuttleworth, of Birmingham); 10th, “Palestine; Her Past History and Future Glory” (brother Wm. Jenkins).—B. BRADLEY.

(July 1896) GLASGOW -I have pleasure in reporting the obedience of ANDREW PEEBLES (22), who, after the necessary confession of Faith, was baptised into the sin-covering Name. Our brother, whose religious associations in the past had been with the Methodists, was brought to examine the truth by brother Robert Gillespie, of this ecclesia, with the satisfactory result above mentioned. As stated in the Hamilton intelligence last month, brother and sister John Carruthers have removed to Glasgow, and will meet with this ecclesia. Brother Colquhoun, whose baptism was reported in the May number, has already, I regret to say, withdrawn from fellowship. The lectures during the past month have been:—May 24th, “Is the Doctrine of Heaven-going at Death Scriptural?” (brother Campbell); 31st, “The Thief on the Cross” (brother Ritchie); June 7th, “Hell” (brother Hough); 14th, “Baptism; is it essential to Salvation?” (brother D. Perrie).—D. CAMPBELL.

(August 1896) SHEFFIELD-We were much cheered with a visit from brother J. S. Dixon, of Leicester, who lectured for us in the evening—to a most attentive and interested audience—on “The Unpreached Gospel.” Other special lectures being followed by our own brethren, and we trust the seed that is sown may fall on good honest ground, and bring forth fruit to the honour and praise of God. We regret to announce the withdrawal from our meeting of sister Wallis and sister Hinchcliffe.—H. W. LEAH.

## WITHDRAWAL DUE TO SPECIFIC DOCTRINAL ERRORS

### CAMPBELLISM

(February 1882) SCHOLLS FERRY (OGN.)—Since our divided condition in this State, six have left the Nicholites, and become united with our company On the other hand, we have lost one by death, as lately reported (our beloved Brother Stevenson), and two Brother and Sister Cooper, have removed twelve miles away (to Beverton), from whence we expect them to meet with us frequently. Then Sister Green dwelt in our neighbourhood for a while, but removed to California, where she has lately followed her husband (Brother Green) to the grave. Our much-beloved and missing Brother Quinn followed his daughter (SisterGreen) to California last summer. We have just heard from him. He is located at Forestville, Sonoma Co., California. Another sad event, that our brethren mourned with much weeping, was the withdrawal of Sister Miller, in order to re-unite with the Campbellites. This was on account of the bitter and (to her) irresistible opposition of her entire family. So you see changes are continually going on. Among others, one causing “great heaviness, and continual sorrow of heart,” is the dismal clouds of scepticism that have overshadowed Brother W. Wing for the last year. After his removal to the territory of Idaho, he was thrown into the society of infidels, and has not been able to resist their arguments. Truly, there are many dark clouds and little sunshine in this life. [Truly so: but the morning comes, when there will be life, and light, and liberty, and joy, to such as endure to the end.—[ED. C.]

### CHRISTIAN ISRAELITISM

(June 1882) KIDDERMINSTER-I have to announce the immersion of another believing Gentile into the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, viz., Mr. BROOKFIELD, china dealer, formerly an attendant at the Countess of Huntingdon’s Chapel, in this town, a young man who has for a considerable time given attention to the things most surely believed amongst us. He was immersed at Birmingham, on Sunday, April 9th, 1882. Bro. Hodges—formerly a member of our ecclesia—who has been residing some months at Liverpool, has now returned to this neighbourhood, and again associated himself with us. We are sorry

to have to record the falling away of two of our members, Mr. and Mrs. Hughes, to the Christian Israelites.

(February 1883) NOTTINGHAM- Brother Kirkland reports the obedience, on January 1st, of EDWARD HEMINGWRAY (19), formerly Wesleyan. Also, with sorrow, he notifies the withdrawal of the ecclesia from Rufus Godfry Jones, on account of his disorderly walk and continued absence from the table. Sarah Ann Turney is now no longer in the fellowship of the brethren, she having united herself to a number of people calling themselves "Christian Brethren."

### **CLEAN-FLESH, RENUNCIATIONISM, TURNEYISM, J. BELL, G. CORNISH**

(October 1873) GLASGOW.—We hear of four having separated from the ecclesia in this place, because of their acceptance of the Renunciationist heresy.

(Excerpt from October 1874) GLASGOW.— There has been one addition to the ecclesia since last report, viz., ROBERT BLACK, who had been immersed in 1849 as a result of the Dr.'s visit to Glasgow. He was in the Stockwell Street Meeting (a place in which they do not 'all speak the same thing'), but withdrew from it about six months ago, being very dissatisfied with their looseness doctrinally: since which he has attended our meeting, and, after a serious consideration, decided to put on the sin-covering name, he regarding his former immersion as invalid on account of having had erroneous views of the God-head and the mission of Jesus Christ.

(July 1874) DEAL.—A statement having been publicly made to the effect that all professing the truth in this place have given in their adhesion to Renunciationism, brother Measday wishes a contradiction to appear. The contradiction comes through brother Bosher, jun., who while visiting Deal, was requested as an eye witness to give testimony to the falsity of the statement that had been put forth.

(August 1874) LEITH.—Brother Ker writes to counteract the false impression that the Leith ecclesia has gone over to Renunciationism. He says they had a visit from Edward Turney and William Ellis, the former of whom was allowed to explain his "free life" theory, on the understanding that questions would be answered. He, however, occupied from a little before eight in the evening until about twenty minutes after ten, so that only one or two questions were put, and these under a sense that the questioners were intruding, they being reminded by the lecturer of the lateness of the hour. The brethren were afterwards surprised to learn from TWO different towns visited in the same way, that the Leith ecclesia was reported to have received the "free life" ambassadors with open arms, in a way to convey the idea that they endorsed the doctrine propounded to them. "The reverse," says brother Ker, "is the fact, a single proof of which may suffice. One of our number, who had previously shown a slight disposition to sympathise with Renunciationists, rose to his feet at the end of the forenoon meeting, on Sunday, July 5th, announced that he wished to withdraw anything he might have said in favour of the Turney doctrine; that he saw he had been misled, and further, that he never had seen so clearly the fallacy of the arguments used in support of the new theory, as he had done since the visit of Turney and Ellis. Their visit, therefore, has done us good, but in a very different way from that represented. We have not a single Turney sympathiser now, far less accepting as an ecclesia their scheme of "free life" redemption." Brother Ker adds a few remarks by way of answer to the arguments presented to them, but they are unnecessary, and only help to give importance to that which is unworthy of attention.

(Excerpt from September 1874) GLASGOW.—Brother Nesbit writes to say that the brethren in the fellowship of the truth now number 44, firmly established in the one faith, notwithstanding recent efforts to subvert them by a personal visit of Edward Turney and William Ellis. Only one declension has resulted—that of John O'Neill. "This is," says brother Nesbit, "as far as I am aware, the only evil which

has resulted, although Edward Turney, serpent like, makes it appear as if it would turn out otherwise. He called upon me (David was in at the time, as is his usual) and remained for about two hours. We cross-questioned him at some length, but were very dissatisfied with his answers; and so far from being favourably impressed by either his doctrine or himself, it was entirely the other way. He talked a great deal about the pleasing reception he was getting at the hands of the brethren, saying they were surprised on finding him at large, and not requiring to be led in a chain by William Ellis, whom he styles his “showman;” and further, that the brethren expected to see a rhinoceros or boa-constrictor. This I find is a stereotyped remark of his. He repeats it on all occasions, as I find from those with whom he has come in contact on his tour. I was struck by the difference in the atmosphere which surrounds him from that surrounding (and I say it without any intention to flatter) you. He has too many “good words and fair speeches” for our taste. Mother, who overheard part of the conversation, remarked, “Oh, but he has a wily tongue, that man.” It was nauseating. Lest he should gather a wrong impression from his interview—mistaking courtesy to himself for favour to his doctrine—I was plain at the end of our conversation. He told us that many of the brethren had not understood his writings. I said, “what you have stated to us now is what I have always understood you to teach in your writings upon the subject.” Notwithstanding our very apparent opposition to his doctrine, he represents us as saying we had heard something which was new to us, and favourably received the answers given, which is simply untrue, if he is referring to the subject of the sacrifice of Christ. It is also untrue what he says about brother Owlter. Even the letter of complaint from brother O’Neill is founded on brother O’Neill’s misunderstanding, which I called on him and pointed out. In a letter he sent to me yesterday, he says he will write Turney, and get him to publish a letter contradicting his former communication, and exonerating the managing brethren from all blame; and he further states that the mistake was on his part, in accusing me of “not reading to the ecclesia a letter addressed to them which he did not write, but only thought he had done so.” But I will only have bored you with this. There is more ‘sinful flesh’ about it than anything else, so will close at this time.”

(Excerpt from January 1876) MANCHESTER. — Mr. H. S. Sherwood, whose suspension of fellowship with the Manchester ecclesia, in connection with the Renunciationist schism, was reported twelve months ago, requests it to be made clear that he does not deny that the Lord Jesus “came in the flesh;” but suspends his judgment on the question raised by the schism in question, believing the Scriptures afford no answer to it.

(Excerpt from September 1877) MANCHESTER. — After a time of much unrest, the ecclesia has had to take a stand against the no-will heresy which emanated from Halifax. It has adopted a resolution declaring that heresy subversive of the apostolic doctrine of Christ, and declining fellowship with those who hold it. The result has been a diminution of numbers, but a restoration of peace and union, with the prospect of a resumption of prosperity as regards those both without and within.”

(Excerpt from March 1878) LEEDS.—Brother W. H. Andrew writes: “Since my last report we have had an addition by the removal of brother Cowperthwaite from Nedderton. We have to regret the loss of brother Pickles, who has accepted the No-will theory.

(March 1880) PLYMOUTH.—Brethren Sleep and Peline write as follows:—“We, the undersigned, write to inform you that after due and diligent study we have come to the conclusion that Jesus was made in all things like unto his brethren, partaking of the nature of Adam, which is sinful nature, and consequently, subject to the same condemnation. In all other points of doctrine we are agreed with the views held by the Birmingham ecclesia, and others of the same faith elsewhere, in relation to the foregoing statement. We, therefore, reject ‘free life’ and ‘substitutionary’ sacrifice, as taught by the late brother E. Turney and party, and also the latest emanations both from the Nottingham and Birmingham Renunciationists, which we believe to be subversive of God’s plan of salvation. Those with whom we have been meeting were asked, that in order to have sound fellowship, a day should be appointed that we might declare our views,



and scripturally discuss them, and to see how many, if any, would believe with us, and if not in accordance with our views, we should withdraw ourselves from them. The managing brethren granted us a hearing, which was to have taken place on the 18th inst., being a clear week and four days from the request being granted. But instead of the meeting taking place, a resolution was passed declining to hold it. We have, therefore, withdrawn, and ask to be recognised by the Birmingham ecclesia, as two brethren holding the same truth with them, and we will endeavour, to the best of our abilities, to advance the truth. If any brother should happen to be coming so far west as Plymouth or Devonport, we shall be glad to see them. Our addresses are A. Sleep, 46, Marlborough street, Devonport; J. Peline, 18, Buckwell street, Plymouth.” [To A.S.: If a man is tormented with doubts with regard to the validity of a previous immersion, doubtless, the Lord, who is “full of compassion,” will pardon its repetition, even if in His estimation it should be unnecessary.—EDITOR.]

(January 1881) MUMBLES.—There is good news from this place. Seven years ago, the large ecclesia, meeting in what used to be a Methodist chapel, was broken up through various causes, principal among which was the outbreak at that time of Renunciationism. Brother W. Clement espoused the plausible doctrines promulgated from Nottingham, and a number with him did the same. About an equal number refusing the new doctrines, separated themselves, and met in the Assembly Rooms. Here they were again afterwards subdivided, through various untoward occurrences. In the progress of time, Renunciationism has come to naught: not to speak of the dissolution of its principal assemblies, its principal support is in the grave; its next, has gone over to sceptical Unitarianism; its next, has become a Josephite, denying that Jesus was the Son of God. The increasing corruption caused our Mumbles friends to re-consider their position. Re-consideration resulted in the acceptance of the truth originally professed. This opened the way for proposals of reunion. The proposals, after consideration and discussion in a written form, were accepted on all sides; and the result has been the coming together of the broken fragments of the original assembly, with the resolve to redeem the past by a better future, should the long-suffering of the Lord provide scope in further delay for that amendment and salvation of which he desires to see all men avail themselves. This excellent result has likewise extended itself to Swansea, where disunion (due, however, to different causes) is now at an end. At Neath also, fellowship has been accepted on the basis of the truth. Brother W. H. Jones reports from Mumbles that several immersions have taken place, including HENRIETTA EMILY BEHENNA, eldest daughter to sister Behenna. The ecclesia now numbers fifty-seven. Brother D. Clement writes, Dec. 12th, of arrangements connected with the delivery at Mumbles of a course of lectures by brother Roberts, of Birmingham, in inauguration of the new and hopeful turn of events. He says: “We are expecting next Sunday the largest meeting on the basis of the truth ever held in Wales. We shall have, in addition to our own number (about sixty), sixty or so from Swansea, and representatives from Neath, Llanelly, and Gower. It is quite possible that from 130 to 140 will break bread together. Truth is stranger than fiction. Who would have suggested such a thing was among the order of probability? We have resolved to open the Assembly Rooms (which is ours till Christmas), for the purpose of making a general spread for the brothers and sisters from Mumbles, Swansea, and all others attending, to dine and tea together on Sunday. We intend to give up the Sunday school after dinner, and hold a fraternal meeting at half-past two.”

(Excerpt from August 1881) MELBOURNE.—Brother J. C. Gamble reports that three more have been added to the little flock in this “fair city of the south.” On Sunday, April 10th, brother and sister Bowman, late of Birmingham, united with the brethren in fellowship. They were formerly connected with the Birmingham ecclesia, but severed themselves from it some eight years ago, at the division upon the Renunciationist heresy, although it would appear they did not fully sympathise with it. However, they now reject the theory altogether, and are satisfied with the truth in its purity and simplicity. During the time they have been in the colony they have held themselves aloof until two or three months ago.

## DOWIEISM

(March 1866) EDINBURGH.—Bro. Ellis announces the immersion of James Durrie, of Alloa (Scotland), on the 15th of January. He also describes a revolution in the midst of the Edinburgh ecclesia, of which more will be heard anon.

(December 1866) TURRIFF.—Brother Robertson, writing in the month of October, transmits the following copy of a letter addressed to Mr. J. Cameron, of Edinburgh. “I presume, as I am writing you upon a matter of business, it will not be very far out of order, to drop, through you, to George Dowie and those in fellowship with him, my resolution to repudiate all fellowship with them. I do so in all solemnity for the truth’s sake, which I value more than all the best friends on earth. In taking this step, I have consulted no one, but have acted for myself, as I shall have to answer for myself before the judgment seat of Christ. How could I have fellowship with a man who is in doubt on one of the first principles of the gospel of the kingdom? With such a doubt, I could not baptise him; and to fellowship in such a case, would be to go through a sham. This conviction was ripened by what appeared in this month’s *Messenger*, p. 148, in which Mr. Dowie says he is not prepared to say whether the truth of eternal life should be apprehended before or after baptism. From such an uncertain state of mind I must withdraw myself. I deeply regret the necessity of such a step, for the truth’s sake, which lies bleeding at your feet. That you may come to the right ways of the Lord before it is too late, is the heartfelt desire and prayer of your well-wisher, JAMES ROBERTSON. [Since his last communication, brother Robertson has been twice at Whitehills, Banffshire, and held two well-attended open-air meetings. In a subsequent communication, brother Robertson states the following facts, which we commend to the sympathetic consideration of our readers.—He earns his livelihood by sedentary manual labour, but for many years has been unable, from the state of his health, to apply himself continuously to his employment; and is under the necessity, at occasional intervals, of availing himself of change of air and occupation. This change he seeks in connection with efforts for the truth. As he says, “I often go away, and hold meetings, when I am not fit for my work, and come home all right again.” These efforts have hitherto been attended with considerable result, as our readers have from time to time had evidence of, in the “intelligence” paragraphs, sent from Turriff. In the prosecution of these efforts, however, brother Robertson has been beholden to the kindness of friends. His pecuniary resources have not been such as to allow of his absence from work without assistance. Some in certain parts have paid his rent, and contributed in various other ways to keep him in the field of occasional exertions. Those who have hitherto acted this part have been the “Dowieites.” From these he has now separated himself, and in reference to this he says, “I expect nothing in the future from the quarter I have now left. I was glad of an opportunity of leaving them before they had one this season of giving. I left them from a determination to stand by the truth, leaving the issue with God and his children, among whom I dwell in unity. I have now to ask, shall I continue to do as I have been doing heretofore? I would not like to incur expense on my brethren without their approval, but I like to do something for the truth if they like to stand by me in my deficiencies.” Nothing more need be added, except to say that what is wanted is for individual brethren and ecclesias to say how much they are prepared to guarantee annually toward the object thus set before them. The Editor will be glad to receive communications on the subject.

(Excerpt from December 1867) EDINBURGH.—MRS. HUGHES, lately among the adherents of George Dowie in Edinburgh has been added to the ecclesia. She was formerly a member of the New York ecclesia; and coming to England in ignorance of a division prevailing, she became a member of the Dowieite meeting; but, however, after a considerable time, she came to see their false position in relation to the truth, and renounced their fellowship.

## **IMMORTAL EMERGENCE**

(July 1893) NOTTINGHAM -Obedience to the Gospel call has been rendered during the past month by RICHARD WILLIAM ASK (20), fitter, formerly Baptist, who we trust having entered upon the race may run well and endure to the end. We deeply regret that sister Footitt has withdrawn from fellowship, having adopted the theory of immortal emergence of the righteous from the grave (which involves the rejection of the doctrine of the saints for life eternal.—ED.). During the month the following items of the faith have been dealt with by the lecturing brethren:—May 14th, “The mark of the beast and the number of his name” (brother F. W. Porter, of London); 21st, “One King over all the earth” (brother H. H. Collyer, of Leicester); 28th, “What the earth was created for?” (brother P. H. Horsman); June 4th, “Man mortal” (brother Elston); 11th, “How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?” (brother Burton).—S. RICHARDS.

## **THE FUTURIST THEORY**

(June 1865) GALASHIELS.—The meeting here has come through a severe ordeal in consequence of the existence of a difference of faith in reference to the revelations vouchsafed to John in the isle of Patmos. It was contended on the part of one or two that the things revealed to John are all in the future with the exception of those described in the first three chapters; in opposition to which others maintained the truth that they relate largely to the events already accomplished in the history of the post eighteen centuries. The difference grew to such an issue that a disruption seemed unavoidable. A visit from brethren Ellis & Steele, of Edinburgh, however, confirmed those who contended for the truth, decided those who were uncertain, and caused those who contended for the futurist theory to withdraw.

## **THE ANGLO-ISRAELITISH THEORY**

(Excerpt from August 1879) BIRKENHEAD.— I have also to inform you that Sarah Pennington and Thomas R. Robertson are no longer in fellowship with this ecclesia, they having elected to fellowship those who are separated from us on the Anglo-Israelitish theory.”

## **THE NO ETERNAL LIFE HERESY**

(July 1883) LIVERPOOL-There have been two additions to our number during the past month, viz.—on May 26th, ELIZABETH COLLENS, formerly Baptist, wife of the writer of this, and on June 2nd, ANN ASHURST (18) lately Wesleyan, step-daughter of our brother Thomas Rylands. Sister Hamer has returned to Manchester. Brother H. Croston having adopted the theory that Eternal Life could not be attained by any of the human race who lived whilst the law of Moses was in force, with the exception of the prophets, has withdrawn himself from our fellowship. This strange doctrine has found a few supporters in the ecclesia, and several of them are following Brother Croston’s example, to the great sorrow of the brethren.

(Excerpt from August 1883) LIVERPOOL-As foreshadowed in my last communication, several members of this ecclesia have followed bro. Croston and separated themselves from us on account of their reception of the theory that, with the exception of the prophets, no one who lived while the Law of Moses was in force could become related to eternal life—their names are brethren John Monaghan, Benjamin Jones, and William Smith, and sisters Jane K. Saxby and Eliza E. Woolfall. The folly of this idea which makes void so many of the affectionate utterances of the Diety addressed to his ancient people through his servants of old and through Christ, makes their separation all the more painful to us, who, in time past,

have walked with them and taken sweet counsel together. We, however, yet cherish the hope that they may renounce this error and return to our fellowship.

(September 1883) LIVERPOOL—On the 7th of July last we immersed Mr. ANTONIO JANEIRO (53), labourer, formerly a (so-called) believer in Christ, and on the 6th of August, Mr. D. L. EVANS, who was many years Professor of Hebrew and Natural Philosophy in the Presbyterian College at Carmarthen. On the 7th of August brother and sister Spence left Liverpool for Glasgow, whence they were to sail for Brisbane.—Sister Margaret Jones, Mary M. Jones, and Kate Saxby, who are connected by family ties with the brethren and sisters who have separated themselves from us on the theory that eternal life was unattainable while the law given by the hand of Moses was in force, have also withdrawn from our fellowship.—HY. COLLENS.

(Excerpt from October 1883) LIVERPOOL—On the 26th August, brother Richard Gee, his wife and his two sons; also brother Daniel Munnerley and his wife Elizabeth, who are all in fellowship with us, left for Plymouth *en route* for Brisbane, amidst the regrets of the brethren. The theory of no eternal life under the law has drawn away four more of our number, viz.—Charles Barber, Sarah Jane Barber, G. W. Griffiths, and Ety S. Griffiths.—HY. COLLENS.

(May 1888) ABERDARE—Brother John Pugh reports that brother Roper has again separated himself and keeps sister Roper from attending the meetings. Perhaps he may see more clearly by and bye. Lectures during the month have been:—March 18th, “The covenant with Abraham” (brother John Pugh); 25th, “The things concerning the Kingdom of God” (brother Jones, of Merthyr); April 1st, “The resurrection” (brother G. Haines); 8th, “The Christ of the Bible” (brother Jones, of Merthyr). The quarterly meeting took place on Sunday, the 8th, when the children received their prizes.

## PARTIAL-INSPIRATIONISM

(January 1885) LEICESTER—“John S. Dixon,” who has left the brethren, writes “to the Editor of the *Christadelphian*,” with greeting, to say that his departure is not due to his having “surrendered to arguments of of scepticism” (as stated in last month’s *Christadelphian*), but to his having “adopted, after a very prolonged investigation, the position enunciated in the article on Inspiration by bro. Ashcroft.”

(December 1885) Manchester.—Brother J. Holland writes: “A wholly-inspired Bible, forming a part of that whole counsel which Paul did not shun to declare, and the Manchester ecclesia having amongst them those who advocate a partly-inspired Bible, and declining to make known its position in regard to the matter, eight of us have withdrawn, and are meeting for breaking of bread at sister Holland’s, 32, Gladden Street, Ancoats, until we can obtain a suitable meeting-room.

(January 1886) Cardiff.—Brother Symonds reports the brethren here continue to hold aloft the Word of Life to the best of their ability. On the other hand, brother Thomas Davies has found it necessary to step aside until they define their attitude distinctly, both as to the doctrine and fellowship of partial inspiration. It is to be hoped the situation will clear.

(January 1886) Dundee.—We have two communications from this place,—one reporting a “recoil from strivings to no profit,” and the other (from brother T. Mitchell) intimating a decision on the part of himself and sister-wife to stand aside until the meeting repudiate the doctrine and fellowship of partial inspiration.

(Excerpts from January 1886) Glasgow. — The motion being rejected, the supporters of it have withdrawn themselves and now meet separately to the number of twenty-one on the foundation of a

wholly divine and infallible Bible. They have rented temporarily the hall of Nelson's Hotel, East Ingram Street (formerly Cannon Street), where they meet on Sundays at 11.15 a.m. for the breaking of bread. No public effort will be attempted until the beginning of the New Year when the brethren hope to occupy premises to which they can invite "the stranger." Brother Campbell adds: "If there are any brethren in Glasgow desirous of casting in their lot with those constituting the new ecclesia on the basis already mentioned, we shall be very glad indeed of their company and support. Not possessing the list of addresses of the brethren, we have not been able to communicate with all. We trust, therefore, that no one who upon principle should be with us will stand aloof merely because they have not hitherto heard from us.

Brother Dick adds to the foregoing:—"The ecclesia in Glasgow has been in a very unsatisfactory state for a long time owing to the controversy on the divine authority of the Bible. Sunday after Sunday, when the forenoon services were past, generally found some of us eagerly debating the subject, or vigorously criticising some article or letter that had recently appeared. One of the brethren whose mind was sadly exercised by the openly-expressed doubt of the Bible's entire inspiration, wished to have an ecclesial expression of view concerning the subject, but the managing brethren were unwilling to move one foot in the matter. The upshot was he sent in his withdrawal. Other two brethren and four sisters kept away.

(Excerpt from January 1886) LONDON. — ISLINGTON. — A special meeting of the Ecclesia was held on Oct. 19 to consider the inspiration question, notice having been previously given that the following propositions would be moved:—1. "We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the divine authorship, and consequent infallibility, of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship." 2. "We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it." Brother J. J. Andrew moved the first of these, which, however, was not voted upon, as at the close of the meeting a proposition by brother H. H. Horsman to adjourn the question for 12 months was carried by 43 to 36, many not voting. As this amounted to a refusal, either to reject the "fallible authorship" theory or to repudiate the fellowship of those holding it, the supporters of the proposition at once withdrew from fellowship, and to the number of nearly 100 have since been meeting at 69, Upper Street, for the breaking of bread.

(January 1886) WESTMINSTER.—Brother F. W. Porter writes:—"The controversy on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, has at length terminated amongst the South London brethren and sisters, so far as the Westminster ecclesia is concerned. The matter has been under discussion for a considerable time, four ecclesial meetings having been held for the purpose. The ecclesia was asked to re-affirm their old position, and their belief in a wholly inspired and infallible Bible, and their determination to fellowship those only who so believed in the following propositions:—Prop. I.—"We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the Divine Authorship, and consequent infallibility of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship." Prop. II.—"We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it." To these, however, the following amendment was moved:—"That the Bible, as we now have it, is a reliable record of God's dealings with men in the past, and an infallible revelation of the way of salvation and of His future purpose; a belief of which, in conjunction with obedience to the precepts of Christ and the apostles, we hold to be necessary to salvation. We shall therefore continue (as heretofore) to fellowship only those who so believe and teach." On the first proposition and amendment being put to the vote of the meeting, the former was rejected and the latter carried by a large majority. Under these circumstances, about 60 brethren and sisters (including the writer of this report) have felt it their duty to withdraw from the ecclesia, it being impossible to endorse the amendment, which not only evades the point at issue, namely, the character of the autographs, but directly affirms that while certain parts of 'the

Bible as we now have it are infallible,' other portions are merely 'reliable.' Moreover, it is manifest that it will admit into fellowship those believing in a partially inspired Bible. The brethren and sisters who have withdrawn from membership have constituted themselves a separate ecclesia meeting at the Hanover Assembly Rooms, 334, Kennington Park Road, S. E., having adopted the two resolutions first mentioned as a basis of fellowship."

(January 1886) Newburgh (FIFE).—Brother Hepburn writes:—"I think it right to mention that the Newburgh ecclesia has decided to fellowship those who believe in partial inspiration of Scripture. In view of such decision, I have tendered my resignation. Brother Forbes and I will have to break bread by ourselves. I think it is absolutely necessary that there should be a clear basis of fellowship on the question of inspiration—a line of demarcation drawn to guard against restless spirits keeping the body in a sea of trouble. What can be more unsatisfactory than when one quotes certain Scripture, to be challenged upon the authenticity of the passage quoted? There must be a conjoint admission as to inspiration *in toto*—not only for the sake of the communities, but for the *truth itself*. Where would the truth be to many of us if we admitted the 'liable to err' element? The Bible is the basis of the truth as far as we are concerned, and to admit the basis to be false in one jot or tittle is to admit uncertainty as to the truth. Salvation itself would become indefinite. Possibly the hope of it would cease to exist except in name."

(January 1886) Newcastle-on-Tyne.—Brother Little reports:—"On May 14th, 1885, we adopted the amended resolution on inspiration. There were only two dissentients, viz.:—Brother and sister Forbes, who objected to it being made a basis of fellowship, and therefore withdrew themselves. We have, since then, endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation on the ground of wholly-inspired and infallible Bible, but, I regret to say, it has been unsuccessful. This was not mentioned at the time, as we expected it would be unnecessary."

(January 1886) Swansea.—Brother Randles and thirty-two other brethren and sisters have stepped aside and organised themselves on a separate basis, in consequence of the refusal of a minority to agree to a proposal to decline the fellowship of the Exchange brethren in Birmingham. The minority did not absolutely refuse what was proposed: but they wished first to communicate with the Exchange brethren in order to be sure that they were not prepared to take a right position as to inspiration, both in doctrine and fellowship. They desired the opportunity of submitting to them a proposed declaration—upon the reception or rejection of which their action would turn. Supposing this to be a sincere proposal on their part (as it seems to be in some cases, at all events), there ought to be no difficulty in reaching an accommodation. Let the minority submit their proposed declaration to the Exchange. If it is accepted, a way will be opened for many reconciliations. If it is rejected, the minority ought to have no difficulty in identifying themselves with the majority.

(Excerpt from February 1886) Bath.—Brother Keepence reports the separation of four on the question of fellowshiping the Exchange brethren.

(February 1886) Derby.—Brother Clark reports that a Special Meeting of the ecclesia was held on January 6th, to consider and declare its position on the inspiration question. The following resolutions were proposed by brother W. Chandler, and seconded by brother E. Grimes:—1.—"We hereby affirm our unabated confidence in the Divine Authorship and consequent infallibility of the Bible, and in the reliability (subject to errors of transmission) of the copies in our possession—a recognition of which has hitherto been implied in our basis of fellowship." 2.—"We reject the doctrine which attributes to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship, and we deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who believe it." An amendment was proposed by brother Colebourne, and seconded by brother C. S. Tyler, as follows: "That upon the question of inspiration, we affirm our belief in every Bible declaration upon the

subject, accepting fully the apostolic statements, that ‘Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit,’ and that ‘All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable,’ &c. But we deprecate most earnestly the making of any particular theory a matter of division in our midst, and we are prepared to give the brethren everywhere the right hand of fellowship who hold fast to the truth, as hitherto believed amongst us.” The amendment was carried by 36 to 27. As this amounted to a refusal to dis-fellowship partial-inspiration, the 27 and five others who were not at the meeting, resolved to separate themselves, as they could hold no communion with those who would tolerate such a dangerous doctrine as a partially-inspired Bible. Being in a minority, they were obliged to leave. They have taken the bold step of securing the Athenæum, Victoria Street, which is twice the size and much better in every way than the old one. “Although it will be hard work at first, we shall do the best we can to build up an ecclesia on the sure foundation of an inspired and infallible Bible. The following compose our ecclesia:—Sister Berry, brother and sister Chandler, sister L. Chandler, brother Duffield, sister Ellis, brother and sister Godber, brother E. Grimes, brother and sister Jackson, sister Mann, brother and sister W. Millband, brother and sister T. Millband, brother Morrall, sisters Ruckwood, brother and sister W. Smith, sister A. Smith, brother and sister Stenson, sisters Stevens, brother and sister Taylor, brother and sister Whittaker, sister M. Wilson, and the writer, W. Clark.”

(February 1886) Great Bridge.—Brother Hollier says several brethren have asked for an explanation of the apparently anomalous position of things appearing last month. He deems it necessary to make the matter clear. The ecclesia, which has passed the resolution reported by brother Hardy, contains those who were determined not to abide by that resolution, neither by the one adopted by the Temperance Hall (Birmingham), which those with brother Hollier have fully accepted.—Brother Moseley also writes that notwithstanding their resolution, the table of those with brother Hardy is still open to the Exchange, Kidderminster, and Wolverhampton brethren by whom partial inspiration is tolerated. Brother Moseley says: “To my mind no resolution is sufficient that does not embody these three points:—(1) Belief in a wholly infallibly - inspired Bible. (2) Disfellowship of those who believe otherwise. (3) Dis-fellowship of those who *tolerate* the doctrine, of a partially or imperfectly-inspired Bible. A brother with whom those with brother Hardy is in fellowship, sent a message to our brother Hollier that he was surprised to find that a man who had read his Bible so much had not yet had his eyes open to its imperfections! This illustrates what is hidden under their plausible resolution, and explains why those who desire to be faithful have had to stand apart. Brother Hollier says:—“Our time for breaking bread is 2.30 p.m. and 6.15 for lectures. The lectures for the present have been by brethren White, Moseley and Hollier. We shall be now writing to the various lecturing brethren to help us.”

(Excerpt from February 1886) Nottingham.—Brother Kirkland reports the death of sister Boot, the beloved wife of brother John Boot, after a long and painful illness (cancer), during which she was always patient and cheerful. She fell asleep on November 23rd, 1885, aged 62 years. Sister Boot had been in the truth about 17 years. Brother Boot has the sympathy of the brethren and sisters in his sorrow and bereavement.—I have also to report the withdrawal of brother Webb, (of New Basford, Nottingham). He, having lost confidence in the reliability of the word, has now taken up the theory of Universalism, and wishes to sever his connection with the Christadelphians.

(February 1886) Durban (Natal).—Brother R. Elliott reports that a meeting was specially convened on October 25th to consider the teaching of the *Exegetist*, when attention was called to the fact that it accepted a theory which amounts (in the terms of its own definition) “to the somewhat startling admission that historical infallibility is not essential to the inspiration of the Scriptures.” This the majority could not explain away; but would not accept the obvious sense, nor, of course, refuse fellowship to its sympathisers. “We have, therefore, after long and painful controversy, been compelled to withdraw, so that the ecclesia is now reduced to three, viz., brother and sister James Elliott, in Maritzburg, and myself

here in Durban. It is easier to bear isolation than to permit compromise on a question that affects the foundation of the hope of Israel for which Paul was bound with a chain.”

(March 1886) Peterboro.—Brother Bruce reports that the following brethren and sisters have had to stand apart from those heretofore assembling as the Peterboro ecclesia, on account of their refusal to avow their belief in the completely inspired and infallible character of the Scriptures, and their determination to have no fellowship except on the basis of that belief:—brethren King, Norman, Read, Stapleton, Mansfield, Fogarty, Grocock, and Bruce; sisters Smith, Read, Stapleton, Bruce, Grocock, and Grosssmith. They meet at Kind’s Rooms, Cowgate, about three minutes walk from the G. N. R. station, where they hope soon to commence the proclamation of the truth by lectures. Brother Bruce says:—“It is a sore trial, but we must not be discouraged. Christ has only one body, and it is the Father’s love towards the members of that one body, that leads Him to purge and purify them, so as to work in harmony. We must be of one mind, holding fast the one faith, having peace one with another, not tarnished with strange doctrines which the human mind sees fit to invent. We, who have come away, believe that the autographs of the Bible now in our possession were God inspired writings and free from error, whatever errors of transmission may belong to the copies now in our possession. We therefore cannot accept fellowship with those who attribute certain parts of the Bible to a human authorship, or who while believing the Bible to be wholly inspired, fellowship those that believe in a partly inspired Bible.” Brother Bruce further reports the removal of brother Norman to London. The brethren are sorry to lose him, as he has been a great help to them in our trial.

(May 1886) London (HARLESDEN).—Brother Reuben Smith writes: “Will you kindly make known through the *Christadelphian*, that after a long and careful consideration of what has been passing between different ecclesias, about the inspiration of the Scriptures, myself and sister wife have come to the conclusion that it would be unsafe to remain and be a party to the state of things that exists in our midst any longer. We cannot fellowship those who profess, but will not declare, that they believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and at the same time fellowship those who are opposed to the faithful attitude that has been taken. We firmly believe (as we always have done since knowing the truth), in the entire inspiration of the Scriptures subject to errors of translation, and in the future we will fellowship only those who only take a faithful attitude in the matter.”

(July 1886) Manchester.—Brother Wheller, referring to the statement appearing last month, says: “My reason for leaving the Downing street meeting was because ‘God’s Word’ was not allowed to apply to all the Bible. I was fully convinced of this from various sources before deciding to sever myself from them.”

(July 1886) Newcastle-on-Tyne.—Brother Little (14, Sycamore Street) writes:—“At a special meeting held on May 30th, we were asked to rescind the resolution affirming our belief in a wholly inspired Bible. This the under mentioned brethren and sisters refused to do: Brethren J. Morris, J. Leadbitter, J. Leadbitter, jun., A. G. Little, and J. Little; sisters E. Leadbitter and A. Young. Those who have given up the faithful attitude which they took twelve months ago have left us in possession of the meeting room. We have resolved to discontinue the lectures for the summer months, but will meet as usual at 2.30 p.m to break bread, when we shall be very glad to see any brother passing this way, who, with us, believes in the infallibility of the Scriptures.”

(December 1886) Dudley.—Brother Hughes reports the obedience of brother T. WALKER (24), formally belonging to the Presbyterians, who after evidence of his understanding of the one faith, put on Christ on Wednesday, November 10th. The lectures continue to be well attended, and several are much interested. Brother Hughes reports, on the other hand with regret, that eleven have left the meeting in connection with inspiration troubles. A resolution, declaring belief in the complete inspiration of the Bible, was passed over 12 months ago. It was thought that those who opposed the resolution at the time would finally see their way to accept it, seeing they were willing to remain, but matters have gone from bad to worse.



They have condemned it more and more. They denied that partial inspiration had been taught, and when the evidence was produced, they would not accept it, and refused to withdraw from those who taught it. In consequence of these and other things, the managing brethren invited these brethren to a special meeting with them on September 23rd, to see if some means could be adopted to bring about a better state of things; but the brethren in question would suggest nothing. They had asked previously to this that we should have lectures from the Exchange, &c. This was out of the question. We now asked them to withdraw from us if they could not accept the resolution, and that we would give them an equal portion of the ecclesial property. But this was refused. There being no means of bringing the matter to a peaceable settlement, it was decided that the matter should be brought before a general meeting of the ecclesia. The meeting was held Sept. 30th, 27 brethren and sisters being present. It was proposed that the ecclesia refuse fellowship to all brethren and sisters who would not accept the resolution; 17 voted for it and 7 against; 2 left the room before it was put, and 1 was neutral. Up to the present 34 have accepted the resolution. These are all of one mind, and now meet together with unity, love, and peace in our midst. We already feel much benefited by the separation, though deeply regretting it.”

(January 1887) Glasgow.—Brother Dick expresses the hope that the year upon which we are entering may be a year of peace in the household. Re-union among those who have separated, he considers hopeless. Each section has chosen its position: one considering it was an unnecessary separation; the other that it was necessitated by the relaxing of the bond of union. Those of the former opinion accuse brother Roberts as the archleader at whose nod all have abjectedly prostrated themselves in the dust. They say it is a case of blindly following man’s dictation, and not the inspiration of the Bible. This accusation brother Dick justly remarks is puerile. The cause lies in the hoisting of false colours at the first. He further remarks that stern and unbending stuff is needed in this age to uphold the scriptures against the almost universal tendency to bend them to the theories of the scientific sceptics; and to resist the growing and undignified habit of trying to mollify the infidel by rounding off the rough edges of the Bible in order to make it more palatable to his refined and cultured taste. Theological professors of all kinds are mutilating the scriptures to conform them to a more rational and modern pattern in order that the attacks of the scientific agnostics may be rebuked, and at the same time a hold retained on the religious world. It is sheer folly, says brother Dick, to hold on with the world’s wisdom and expect to retain the wisdom of God. What is wanted is uncompromising fidelity to the Bible.—(Brother Dick need not be troubled at the uncharitable theories of the current situation entertained by those who tolerate the idea of a partly human and erring Bible. They are bound to conjure and nurse such a theory for the soothing of their own consciences. It is the universal habit of those who are in a false position to calumniate and defame those who cannot agree with them. It has been so in all ages. Christ himself did not escape the propensity. His enemies could not confute him on the merits of the questions at issue between him and them, nor could they deny his works; yet they must needs adopt a theory that made their opposition to him agreeable to their own self-esteem. They said he had a demon and was mad; that he was a servant of Beelzebub, a teacher of sedition, a gluttonous man and a wine bibber and a friend of publicans and sinners. They would not allow him a good motive or a useful function. Need we be surprised if, in our day the same propensity is manifested on the part of those who cannot justify their own attitude except by blackening the action of those who have been compelled to separate from them? It is a poor discernment of human nature that could make such a mistake. It is not in men—especially Scotchmen—to be led in the way supposed. Endure it all, in patience. Things will look very different when the electric blaze of the divine light is turned on them. Men judge by the murky lamps of modern literature. Those who walk by the light of God can wait.—EDITOR.)

(February 1887) Manchester.—Bro. Holland writes:—“I omitted to state in my last intelligence that brother Brown had also cast in his lot among us, along with Brother John Trueblood and Brother Keay, from the Grosvenor Street Meeting.

(February 1887) Bristol.—“I should like to add my name to those of brother Bradley and Coles, as one with them in not breaking bread with the Bristol ecclesia, since they declared themselves on inspiration in the manner they did. We shall try to establish a meeting. I hope by the next time the *Christadelphian* is published, we shall be able to send good news.”

(March 1887) Huddersfield.—Brother Heywood reports the removal of meeting room from Devonshire Chambers, King Street, to the Liberal Council Chamber, Imperial Arcade, New Street. The removal was necessitated by the proprietor letting the whole of the Devonshire Chambers to the Young Men’s Christian Association. Brother Heywood says:—“We were very sorry to leave our pleasant room, but it was expedient, as our notice to leave would expire in a few months, and the Y.M.C.A. desired us to oblige them by getting away as early as possible, and compensating us for the obligation. Our present premises are not so comfortable, but they are the best we could meet with at present. We have also to inform you of the establishment of an Ecclesia at Slaithwaite, 4½ miles from Huddersfield, and consisting of six brothers and sisters residing near Slaithwaite who find it very inconvenient to attend here on account of distance and railway expenses. A meeting was opened on January 13th at the house of brother Wilde until they meet with a suitable room. In their letter of resignation they request our assistance and prayers for the success of the Gospel; also stating the basis of fellowship to be a wholly inspired Bible. We are very sorry to lose their support and presence at Huddersfield, but we cannot reasonably object, under the circumstances, to their request, and have accepted their resignations as under:—Brethren Benj. Heppenstall, David Brown, George Wilde; sisters P. Wilde, S. A. Brown, A. Walker.”

(April 1887) Cumnock.—We have this month to report a further reduction in our number by the loss of Sister Robb who has been married to Brother Mullen of Irvine. Brother Mullin’s views on the inspiration of the Bible are a barrier to our fellowship. Sister Robb was faithfully warned as to the position she would be in, and however painful it is for us to write thus, we cannot but adhere to the terms of our resolution upon inspiration.—ALLAN MACDOUGALL.

(June 1887) Kidderminster.—Brother Braginton, who had made arrangements to emigrate, writes to say that he has abandoned the idea in consequence of being able to receive the embarkation order from London. Brother Perrigo has left the brethren on inspirational grounds. Brother Sterry, who left soon after the separation, and returned to the brethren in Worcester Street, states he now gives up the Bible altogether, as he can have no faith in a partly inspired Bible.

Brother Braginton further reports that an unsuccessful attempt has been made to effect a reconciliation between the two meetings here. The attempt arose out of the fact that the time had come for the brethren associated with brother Braginton to engage a public room. Up till now, they have met in a private house, but being now on the look out for a public room, they thought it would be as well to let brethren in Worcester Street know their intentions, as it had been said there was no difference between them, and that the public existence of a second meeting would be to the detriment of the truth. So a correspondence ensued from which the following are extracts:—

Woodfield Crescent, Kidderminster,

13th April, 1887.

“DEAR BROTHER WINBURY, —At our quarterly meeting, of April 6th, it was agreed to secure a public room as early as possible, for the proclamation of the ‘truth.’ But before doing so, it was decided unanimously, to lay the matter, through you, before the brethren and sisters meeting in Worcester Street, with a view to bring a reconciliation if possible. . . .”

If a reconciliation can be brought about we shall only be too glad to work with you for a furtherance of the "Truth." Our position, briefly, is as follows:—

"That we believe in the infallibility of the Scriptures in all parts, as originally written, and therefore free from error."

This is brief but sufficient to cover our case. If you can see your way clear to endorse it, or any other form of words embodying the same meaning, we shall be glad to enter into fellowship with you and thus put an end to the controversy, as far as Kidderminster is concerned.

Hoping you will lay this before the brethren and sisters, and let us know the result as early as possible, I remain yours truly, A. H. BRAGINTON.

7, Summer Place, Kidderminster,

April 19, 1887.

Dear BROTHER BRAGINTON, —Your (BROTHER WINBURY's) letter of the 13th inst. to hand. I have laid the matter before the Managing Brethren, who, one and all, receive your letter with pleasure. It is extremely gratifying to us to learn there is a desire on the part of the members of your Ecclesia for a reconciliation between our meetings. . . . Before laying the matter before the whole Ecclesia we desire you to accept our invitation to a conference, in order for us to obtain fuller information, and so be able to place the case before the Ecclesia in the fullest light possible. We propose you should select three of your own members to meet our Brethren Barker and Thatcher in company with myself, at either of your homes on Monday evening next—or any other suitable evening,—we leave time with you. Trusting a reconciliation may be effected, I remain fraternally yours, [Dark gray Rule 35 compiler]

A. WINBURY, Sec.

Kidderminster, April 21, 1887.

Dear BROTHER WINBURY,—I laid your letter before the brethren and sisters last night, and they decided not to hold a conference. They think the matter has been long enough before both parties to enable them to understand their respective positions; and that no conference will throw any more light on the matter, or make our position any clearer than what it is in the proposition submitted in our first note. Our position is the same now as when we left, and we cannot move from it. . . . We (Kidderminster ecclesia) know what will be the result if two meetings are held in the town; and for this reason we thought it would be best to let you know our intention. We don't want to enter into a long correspondence, because it is unnecessary. Give us an answer in the affirmative or otherwise, so that we can move in the matter. Yours truly,

A. H. BRAGINTON.

Summer Place, Kidderminster,

April 29, 1887.

Dear BROTHERS and SISTERS,—In reply to your communication per Bro. Braginton, we have to say that we are glad you recognize there would be an evil in having two meetings in Kidderminster to

advocate the same truths, and organized practically upon the same basis. We (Kidderminster ecclesia) repudiate, however, altogether the responsibility of any division in the town. It rests, we believe, entirely with those who—in an unscriptural manner, and without a Scriptural reason separated themselves from that portion of the Ecclesia of Christ meeting in Kidderminster.

We decline to pass any further resolutions, having NO practical bearing upon our work—resolutions which cannot be demonstrated, and which do not at all affect the Bible “as we now have it.”

We should be glad indeed for unity of thought and feeling to be restored. We (Kidderminster ecclesia) are on the same foundation as when those of you left us, first connected yourselves with the Truth; but we believe such resolutions as you propose to be unprofitable, and that those who cause divisions over them, act contrary to the Truth and to the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Desiring constantly to be led by him and walk in accordance with his word.

We remain the Brethren of Christ assembling in Worcester Street. Signed on their behalf, A. WINBURY, Secretary

Woodfield Crescent, Kidderminster,

May 5, 1887.

DEAR BRETHREN,—Your letter was laid before the Brethren and Sisters last Sunday morning; and they . . . requested me (much against my wish) to write you again and deny, emphatically, your assertion that we separated ourselves in an unscriptural manner. The facts are these: When the theory of “Partial Inspiration” was put forth, it was accepted and warmly defended, and we requested the Managing Brethren to convene a meeting to consider the matter, but they refused; and matters got worse. It was said openly, “Now, we can meet the Infidel.” “This is just what we want,” &c. There was only one course open for us, and that was to withdraw.

We are sorry you cannot see your way clear to declare for a wholly inspired Bible . . . There have been times in the history of the “Truth” when sharp and decisive action had to be taken (Num. 16. 20 to 35, and Num. 25. 1 to 9) and so in this matter of inspiration.

Your repudiation (of responsibility) amounts to nothing; the fact remains that the responsibility falls on you for two meetings being held in the town. We have done our duty, and more than our duty, in letting you know our intentions . . .

To say that “such resolutions as we propose,” &c., “are contrary to the truth, and to the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. . . . You fail to catch the spirit of Christ; there were times when he was angry (John 2, 15, Mark 3, 5), and opposed to error (Matt. 24, 4, and he never sacrificed truth for the sake of peace, Yours truly, A. H. BRAGINTON.

(June 1887) Mumbles.—The small company of brethren and sisters here who (leaving “the synagogue”) have rallied to the standard of an inspired and infallible Bible, and its commandments to behave with meekness and abstain from evil speaking, now number 34. Brother David Davies has just added himself to their number. He says he remained at the synagogue in hope of action becoming harmonious with profession, but seeing the signs the other way, he grew in doubt of his position and at last resigned. In illustration of his meaning, he states that it was declared in the synagogue that no ecclesia would be fellowshipped by them who refused to adopt their resolution affirming the complete inspiration and

infallibility of the Scriptures. In accordance with this declaration, the resolution was transmitted to the Exchange brethren, Birmingham, for their consideration: but they refused to consent to it: notwithstanding which, fellowship was continued. One of their brethren came to explain matters, but the explanation did not mend matters, and they have not mended since, and the end of it, so far as brother Davies is concerned, has been his resignation. He says: "I am now found among them those who rejoice in an infallible record of God's dealings with man in the past and an infallible record of the way of salvation."

(August 1887) Huddersfield.—Brother Heywood reports a reduction of numbers through the leaving of brother L. E. and E. J. Edwards, also the sisters Edwards and Dora and Hetty Kendall. They now meet with those who tolerate partial inspiration. Brother Heywood says: "Although reduced in numbers, we have unity, love, and comfort in God's Word and the work of the truth."

(September 1887) Bournemouth.—Brother Sherry reports the obedience of HANNAH HARRIET MONDEY (18), of Southampton, who has been under the tuition of her mother, and gave an excellent confession of the One Faith. Her mother, sister H. D. Mondey, some years ago lost her husband, who was a brother in the truth, and has since had to maintain herself and four children by doing needlework, which at times is very hard. Any little assistance that brethren could render would be greatly appreciated by a sister who is worthy of it. Her address is—"Mrs. Mondey, Smith's Quay, Hitchen Ferry, near Southampton." She is isolated. A visit from any one passing would greatly cheer them.—Sister Ludlum, of Nottingham, has come to live here, and is in fellowship with us. She previously met with the brethren in fellowship with the Exchange, Birmingham, but upon examination of their position was compelled to renounce it from a Scriptural standpoint. We have had a pleasant visit from brother and sister R. R. Jardine, of Birmingham, also sister P. Jones of the same place, is visiting here.

(December 1887) Irvine.—Brother John Mullen reports a recurrence of separation here. He says: "You will think it strange to hear of another separation in Irvine. We took that step two years ago, but some of us gave way at that time to the contention of some that the inspiration question did not affect fellowship. We went back only to find discomfort, and not the unity and oneness of mind in regard to the Scriptures that they professed to have; so we have been obliged to come away." We have been asked to give a reason why we have written as follows:—"We, the undersigned, having carefully and prayerfully considered the conditions obtaining in your midst, have come to the conclusion, that from the point of view of Divine obligation, it is our duty to withdraw from your fellowship, for the following reasons. Firstly: That you practically deny the total inspiration of the Bible, and its infallibility, by extending toleration in fellowship to those who do so. Moreover, you hold those in higher estimation who so deny, than they who are earnestly contending for the complete inspiration of the Bible, and the entirety and integrity of the Word of God—a standing proof as to your attitude in relation to this most important question. Secondly: You tolerate those in your midst who hold and teach that it is quite unnecessary on the part of an Ecclesia to interfere with any of its members who may choose to marry an unbeliever. Indeed, saying in effect, that believers are at liberty to marry whom they will, either out of or in the Lord, as they may think fit. Becoming persuaded in our minds that the position you occupy as a community, in relation to the subjects above named, is unscriptural, so as not to be partakers further therewith, we have made up our minds to stand aside therefrom as already stated. (Signed) Georg Haughton, John Mullin, James Mullin, Thomas Mullin, John Campbell, James Colvel." Since then brother Robert Mullin has seen it his duty to withdraw for the same reasons, and is now meeting with us, which makes our number, including sisters Campbell, Haughton, and Mullin, ten. We meet at present in brother Haughton's house, upon the first day of the week, at 12 o'clock, for the breaking of bread, and prayer

(March 1888) LEEDS—Brother Thorp reports the baptism into the all-saving name, on November 27th, 1887, of Mrs. KNIGHT, formerly Baptist; also Mrs. Wm. FULLER, daughter-in-law of brother Fuller.

The evening lectures are moderately attended. “We regret to say that brother Robert Smallwood is no longer in fellowship with the Leeds Ecclesia. We held our annual tea and meeting on December 26th, when a goodly number of brethren and sisters from other Ecclesias were with us. About 120 sat down to tea. Amongst the number were a few interested friends.”

Brother Thorp, writing later, forwards a pleasing piece of intelligence, practically amounting to the addition of 21 brethren and sisters to the fellowship of the Leeds Ecclesia, on the basis of uncompromising fidelity to the entire inspiration of the Scriptures, and the doctrines they contain. Their names are as follows:—Brother D. Addis, sister F. Ashby, brother H. Bramham, brother S. A. Dodgson, sister Mary Encell, brother Charles Frisby, brother and sister Johnson, sister Emma Kinghorn, brother H. Robinson, brother and sister Milner, brother George Pickles, brother and sisters Patchett, brother and sister Suggitt, brother and sister Willes, and brother J. Whittaker. These, however, will form a separate ecclesia in a part of the town at a considerable distance from the George Street ecclesia. The circumstances leading to this re-union, as attested by the documents accompanying the report, are briefly these. There is a meeting in Albion Street composed of such as hold what is known as the no-will doctrine. To this meeting, at one time, as we gather, the foregoing belonged. Some time ago, this meeting made proposals to the Great George Street Ecclesia that they should enter into fellowship without ceasing to be separate meetings. The Great George Street Ecclesia signified consent to this, provided they could agree on a basis. Deputations from each meeting conferred together, but they could not agree on inspiration, and the attempted re-union was abandoned. Afterwards, a number separated from the Albion Street meeting, and formed a meeting in Wellington Road, on the basis of the statement of faith accepted by the Birmingham Ecclesia, and the complete inspiration of the Scriptures. The subject of the reunion with the Great George Street Ecclesia was then resumed, with the result of a complete understanding by which the two meetings are in fellowship and cooperation, though retaining their separate ecclesial organisations. The only drawback is the loss—to the Great George Street Ecclesia—of five who could not consent to the entire inspiration of the Scriptures being made a matter of fellowship. (How much inspiration must be recognised in the basis of fellowship? Any? Surely, no one professing the truth would say, “None.” If you say some amount of inspiration must be recognised, you are in the difficulty of having to define how much. Because if the Scriptures are to be regarded as only partly inspired, one man may make the amount so small as to require but one step more to make it none at all, and his fellowship could not be objected to. If you say it must not be so small as that, by what authority will you fix it at a higher point? and will not the authority you claim justify us in taking it up to the very top, and say “All?” And how can men, believing in any partial inspiration, be certain of the inspiration of any particular part, seeing there is no discrimination in the Scriptures between one part and another. It seems as if a sensible treatment of the subject ought to end in the adoption of entire inspiration as the only practicable basis of fellowship.—ED)

(March 1888) MUMBLES- Brother Clement writes:—We continue to do our best to hold forth the truth in our meetings both of the brethren and those set apart for the instruction of the stranger. I am not able to report additions by immersion, but two more have come to us from the partialist meeting at the synagogue. They were not able any longer to remain in a meeting which fellowships those who are unprepared to make the inspiration of the Scriptures a test of fellowship. The two to whom I refer are sister Bessie Jones, wife of brother W. H. Jones, and sister M. A. Davies, wife of brother D. Davis. We have lost for a time the company of sister Margaret Morgan, who has fallen asleep after a short but very severe illness. I had the pleasure of being with her the day before her death, and it was a joy to hear her confidence in the truth when death was near.

(Excerpt from March 1888) SYDNEY.—(*New Masonic Hall, Castlereagh Street*).-

Brother Burton represents, on behalf of the Masonic Hall brethren, that intelligence ought not to appear from those meeting in the Temperance Hall, Sydney. In justification of this, he submits a batch of correspondence, relative to attempts at re-union. Brother C. C. Walker being in Birmingham, and knowing something of Sydney matters, brother Roberts requested that he should go through the correspondence and report. Brother Walker writes:—"There are two meetings in Sydney, one at the New Masonic Hall, Castlereagh Street, containing among others brethren Bayliss, Burton, Howell, Payne, Barton; and the other at the Temperance Hall, Pitt Street, containing brethren O'Toole, Hawkins, and others. The first-mentioned meeting I attended when on a visit to Sydney in 1886, and I know all the brethren above named, and, so far as I could judge, believe them to be earnestly desirous of the right and walking uprightly in the truth. I was enabled to leave the book supply in the hands of brother Bayliss in thankfulness to God for having found a brother in whom I could repose confidence and who seemed to possess all the needful energy, business talent, leisure, &c. Of the other (the Temperance Hall meeting) I know nothing personally, except from visits from some who belonged to it. The two meetings have not been in fellowship for I think some years. The Masonic Hall brethren now protest against the insertion of any more intelligence from the Temperance Hall, on the ground that they are not really upon the same basis as the 'Christadelphian.' The Masonic Hall brethren have reprinted the 'Statement of the One Faith,' adding, or rather prefixing, a clause, headed *Our Foundation*, requiring a belief in a wholly-inspired and infalible Bible as a first condition of fellowship, and adding to the 'things to be rejected' a participation in political or municipal elections, and concluding with an epitome of the commandments of Christ and a short statement of constitution. It is a thing that any enlightened and humble brother could heartily endorse. They sent this to the Temperance Hall brethren, endeavouring to come to unity; but the attempt seems to have been repelled; and the matter was met in a hypercritical spirit. This is the impression produced on me by going through correspondence sent by brother Burton. The Temperance Hall brethren say that they approve of *Our Foundation*, but the Masonic Hall brethren say that actions speak louder than words, and that so long as there are those among them who have never declared for a wholly-inspired Bible, and from the fact that the *Fraternal Visitor* is used for Sunday morning addresses, their verbal approval goes for nothing. 'They have among them,' says brother Burton, 'brethren who are lecturers for alien "Good Templar" bodies, who say it is permissible to sue the alien for wages, who allow clergymen to marry in their house one of their children to an alien, and some who declined to say if they endorsed the statement or not.'"

"This, in brief, is the position. It is not one sided information, and the said correspondence embraces letters from three of the Temperance Hall, who have left them for the other meeting. One of these letters is from a brother who strove against the wrong, but was voted into the background, and so felt no alternative left but flight."

"Altogether, I am inclined to think that the Temperance Hall meeting would be benefited by the exclusion of their intelligence until they put matters on a more consistent footing. It is difficult to judge at a distance. It is easier to let things slide than to take action that will be sure to hurt somebody, and yourself, too, into the bargain; but the action above suggested won't prejudice them in Christ's eyes, and may, indeed, be the means of helping them to find acceptance of Him at His return. How greatly the whole earth needs His controlling hand."—CHAS. C. WALKER.

(June 1888) NOTTINGHAM-Brother Kirkland writes:—"It should have been reported some time ago that sister Lucy E. Ellis has withdrawn from our fellowship and associated herself with the brethren and sisters who left us at the time we declared our position upon the Inspiration question. We have suffered loss by the death of sister Bramley. She was an aged sister, and had been very ill for a long time before her end came. We have been privileged to assist one more to put on the name of Jesus—LIVINIA HALL (24), who was immersed on May 10th. She was formerly a member of the Church of England.

(November 1888) BELFAST- Brother Hugh Close writes telling of a division that has taken place here consequent on the action of a brother visiting Scotland, who while there fellowshipped those who are not with us on the question of the Inspiration of the Bible. On his return he defended his position, which was called in question by brother Close. Sympathy being shown with the unsound position the brother had taken, has resulted in brother and sister Close and brother and sister Magee withdrawing from the meeting. They express their determination to have fellowship with none who will not make the entire Inspiration of the Bible a test of fellowship.

(January 1891) CANNOCK (*See DUDLEY*.)-Brother Jackson reports that the following have been compelled to make a stand in defence of the entire inspiration and infallibility of the Bible:—Brother and sister S. Dawes, brother and sister Jackson, senior (the latter after several weeks neutrality), brother and sister Jackson, junior, brother and sister Barker, sister Morgan, sister Cooper, brother Rider. These have made the Birmingham statement their basis of fellowship, and are meeting at brother Jackson's house to remember Christ and to help one another in the race for life. Brother Jackson says: "The result is a trying and sorrowful one, supplemented as it is by a trial of (especially to myself) a far more searching character. I allude to the sudden death at the Birmingham tea meeting of the one who has shared my joys and sorrows and been my companion in the truth for about 17 years, which event happened only a few days after she had decided not to tolerate corrupt doctrines concerning the Scriptures. The blow is a staggering one to me, and requires a supreme effort of faith in the reality of the 'far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory' to enable me to look upon it as a 'light affliction.'"

(April 1891) ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE -I have to report further cases of obedience to the truth's requirements, namely, Miss SARAH A. BATTERSBY, formerly Church of England, Mrs. ETCHELLS, Wesleyan, and Mr. STEWART, Independent. The two former were united to Christ on the 15th of February, and the latter on the 1st of March. I should state that the above-named, and our brother and sister Battersby, reside at Droylsden, some distance from here, and have now formed themselves into a separate ecclesia, meeting at the house of brother Battersby. They have also added to their number brother and sister Wood, who have had cause to withdraw from the Grosvenor Street Meeting, Manchester, and are now meeting with our brethren at Droylsden on the basis of a fully-inspired Bible. A partially-inspired bible soon leads to confusion, as is testified by those who have a knowledge of the inner life of ecclesias existing on such a basis. How necessary then that we should be firm on this, the groundwork of our faith.—J. CHADWICK.

(May 1891) LINCOLN-Our last report is to be found in the *Christadelphian* for June, 1890. There it is stated that we had to separate ourselves from those brethren meeting at the Arcade, owing to the Nottingham trouble. Since then, a new basis has been formed which admits those to fellowship who have not declared their belief in a wholly inspired Bible. In this we cannot join. The following refuse fellowship to all those who refuse to declare themselves for a wholly inspired Bible: Brethren Bingham, Britton, Dracup, Green, and Harley. We meet for breaking of bread at brother Harleys', 89, Portland Street. Sunday mornings at 10–30, and on Sunday evenings for Bible Class at 6 30. We shall be pleased to welcome any brother or sister who may be able to visit us on the right foundation. *Brethren* Bingham, Britton, Dracup, Green, and Harley; *Sisters* S. Bingham, E. Bingham, Dracup, Harley, and Taylor.—W. GREEN.

(January 1892) NOTTINGHAM-We have to report the removal of sister Florence Betts to Birmingham, and that brother Hofmeyer has left our fellowship and united himself with the brethren separated from us on the question of the scriptures. Brother J. U. Robertson was with us on Sunday, December 13th, and gave us a cheering exhortation at the breaking of bread. Lectures as follows: October 25th "Who and What is the Devil we have to fear? And what are the weapons with which to fight him?" (brother Sulley); November 1st, "Living Water," (brother Fidler); 8th, "Man as he is, and as he may become: A theme for



the consideration of those who hold the heathen notion of his native immortality," (brother Roberts); 15th, "What is that Holy Spirit promised to the disciples, and is he with us to guide us into all truth?" (brother Sulley).—JOSEPH STONES.

(November 1893) NEWPORT (MON.) -We have during the month received a very pleasing communication from Abergavenny, in which brother H. C. Edwards, solicitor (who has been appointed as recording brother, *pro tem.*), informed us that slightly more than half the Ecclesia, which hitherto has been in fellowship with "Partial Inspirationists," have now cut themselves off from their old associates, and decided in favour of fellowship only with those who maintain "the complete Divine Inspiration, and consequent infallibility of the scriptures as originally written by God's prophets and apostles." They have always held the scriptures to be wholly inspired and infallible, but have heretofore maintained a neutral position in reference to the division caused some years ago by the agitation of the doctrine of partial inspiration. They have asked for help in the lecturing department, and we have arranged to send brother J. Lander for Oct. 15th, when a free discussion upon "Our Unity and Welfare, and the Interests of the Truth" has been decided upon by our brethren there. We hope to hear a good report from our brother when he returns. We have had an addition to our numbers, in Sister Goodchild, who has removed from London, in all probability to reside permanently in Newport.—Our lectures have been as follows: Sept. 17th, "If a Man Die shall he Live Again?" (brother T. J. Cross); 24th, "Christ, the future King of the whole Earth" (brother C. W. Heath); Oct. 1st., "Felix Trembled! Why?" (brother J. Lauder); 8th, "Destruction cometh! and they shall seek peace and find none" (brother E. S. Schofield).—W. COLLARD.

(August 1895) DERBY *Athenæum, Victoria Street.*—Sundays, 10–30 a.m. & 6.30 p.m.; Wednesdays, 8 p.m.—We very much regret that brother B. Parsons has decided to cast in his lot with those who tolerate partial inspiration. We continue to let the light shine; but now, as ever, few come to the light.—W. CLARK.

(September 1894) SOUTH AFRICA QUEENSTOWN.—It is a considerable time since there appeared any intelligence from Queenstown. We have not been idle, but the reverse. The advent of brother and sister Harper, from Warrington, England, quickened the ecclesia into new life in the direction of a public effort. Hitherto we have not had brethren amongst us who felt equal to lecturing, but for the last three months we have had lectures by brother Harper every Sunday, and several seem interested. There seemed every prospect of spiritual prosperity until three weeks ago, when the inspiration question came to the front with disastrous results to the ecclesia. The origin of the matter was the arrival of a letter from the Secretary of the *Fraternal Visitor* to brother Bushell, enclosing one from a prominent brother intimating his desire to come out to South Africa for health sake if there seemed an opening in a business way. There was also a request for intelligence to be sent to the *Visitor* of the doings of the ecclesia. Objection was taken to the sending of any intelligence to an organ espousing a cause with which we had no sympathy; and while sympathising with the brother and desiring to help him, there could be no question of fellowship with anyone holding the doctrine of partial inspiration. It then became manifest that some in the ecclesia were willing to fellowship anyone and ask no questions on inspiration, and also espoused the cause of the party from whom the ecclesias have separated, contending that the doctrine of partial inspiration was not taught by the party represented by the *Fraternal Visitor*. Several meetings were held, and evidence produced from their own writings endorsing and advocating partial inspiration as the explanation of the errors to be found in the Bible. The upshot of the matter was that brother and sister Harper withdrew from the ecclesia, and followed by three others, brother Bushell retaining our meeting-room and contents. The following are the names of the brethren who are meeting together on the basis of a pure Bible. Brother and sister Harper, brother Aston, and brother and sister Gibson. At present we meet at brother Gibson's for breaking of bread.—GEO. GIBSON.

(December 1895) ABERDARE—We regret that after a long absence from the table brother Eynon has now thrown in his lot with those who fellowship partial inspiration. We are encouraged, however, by having increased audiences at our lectures, as a result of an extra effort in the distribution of handbills.

### PRESENT POSSESSION OF ETERNAL LIFE WITHOUT IMMORTALITY

(June 1896) IRVINE—We have been cheered by another addition to our ecclesia, in the obedience of SAMUEL CAMPBELL (22), son of brother and sister Campbell. After a good confession of the truth, as it is in Jesus, he was baptised into Christ on Saturday, March 28th. I have also to report withdrawal from brother Hynds, on account of his belief in the Eternal Life theory. The brethren here have done all they could to turn him from the error of his ways, but have failed in their efforts. He thinks a man can have eternal life and not have immortality; so that, according to his belief eternal life is a present possession, and, therefore, not a matter of hope.—ROBERT MULLIN.

### UNITARIANISM

(Excerpt from June 1869 see below) DETROIT. — I arrived in Michigan about the end of April, 1868. Brother Donaldson received me very kindly, and assisted me in arriving at a correct knowledge of the one faith. There was a party here of so-called Christadelphians, who had been expelled from the body, on account of holding Unitarian views on the nature of Christ—people who believed he was a mere man—a good man, but no more than a man. Who quietly ignored the 1st chapter of John, where it is stated that ‘the Word that was with God and was God, became flesh and dwelt amongst us.’

(Excerpts from October 1869) DETROIT.— James B. Paton writes on behalf of those referred to by brother Fish, of Detroit, in our number for June last, as “a party of so-called Christadelphians: who had been expelled from the body on account of holding Unitarian views on the nature of Christ.” He denies the charge, alleging that they have no sympathy with the idea that Joseph was the father of Jesus. He says “we believe the testimony of the apostles, that he was begotten by the power of the Highest, quickening the seed of the woman, of Abraham, and of David, and thus constituted the Son of God. We believe that he was in reality a man with our nature, acquainted with grief, stricken with sorrow, perfected through suffering, organized in all respects like unto his brethren, in character without spot or blemish, obedient in all things: hence a saviour to the race. We believe he was made Christ at his baptism, when he was anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows; that he did indeed suffer a cruel and ignominious death, as real as that of any other son of Adam: that he was buried, was raised by the power of his Father—Deity, and then made partaker of the divine nature, made both Lord and Christ and now our great high priest at the right hand of God” These definitions he puts forward in opposition to views alleged to be held on the other side, viz. that Christ always was, and that Christ never died and could not die: “Can you find any fault with this?” says he, referring to his own statement of belief; “You have the facts before you: tell us in your next No. who are the true Christadelphians in Detroit.”

It is not in our province to comply with this request. No living man can pronounce judgment upon a question requiring the discernment of the Spirit. If a man deny the truth, we can recognize the palpable fact, and wash our hands of his fellowship. It is possible to say what is the truth and what is a lie, but to declare who among those professing the truth are the *true* brethren of Christ, is not in the power of mortal man. The friends of the truth in Detroit, who are unhappily divided, apparently differ in their modes of defining the truth on one of its subtlest points, and hence disagree. We must refer them to our remarks this month under the head of “Supposed Inconsistencies in Christadelphian teaching concerning Christ,” for a possible ground of agreement. So far as we can judge, there is no difference in their actual conception of Christ, unless the definition above is intended to mean that Jesus was *only* the son of man, and *not* the Son of God; that “the power of the Highest” merely “quickened the seed of the woman” without

imparting of its own nature to that seed. If this is the idea of those with Mr. Paton, (that Jesus possessed only the nature of his mother,) then there is a substantial difference between them and those they have left—a difference justifying disunion. If this is not so, and those with Mr. Paton endorse the self-evident conclusion that Jesus received the basis and the type and power of his nature “from above,” by the spirit, (which is the Eternal Word, Discourse or Expression of the Father,) and that the man Christ Jesus was the flesh-form and individual character produced by this interposition of Eternal Power, laying hold of the condemned nature of Adam, in the line of Abraham and David—then there is no ground of disagreement, except such as may arise from different forms of speech; and this is a disagreement that ought to be put an end to as quickly as possible.—EDITOR.

## INDIVIDUALS RETURNING TO FELLOWSHIP WITH THE SAME ECCLESIA

Rule 3: That we recognise as brethren, and welcome to our fellowship, all who have been immersed (by whomsoever) after their acceptance of the same doctrines and precepts. *The Ecclesial Guide* pg. 35

(Excerpt from October 1870) WASHINGTON (District of Columbia)—July 21<sup>st</sup>, 1870. But as Bro. Thomas has since said, the material was not good, the body grew too rapidly, the seed had not fallen “into good ground,” for “some fell upon stony places, and some fell among thorns,” some “endured for a while, but when tribulation or persecution arose because of the word,” “they became offended; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choked the word, and they became unfruitful.” When the war-cloud of 1861 burst upon us, the brethren were scattered. Some advocated the claims of the Union; some those of the Confederacy; some left for Canada, to escape being drafted; some left to seek work in other sections of the country; some left because the truth was unpopular, they preferring to listen to clerical hypocrites, “who teach for doctrine the commandments of men,” rather than to be numbered among “a sect everywhere spoken against;” some accepted the “Josephite” doctrine, thus “denying the Lord that bought them;” and “counting the blood of the covenant an unholy thing.” At all events, in a very short time after the commencement of the war, there were but two, and sometimes three who met together on the first day to commemorate the suffering and death of the Lord Jesus the Christ. At the close of the war, the number was increased to six brothers and sisters, and so continued until about three years ago, when they were joined by four others, who had once before been identified with the body, but on account of some doctrinal misunderstanding had withdrawn. About six months ago, we withdrew from the last-mentioned four persons, as they advocated doctrines and practices, which we could not scripturally endorse.

(Excerpt from April 1874) LEEDS. — Brother Hollings reports: “We have received brother John Wilkinson into fellowship, after a separation of upwards of twelve months.

(August 1874) LIVERPOOL.—Brother Waite reports that sister Sarah Fowler, who was withdrawn from a short time ago, is restored to fellowship, she having expressed contrition and a desire to be re-united with the brethren.

(November 1874) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Burton forwards particulars of five additions since the last report, as follow: one by immersion, viz., SARAH LOCKTON (20), sister in the flesh to sister Mabbot, an attendant on Wesleyanism; one by removal, viz., sister Annie Hopper, from the London ecclesia, having obtained a situation in Nottingham; two by return to fellowship, viz., brother R. Hoe and sister A. Dabell. The return of these is consequent on the ecclesia having adopted a basis of fellowship, and having in compliance with their request admitted by majority that the withdrawal of the late ecclesia from bro. and sis. Phelps, in 1872, was unscriptural. The fifth addition is sister E. L. Phelps, who was immersed at Derby (see Derby intelligence for April), and who has united with the ecclesia upon a like understanding. There has been one loss by removal—sister A. Turney, now sister A. W. Goldie, of Swansea.

(Excerpt from February 1875) LEICESTER.—Brother Collyer writes, Jan. 13<sup>th</sup>: “You will be glad to hear that brother and sister Warner have been received into fellowship again. This was arranged after satisfactory proof of a true appreciation (on their part) of the important truth which has been discarded by the Renunciationists, with whom they have been for a time.

(Excerpt from May 1875) BIRMINGHAM. — There have also returned to fellowship brother and sister Wall, and brother Mawson, who have held aloof since the Renunciationist schism.

(Excerpt from February 1877) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland writes: “I have the pleasure to report the return to fellowship of brother John Harrison, whose withdrawal from the Nottingham Ecclesia was noticed in the *Christadelphian* for September, 1876.

(Excerpt from April 1877) LEEDS.— I have also satisfaction in stating that brother Willis returned to fellowship on March 11<sup>th</sup>, the matter that had, up to that time, been an obstacle to our fellowshipping him, having been amicably settled.

(Excerpt from June 1877) GLASGOW.— The other additions were brother Noble Watson, originally in fellowship with brother Mulholland, in the Howard Street Meeting, and who, though not accepting Edward Turney’s teaching, remained in that meeting when brothers Mulholland and Johnston withdrew.

(Excerpts from September 1877) BIRMINGHAM.—The return to fellowship of JAMES MURCOURT, who resigned from a sense of his unworthiness some time ago, ought to have been recorded in last month’s *Christadelphian*.—Also during the same period, there has been a return to fellowship on the part of brother and sister Venn, who separated at the time of the Renunciationist schism, with which however it now appears they had no doctrinal agreement; and also on the part of sister Hines, withdrawn from a good many years ago, for reasons not now existing.

(Excerpt from October 1877) DUDLEY.—Brother Blount reports:—“Since our last intelligence, we have lost two brethren by removal, viz., brother Scarfe and brother Parkes, whom we commend respectively to the London and Birmingham ecclesias. I also have to report the obedience of Mrs. WALL (formerly Baptist), whose immersion took place July 18<sup>th</sup>. Brother Watton has been received back into fellowship.

(Excerpt from November 1877) GRANTOWN AND THE BUCHAN DISTRICT. — Brother and sister Campbell, formerly withdrawn from, were united again with the brethren in the fellowship of the truth.

(February 1878) GLASGOW.—Brother O’Neil reports that on the 23<sup>rd</sup> December, ROBERT WALLACE, shoemaker, was immersed into the saving name. His attention was first attracted to the truth by a conversation he heard in a railway carriage on the immortality of the soul. He was connected with the Free Church of Scotland, and held the office of deacon till the truth led him to give it up. The elder of his church visited him before “the sacrament” with his “token,” as usual, but brother Wallace told him he could not accept of it as he had embraced the teachings of the Scriptures on the subject of immortality. He told him he did not believe that man had an immortal soul, or that there was an immortal devil, &c. The elder said he did not see how these things should keep him back from the table; this only shows how indifferent to truth the various denominations of the apostacy are in their desire to retain hold of the people. On the same day there was another addition in brother James McPherson, who was formerly in connection with the brethren in Aberdeen, from whom he separated without sufficient reason. He made application for a return to fellowship, which after an interview and an expression of regret on his part, was granted, the Aberdeen brethren being consulted previously, and their consent given joyfully. On the 13<sup>th</sup> inst. THOMAS BELL, watchmaker, husband of sister Bell, was inducted into the all-saving name, in the usual manner. He was formerly Baptist. This addition has caused the brethren much encouragement. The lectures for the month have been as under:—Dec. 16<sup>th</sup>, The Bible Hell not the Hell of Orthodox Belief.—(Brother T. Nisbet.) Dec. 23<sup>rd</sup>, The Refuge from the Storm or what we must do to be saved.—(Brother Wm. Robertson.) Dec. 30<sup>th</sup>, The Nature of Man; views popular and false, *versus* unpopular but true.—(Brother James M’Climont.) Jan. 6<sup>th</sup>, Immortality: Resurrection, not Death the gateway to it.—(Brother James Nisbet.) January 13<sup>th</sup>, Our Dear Friends: where are they?—(Brother Thomas Nisbet.) The last three lectures are the first of a course of eight lectures, which we have had largely placarded, also setting forth that brother C. Smith, from Edinburgh, will answer any questions on the preceding lectures sent in by the

preceding Sunday. (*Erratum*.—In last month's intelligence, John Brown ought to have been Thomas C. Brown.)

CARROLL (La.)—Brother P. F. Sanders reports the restoration to fellowship of sister Mary J. Eggers.

(April 1878) MANCHESTER.—Brother W. Smith writes;—“It is with pleasure that we acquaint the brethren of the return to fellowship of all the brethren and sisters, with the exception of two, who went out from us last August. We broke bread together on Sunday afternoon, February 24<sup>th</sup>, and it is our hope and prayer that this re-union will be to the benefit of the truth in this city.” [The division thus happily terminated was caused by the no-will theory which is now seen to be erroneous.—EDITOR.]

(April 1878) SWANSEA.—Brother A. W. Goldie reports the immersion of JOHN REES, formerly Baptist, which was overlooked last month. He also writes: “We have had the pleasure of receiving back into fellowship, brother John Morgans, of Skewen, near Neath, who was immersed at Swansea about eleven years ago, but removed to Skewen some years since and was there captivated by the ‘Free Life’ theory. Further thought on the subject has shown him the erroneousness of that and some other doctrines taught by the ‘Renunciationists,’ and the result was a letter from him regretting that he ‘had left the old fold’ and expressing a strong desire to have a re-union with us. He was received into fellowship on Sunday, Feb. 24<sup>th</sup>. We have also had a very interesting case of immersion in the person of SAMUEL BIRD (73), formerly Baptist, who though advanced in years seems to have few of the infirmities of age, except partial blindness, which him reading by gaslight. Notwithstanding this deprivation, he seems very intelligent in the faith, and with bro. John Rees, who belonged to the same church, rejoices much that he has been delivered from the darkness and superstition of ‘orthodoxy,’ into the glorious liberty and light revealed to the children of the Anointed One.”

(Excerpt from June 1878) BIRKENHEAD.—Brother Collens reports: “On the 14<sup>th</sup> of April, brother Gee, from whom this ecclesia found it necessary to withdraw in the autumn of 1876, was readmitted to fellowship. On the 8<sup>th</sup> instant, it was resolved to admit to our fellowship, without re-immersion, sister Margaret Jones, who has been for many years housekeeper to brother Croston, and who was baptized in Liverpool on the 29<sup>th</sup> of July last, her belief having been found, on examination, to be the One Faith

(June 1878) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland reports: “During the month, brother John Boot and sister Boot (his wife), whom we left at the synagogue, carried away with the theory introduced by David Handley, have returned to fellowship with the brethren who have held fast the truth. After our division, our brother and sister B. with many others similarly deceived, were re-immersed, but in the mercy of God they have been enabled to see the error into which they had fallen, and for months past, have been in a very unhappy condition. They at length came forward and asked to be received into fellowship. Accordingly, as it is our rule in all such cases (and from which we never deviate), they were asked to meet the brethren for the purpose of ascertaining if anything existed to prevent such fellowship. After a very satisfactory interview, in which they gave clear evidence of their deliverance from Renunciationism, they expressed their sorrow for having been re-immersed, and rely only on their first immersion as the one baptism. I have also to report that sister Lucy Cheedle has removed from Mansfield to Nottingham, and has been added to our number. On Tuesday in Easter week, we had a social tea meeting, a goodly number of the brethren and sisters being present, also a few strangers. After tea the time was spent in thanksgiving, exhortation and singing. Many of the brethren said it was the most profitable meeting of the kind that had been held in connection with the truth here.”

(Excerpt from September 1878) BIRMINGHAM.—During the month, the following persons have rendered obedience to the faith in baptism: GEORGE TURVEY (43), painter, formerly Wesleyan; RICHARD HENRY ATTWOOD (43), ironworker, formerly Wesleyan (he has been discharged from his

employment, after many years' service, in consequence of his obedience to the truth); JOHN MILES (29), glass embosser, formerly neutral; CAROLINE COOK (35), wife of brother Cook, formerly Wesleyan; CHARLES TURBEYFIELD (17), son of brother and sister Turbeyfield. Brother and sister Poole, of Cannock, have come to reside in Birmingham. The brethren have been gladdened by the return to fellowship of brother Francis Augustus Chatwin, who has finally decided to adhere to the profession and service of the truth in the face of whatever circumstances may arise, without or within.

(June 1878) SKEWEN.—Brother John Morgan writes: “You have been made aware of my return from Renunciationism. I have had to pay the price of my folly in leaving the brethren at the first, but I did it conscientiously and now return in all good conscience, whatever may be said to the contrary. I have every reason to hope and believe that a good work will be done in this place yet if we have time given us before the Lord come. We shall at all events try our best, doing it heartily and with simplicity and singleness to the Lord. I have been going to Swansea and fellowshipping the brethren there till Sunday, May 5, when four of us broke bread together for the first time, viz., in addition to myself, my wife, who has been in the truth with me from the beginning; sister Haddon, and sister Ware, immersed by me since I left the brethren, but who, though among the Renunciationists at that time, believed the simple truth concerning Christ.” Brother Morgan proceeds to speak of meetings convened by placard, in “the Christadelphian Meeting Room, Tabernacle Row,” a room built by himself at the back of his house. These meetings have been for the publication of the truth to strangers. Brother Davies, of Morriston, and brother R. Goldie, of Swansea, have lectured to considerable companies of people, and several are interested.

(Excerpt from October 1878) BRISTOL. — Brother Baker reports the obedience of AMBROSE GARRAWAY (36), who was immersed on Sunday morning September 15<sup>th</sup>. He formerly belonged to the “Brethren.”

(October 1878)MELBOURNE.—Brother W. J. Evans forwards a lengthy communication in response to the equivocal allusion to the Melbourne ecclesia in the *Christadelphian* for May last. Referring to his own antecedents, on which, probably, the said allusion was founded, he remarks, after narrating the facts, “I have deeply repented of the past, and prayed earnestly for forgiveness. I thank God that I feel stronger in the faith and hope of the Gospel than ever I did before, and am quite convinced now of what I did not fully 303arasse before, viz., that there is no salvation out of Christ, and no way of getting into him but by believing the whole truth and obeying it. Since my re-admission to fellowship, I have endeavoured to atone for the past to the best of my ability by untiring effort in the cause of the truth. And now leaving my own personal history, I will give you a brief history of the progress of the ecclesia from its foundation to the present. The first meeting was held in the house of Joseph Brown, Park Street, Emerald Hill, the following members being present: Samuel Jackson, Ellen Jackson, Annie Fincher, Robert Brown, John Bishop, Joseph Brown, Annie Jane Brown, the writer, and sister-wife Rebecca Evans. It was then resolved to form an ecclesia, on the basis of the propositions embodied in the *Declaration* of first principles; also resolved that any hereafter seeking to be admitted to the fellowship of this ecclesia should be required to yield an intelligent and willing assent to the said propositions before admission into the name and fellowship of Christ. The first meeting for the breaking of bread was held about sixteen months back—March twelvemonths. We met for some eight weeks at brother Brown's, when himself and family removed to another part, at brother Bishop's, in Dorcas Street, Emerald Hill. About this time four of our members had removed, and two had been added to our numbers. Believing that if we could secure a public room for our meetings, we should, under the divine blessing, succeed in bringing the truth to operate upon some intelligent and honest minds and hearts, brother Bishop and the writer obtained the Temperance Hall, at a low rental, for Sunday evening meetings. The first meeting was held in the September of last year, since which time meetings have been held every Sunday evening, at which the writer has lectured upon various subjects bearing upon the Kingdom and Name, to small but deeply attentive audiences, several of whom have manifested such an interest in the truth as will, we trust, ere

long develop into obedience. The present members are as follow: Samuel Jackson, Ellen Jackson and Annie Fincher, late of the Derby ecclesia, England; ROBERT BROWN (44), manufacturer; JOHN BISHOP (34), soap boiler; ELIZA BISHOP (28), wife of brother Bishop; JOSEPH BROWN (31), bookkeeper, his wife, ANNIE JANE BROWN (24); AGNES BROWN (36), wife of brother R. Brown; BENJAMIN F. HARRISON (53), late mariner, his wife, ANNA HARRISON (35); ELEANOR WARNER (22); THOMAS THOMPSON (60), gardener; AMELIA KEARSWELL (28), teacher; REBECCA EVANS (36); and the writer, W. J. EVANS (36), builder. We have lost one brother by death, viz., brother A. Hunter. We are, I am glad to say, working lovingly and unitedly together, waiting for the Great Captain of our salvation.”

(Excerpt from November 1878) LONDON.—Brother A. Jannaway writing October 14<sup>th</sup>, says:—“During the past month, the operations of the truth in London have been particularly interesting, as the following will show. We have added to our number G. F. COULSON, formerly neutral, by immersion, on September 22<sup>nd</sup>; ROBERT ROBERTS, cousin to brother Roberts, of Birmingham, formerly Church of Scotland, on the 29<sup>th</sup>; and GEORGE JABEZ MILLER, formerly Baptist, but several years past neutral, on October 13<sup>th</sup>. There has also returned to our fellowship sister EMMERSON, who, through our withdrawal from certain holding an unscriptural belief, has been standing apart from us for some years. Brethren Arthur Roberts, Phillips and Lucas, whose occupation is upon the deep, have departed together on a sea voyage, likely to extend over many months; their fellowship we miss. Since our last report we have taken a hall in Dalston (a district in the N.E. of London), with the hope of extending the knowledge of the truth in this vast metropolis.

(November 1878) STOCKPORT.—Brother Waite reports withdrawal from fellowship with bro. Bradburn, for slander, and further the withdrawal of brother Beaumont, from the ecclesia, from sympathy with the no-will theory. The place of the latter, however, has been filled by the return of one who had for a while been identified with that same heresy.

(Excerpt from April 1879) LONDON.—Brother A. Jannaway writes: “Although I have no immersions to report, since the intelligence appearing in the February number, yet there has been an addition to our ecclesia, by the removal to London of brother Rae, of Bristol, and brother Sawden, of Scarborough”

(Excerpt from September 1879) GLASGOW.—Brother Leask reports that since last writing two others have been added, viz., brother T. C. BROWN, who has been restored to fellowship, and brother GEORGE SMILLIE (30), miner, who after making the good confession, put on the sin-covering name, on Sept. 7<sup>th</sup>. Brother Smillie resides at Coatbridge, about ten miles from Glasgow; but intends to meet with us on the first day of the week

(Excerpt from January 1880) BIRMINGHAM. — Brother and sister Arrowsmith have returned to fellowship. James R. Mawson is no longer associated with the brethren, having resigned his place among them in consequence of his abandonment of the faith.

(March 1880) WISHAW.—The intimation published from this place, in last month’s *Christadelphian*, that Mr. Muir, Mr. Neilson, and Mrs. Neilson, of Blantyre, had been immersed into the one faith and one hope of the gospel, is this month called into question in a document transmitted to the Editor, and signed by brethren David Culbert, and Charles Smith, of Edinburgh, and John Gillies, of Beith,—as a committee, who have investigated the matter as disinterested parties, at the request of the Glasgow brethren. The document is forwarded as a protest against the report, so far as concerns the two men; of Mrs. Neilson, the three reputable brethren in question, know nothing. They base their protest on the fact that the Glasgow brethren having doubted the fitness of Mr. Muir and Mr. Neilson, they went to Wishaw, and were immersed there, and afterwards Mr. Muir declined to be examined by the committee as to his faith, after



consenting to submit, and Mr. Neilson withdrew his application. The committee, after investigation, recommended the Glasgow brethren to refuse fellowship with Mr. Muir and Mr. Neilson, until such time as they voluntarily come forward and make a satisfactory confession of the faith. [Compiler's Note: For lack of where to put this to so, it fits with my category's I am going to add it here]; [See further history below]

(April 1880) WISHAW.—A rejoinder reaches us from the brethren here to the protest referred to last month, against the immersion of Mr. Neilson and Mr. Muir. We recorded the fact of the protest instead of publishing it, desiring to a disagreeable necessity. For the same reason, we report instead of publish the rejoinder, merely indicating the substance of it, as in the other case. This may best be done by quoting the following sentences: "Coming to Wishaw was certainly no fault (on the part of the two candidates for immersion), or, at least, ought not so to be considered. There could be no attempt to steal a march upon us, seeing we had as much acquaintance and more intercourse with them than the Glasgow brethren had. During four or five weeks previous to their immersion we had frequent interviews with them." Referring to the judgment of the investigation committee, the rejoinder says: "They have never seen those men: consequently, they can know nothing whatever of their doctrinal standing. . . They set the judgment of the Glasgow brethren, who did not examine them against that of the Wishaw brethren, who did." With this, we must leave the subject, regretting that excellent brethren should be unable to be of "one mind and one judgment" in a matter that ought to give gladness instead of leading to misunderstanding.

(Excerpts from October 1880) LEICESTER.—Brother Dixon reports that the matters which have been agitating the meeting here have been satisfactorily settled, for which we are all thankful. The following brethren and sisters have been withdrawn from on account of continued absence from the table: Brethren Armstrong, McAdams, Baker, Coleman, J. T. Cooper, and sister E. Dunmore. Brother A. W. Warner has returned to fellowship.

(Excerpt from October 1880) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland reports the return to fellowship of brother Thomas Smith, the husband of sister Hannah Smith, who has been enabled to see the errors into which many of the brethren were led at the time of the Renunciation. After standing alone for some months, he made application to be received into our fellowship, and after several interviews with the brethren, we were enabled to give him the right hand of fellowship and welcome him into our midst.

(Excerpt from January 1881) BIRMINGHAM.— Also, during the month, there has been a return to fellowship upon the part of brother James R. Mawson, who resigned his connection with the brethren for the vain friendship of the world sixteen months ago; also, of several who had gone aside with those who teach that the birth of the Spirit takes place in the present state. The names of the latter, who have returned, are sister Dean, brother and sister Franklin, and brother and sister Martin.

(Excerpt from February 1881) NOTTINGHAM. — Our brother Lake having removed from Windsor has returned to Nottingham, and is again numbered with us; also sister Jeffries, having returned from Sydney, is united with us in fellowship.

(March 1881) MUMBLES—Brother W. H. Jones reports the obedience of MIRIAM LLOYD, daughter of brother H. Lloyd; and MARY MORGANS, daughter of sister Morgans. A sister who has for some years been out of fellowship has returned.

(Excerpt from March 1881) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland reports the return to fellowship from the Renunciationists, of two more, viz.: sister Catherine Richmond and sister Sarah Ann Turney.

(Excerpt from April 1881) MUMBLES.—Brother W. A. Jones reports the obedience of EDWARD LINCOLN BEHENNA, son of sister Behenna. Brother D. Clement reports the return to fellowship of another who had been standing aloof for some time.

(Excerpt from May 1881) BIRMINGHAM. —Sister FELL, who separated herself from the brethren some years ago has now returned, upon a satisfactory statement of her faith.

(Excerpt from May 1881) MANCHESTER.—Brother Barlow reports the return to fellowship of brother and sister Wareham, who were isolated by the action taken towards No-willism by the Manchester brethren. (Sister Wareham will be better known as Emily Birkenhead, sister to the family of that name). Since the time of the action in question, those who advocated the No-will theory have gone further, and now teach the personal pre-existence of the Lord Jesus. In this, brother and sister Wareham cannot follow them, and have had their way opened for a return to the brethren. For some time they have broken bread at home.

(Excerpt from May 1881) NOTTINGHAM. — The meeting after tea was probably unparalleled in the history of the Truth in the People's Hall. Brother Collyer, of Leicester, presided, called attention to the nature of the work to which we are invited in fitting, pleasing, and appropriate language. Afterwards, brother Andrew spoke for about forty minutes. His speech was an instructive and practical exposition of the only way in which brethren can find the favour of the coming king. Brother Roberts spoke in two addresses, divided by a hymn, on the joint mission of John the Baptist and Christ 1,800 years ago, and the bearings of their work on the future, to which the gospel has called us, coming to an appropriate and beautiful conclusion in words of kindly warning to us all. One matter that added interest to the meeting was the announcement that David Handley, who, with Edward Turney, caused a separation of the brethren in Nottingham seven years ago, is just at this time seeking re-admission among them, having come to see that he was mistaken in the doctrine he then advocated, and that the scriptural doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ is that held by the brethren. The spontaneous character of the meeting accounted for much of its sweetness. There was comfort in the typical character of a gathering from the four quarters of the heavens, reminding us of the great congregation which is to assemble on Mount Zion at no very distant date."

(Excerpt from August 1881) JARROW-ON-TYNE. — Bro. Harker also reports the return of sister Ellen Leadbeater, Newcastle, who has not been in fellowship for some time owing to her sympathy with free life views, now abandoned.

(Excerpt from August 1881) LONDON.— Brother Horsman writes: "Brother Wheeler, who was in fellowship with us in the South of London, left for Aylesbury some years ago, and as the result of his labours, there is now an ecclesia of ten in that place. Having been in communication with him, since I resumed fellowship at Islington, upon the doctrines which had caused separation, and found the barrier removed in his case also, I have availed myself of an opportunity of paying a visit, and testify with pleasure to the fact that the whole meeting (ten) have attained to a clear knowledge of the truth concerning sin and its putting-away, and hope to see in the Intelligence columns of the *Christadelphian*, from time to time, a record of their progress."

(Excerpt from September 1881) LONDON.—Brother William Owler reports the addition by immersion of RACHEL HATCH, immersed some years ago, by brother David Handley, at Maldon, in ignorance of the mission of Jesus Christ, and the taking away of sin; also of CHARLES WICKS (27), formerly Baptist; and JANE PARSONS, of Brighton, formerly Campbellite. Sisters Stock and Humphreys, who left a few years ago on the subject of no condemnation for any in Adam, have been re-admitted to fellowship. Mr.

Stock, husband of sister Stock, and immersed by those brethren who have lately returned to our fellowship from South London, has also been received.

(Excerpt from October 1881) LEICESTER On Saturday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, we assisted Miss BRADFORD to put on the only name given among men whereby we may be saved, and, on the following day, we received back to fellowship her father, Brother James Bradford, who went away from us in company with Brother Wilber, whose return was announced last month. We have also an addition by the removal of Sister Minnie Hawkins, of Frome, now Sister Thorneloe.

(Excerpt from December 1881) LONDON—During the past month a few changes have taken place. On November 9<sup>th</sup>, HENRY LOCKHART, formerly Congregationalist, was inducted into the saving name in the appointed way. EBENEZER LEECH, who left us in 1875, on account of doctrinal differences, has again resumed fellowship, the difficulties hitherto preventing having been removed. Sister George Phillips has removed to Dundee, and Brother C. F. Clements, of Liverpool, has returned to London.

(February 1882) LIVERPOOL- On the 27<sup>th</sup> of December a tea meeting was held in the Hamilton Rooms, Birkenhead, to which the brethren from Tranmere and Birkenhead were invited. About 60 of the brethren and sisters from the neighbourhood of Liverpool, and a few interested strangers, were present; the meeting proved to be a very profitable and interesting one. Brother and sister Hughes, who did not see fit to go over to Birkenhead when the ecclesia removed there from Liverpool, have been re-admitted to our fellowship.—HY. COLLENS.

(February 1882) CHRIST CHURCH.—Brother Challoner reports the following immersions, which have taken place since he last wrote:—GEORGE ARCHER and CHARLES SMITH, firemen, formerly Baptists, the husbands of Sisters Archer and Smith; ALBERT LEES, milkman, formerly neutral, and his wife, MARY. Brother J. Richards has been received into fellowship again, in harmony with scriptural requirements. Brother and Sister Archer have removed to the township of Ashburton, some forty miles away.

(March 1882) LIVERPOOL-I have to report the immersion, on the 21<sup>st</sup> of January last, of WILLIAM SMITH SCHOFIELD (25), commercial traveller, formerly a Free Church Methodist, who resides at Bolton. His obedience to the truth resulted from an acquaintance with Brother Benjamin Jones, of Liverpool, who met with him during one of his commercial journies. We have also had the pleasure of receiving back to our fellowship Brother F. D. Parry (from whom we had to withdraw in Nov., 1880). Brother and Sister Killick have removed to Tipton, near Birmingham, and with them Sister Lucy Allen, who is in their service. Sister Elizabeth Wyatt has returned to Birmingham.—HY. COLLENS.

(April 1882) ELLAND- We have several additions this month. Brother and Sister Pickersgill have removed from Huddersfield; Brother SPENCER has returned to fellowship, and on March 4<sup>th</sup>, THOMAS HOWE (22), railway clerk, formerly a very active member in the Methodist body, was immersed. A little more interest seems to be taken in the truth, by the inhabitants of this old town, judging from the extra attendance at our lectures. We expect shortly to open a new room, that will accommodate more listeners.—RALPH MARSDEN.

(Excerpt from April 1882) LONDON-Several additions have to be announced. On Jan. 22<sup>nd</sup>, EDWIN TIMPSON and his wife ANNIE JANE (who formerly met with those holding views subversive of the truth) were received into our midst; and on Jan. 29<sup>th</sup>, HERBERT CASE (also in fellowship with them, and who, on hearing the way of God expounded more perfectly, was re-immersed). Sister Gamble (mother of our Brother T. W. Gamble) has removed from Leicester to London. Bro. S. S. Osborne has left London

for Bristol. Bro. Clarke and Sister Emma Ware have been united in marriage. The ecclesia numbers over 240.

(June 1882) KIDDERMINSTER-I have to announce the immersion of another believing Gentile into the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, viz., Mr. BROOKFIELD, china dealer, formerly an attendant at the Countess of Huntingdon's Chapel, in this town, a young man who has for a considerable time given attention to the things most surely believed amongst us. He was immersed at Birmingham, on Sunday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 1882. Bro. Hodges—formerly a member of our ecclesia—who has been residing some months at Liverpool, has now returned to this neighbourhood, and again associated himself with us. We are sorry to have to record the falling away of two of our members, Mr. and Mrs. Hughes, to the Christian Israelites

(Excerpt from June 1882) LONDON-The following additions have taken place during the past month:—End of April, WILLIAM JAMES SKEATS (son of Brother Skeats and brother in the flesh of Sis. Rachel Skeats); on May 3, HEPHZIBAH WARE (daughter of Brother and Sister Ware), and on May 7, Mrs. AMY ELIZABETH PORTER (wife of Brother F. Porter). John Tylee, formerly with the Renunciationists in Blackfriars-road, has also been received into our fellowship. Sister Morris has left London for Leicester, and Sister Gamble (mother of Brother T. W. Gamble) has returned to Leicester.

(Excerpt from July 1882) LONDON-During the month, the following persons have put on the only name under heaven given among men, whereby they must be saved, namely:—on May 14<sup>th</sup>, Mrs. AMELIA CHRISTIN, formerly Congregationalist; May 24<sup>th</sup>, ELLEN TUCKER, formerly of the Church of England; May 28<sup>th</sup>, CAROLINE JESSIE CHARLES, formerly Baptist; June 7<sup>th</sup>, Mrs. JEANNETTE BRAINE, sister in the flesh to sister Matthews, formerly of the Plymouth Brethren; and on June 11<sup>th</sup>, GILBERT HAMILTON WILKINS, M.R.C.S., formerly of the Church of England. F. C. Sendall, who formerly met with the Renunciationists, has been received into our fellowship. Brother Sendall is about to leave London for Sydney, N.S.W.

(July 1882) MELBOURNE.—Brothor Gamble reports, “Brother and Sister Betts, also Brother and Sister Jackson and Sister Fincher have returned to fellowship. Brother and Sister Pearce, whose immersion was reported in the February *Christadelphian*, from St. Kilda, have also united with us in fellowship, so that the St. Kilda ecclesia has ceased to exist, and we are one again. We have been further strengthened by the immersion of JOHN RUSSELL (26), after the usual good confession, which took place on March 28, 1882. Brother Russell is the son of Sister Russell, of Edinboro', Scotland, who will doubtless rejoice in the fact that one of her sours has been ‘born of water.’ On April 22, we assisted ALICE SPENCER(22), formerly Campbellite, to put on the name, after a very satisfactory confession of the faith, after a little investigation of the truth. These additions, inclusive of Bro. C. C. Walker, who has returned from Ballarat, make our numbers in fellowship 48. I am also glad to acquaint you with the fact that the designations of our serving brethren has been changed from Elders and Deacons to Presiding and Managing Brethren, by a large majority of the ecclesia. We trust this vexed question is now permanently settled, and that our minds may be occupied with those things which are of far greater moment. We again hold our meetings in the city, finding it more convenient than the suburbs. For thee past two months we have held our meetings in the I.O.O.F. Hall, Russell Street, where we continue the Sunday evening lectures. Subjects as follows: March 12, “Man mortal, and immortality” (Bro. Walker); March 19, “Christ's return” (Bro. Gamble); March 26, “What Christ is coming for” (Bro. Gamble); April 2, “The earth, not heaven, the future abode of the saints” (Bro. Walker); April 9, “State of the dead” (Bro. Hardinge);. April 16, “The necessity for resurrection” (Bro. Hardinge); April 23<sup>rd</sup>, “Hell” (Bro. Walker).

(August 1882) BRIERLEY HILL- Brother S. Dawes announces that ELIZA THORNEYCROFT, sister in the flesh to Brother Thorneycroft, put on the sin-covering name at Dudley on June 14. Sister Hammonds, who has been absent from the table for a long time, is now united with us in fellowship again.

(August 1882) LONDON- During the month the following cases of obedience to the truth have occurred—on July 18, SAMUEL MARTIN, formerly neutral, warder in the Surrey County Lunatic Asylum; and on June 25, EDWARD SHERRING, formerly in fellowship with us, but re-immersed at his own request. There has also been added to our number removal—Sister George Phillips, from Dundee; Sister Moore, from Manchester; and Brother Peplow, from Birmingham. Brother T. Turner has returned to Birmingham; and Brother Sendall has sailed for Sydney, N.S.W.

The annual out-door treat of the Sunday School and Bible Class, took place on Monday, June 26 to Fairmead Lodge, Epping Forest. We left the Upper-street Hall in vans, and enjoyed a pleasant day within the grounds of the Lodge, which is enclosed. About 90 children and over 60 adults sat down to tea in the “open,” after which the children listened to an address, and sang two hymns. It is gratifying to report that we all arrived home safe without accident, for which we are deeply grateful to Our Father in Heaven.

The annual business meeting of the ecclesia was held on July 2<sup>nd</sup>, when the usual elections took place. Our number was reported to be 241. The number attending the Sunday School is 74; and at the Bible class 25 young men and women, the majority being brethren and sisters. The average attendance is 69–15 at Bible class, and 54 in the school.—W. OWLER.

Bro. P. A. Hutchinson writes that the new ecclesia, being unable to procure a hall, have, for the present, resolved to meet in the room belonging to Bro. Pittman, and will be known as the Fulham Ecclesia. He says, “We number twenty-one, one of whom has since been added to us by immersion into the name of the Christ. His name is Fermore. He was formerly connected with the Baptists. We trust that we will soon be able to report others. Our secretary, Bro. Marshall, will report progress from time to time.”

(October 1882) LEAMINGTON-A meeting has for some time past existed here out of fellowship with the brethren elsewhere, on account of connection with John Carter, and sympathy with his doctrine, that the birth of the spirit is a present experience. A change has now taken place. Brother Need writes on behalf of self, and Brethren Peters, Mercott, H. Corbett, J. Nutting, J. C. Totter, J. Tandy, and R. Heath; and Sisters Tandy, Nutting, Peters, Cutler, Cotterill, Need, J. Rouse, J. Woodward, H. Woodward, H. Blockley (numbering 18 in all), to say that they have had their eyes opened, and that they have separated from John Carter, and returned to the fellowship of the brethren. Bro. F. R. Shuttleworth, of Birmingham, had an interview with them on August 25<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>. Bro. Need says:—“We expect good results from what has taken place. Indeed, they have already begun to shew themselves, in the form of unity between ourselves and those who have held aloof from us in times past. On Sunday, August 27<sup>th</sup>, we met together for the first time in our new capacity, breaking bread together, Brother Shuttleworth exhorting and giving us also an address on the “Signs of the Times” in the evening. For the present we intend to work quietly, until we are able to do something on a larger scale. Before long we hope to sally forth with fresh activity and strength, to awaken those, through the power of the Gospel, who have not drunk too deep of the intoxicating cup, and that they may once more have the chance of obeying the command, before the time of acceptance has passed away, and so having done our little part of the work appointed, await ourselves the revelation of the Anointed One, as a morning without clouds.”

(December 1882) ELLAND-Brother Marsden reports the removal of Sister Waddington from Elland to Rushworth, where it will be very inconvenient for her to get to any place of meeting. Also the return to fellowship of Brother and Sister Zechariah Drake, consequent on the removal of the obstacle which has existed for twelve months past. This result was due to a meeting and questioning of all parties by Brother Roberts, of Birmingham, on the 1<sup>st</sup> of November.

The Sunday evening lectures are being a little better attended these dark months; and we are given to understand that ministers of the gospel (so-called) have more trouble from us than any other sect.

(January 1883) GREENOCK- I am very happy to inform you that strife and difference have ended, and we are in fellowship, on the basis of the truth, in peace and unity should dwell. The change has increased our number from six to ten. We have removed from No. 8, Market Street to a larger hall, No. 41, Nicholson Street, where we meet every first day of the week at 12 noon and 6 p.m. Any faithful ones passing we will be glad to see.—J. MONAGHAN.

(Excerpt from February 1883) LIVERPOOL-The immersions during the past month have been—December 30<sup>th</sup>, ROBERT HEPWORTH (19), painter, formerly Primitive Methodist; and on January 7<sup>th</sup>, EMMA EDWARDS, and J. BIRKMYRE ROBERTSON (18), Wesleyan Methodist, brother in the flesh to Brother James U. Robertson; and we have received back to fellowship Brother Peter Whitfield, from whom we had to withdraw in November, 1881.

(March 1883) NORTH LONDON (*Wellington Hall, Wellington Street, Islington, 11 a.m., and 7 p.m.*)—Bro. Oowler reports the following additions by immersion on Feb. 7, MARY ANN HATTON, sister in the flesh to Sister Hatton, and at the same time FRANCES SARAH THROSSELL, sister to our Bro. Throssell (Westminster ecclesia), and daughter of Sister Throssell, of Peterborough. Mrs. JANE PITTAWAY, daughter of Bro. James Robertson, formerly of Turriff, now of Grantown, N.B., who was immersed in Aberdeen in 1863, has been received into our fellowship after a satisfactory interview with our brethren. Bro. A. Taylor, who left some years ago with those who held erroneous views concerning the taking away of sin, has also returned to our fellowship. By removal, we have added Brother and Sister J. P. Jones and Sister Florence Townsend, from Birmingham, and Brother Sherwood has returned to London from Leeds. Our Brother Samuel Ware has left London for New York in search of employment.”

(April 1883) ABERDEEN-Brother Craigmyle reports the obedience of Dr. JAMES MURRAY, formerly neutral, whom he describes as the first fruits of the recent public lectures. The following have also been added, viz., Brethren ROBERT EMSLIE, JAMES AULD, WILLIAM COOPER, and Sister COOPER (wife of the last named), who became separated over two years ago; together with Brother and Sister WILLIAM CHALMERS, who had come to a knowledge and obedience of the truth by the help of these brethren during that time. There has been the further addition of Brother ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, who has been out of fellowship for several years, but has now returned, his sister-wife having become reunited some time previously.

(Excerpt from April 1883) KIDDERMINSTER- I have also to state that Crother Perrigo, who, it may be remembered, left us about a year and nine months ago, to join the Plymouth Brethren (which body he originally left to identify himself with the truth), has made application for re-admittance to our body. He deeply regrets the step then taken, and fully recognises the error then made. For a long time he has been uneasy in his mind, and conscious that the Plymouth Brethren had not the truth, and at length he has resolved to return to our midst. Brother Combes has sent in his resignation, which was unanimously accepted.

(April 1883) NEW WOMBWELL-Brother Walker reports the return to the fellowship of the brethren in this place, of Brother Mitchell, the cause of his separation having proved to be a misunderstanding.

(April 1883) JERSEY CITY, N.J.—Since our last report we have had two more additions to the body. On Sunday, January 21, MAY SHAW (18), daughter of our Brother John Shaw, was inducted into the Name. She gave a most intelligent and satisfactory statement of “the hope within her.” Sister Coddington, wife of Bro. Coddington, who was out of fellowship with the body, on account of erroneous belief concerning the resurrection and judgment, has again united with us. Bro. Julius Boggs has left these parts, and now meets with the brethren in Washington. Our Sunday evening lectures are well attended by strangers, and the brethren seem to be doing a good work for the Master. Prominent lectures for the month have been:

“Forty-seven reasons why I left the M.E. Churche (Bro. Coddington); “Temples and temple-builders” (Bro. Sixsmith); “How the blood of Jesus cleanses from sin” (Bro. Vredenburgh).—J. M. WASHBURNF.

(May 1883) ABERDEEN—Bro. Craigmyle reports the return to fellowship of Bro. Andrew Marr, who has been separated from the brethren for over two years. The ecclesia has lost by removal Bro. Charles Walls, who was connected with the Railway Passenger Service here, and who left for Liverpool, *en route* to America, on the 29<sup>th</sup> ult. He left with the best wishes of the brethren in Aberdeen, who commend him to the sympathy of their fellow-heirs on the other side of the Atlantic, where, as yet, he has no fixed destination.

(May 1883) BAGTHORPE—Bro. Marshall reports that Bro. Elam has been restored to the fellowship of the brethren in this place in the Scriptural way. Lectures are regularly delivered on Sunday evenings by various brethren from a distance. The most important have been two from Bro. Richards, of Nottingham, on “Babylon the Great,” and “Angels—do they exist, and for what purpose?” The attendance has been good of those for whose enlightenment these efforts are intended, of whom they are several who are completely spoiled for attendance elsewhere.

(Excerpt from May 1883) GLASGOW—Brother Leask reports that Sister Hamilton, who has kept aloof since the renunciationist heresy ten years ago, returned to fellowship on Sunday, 25<sup>th</sup> March, through the exertions of Brother Handley, while in Glasgow. Brother Handley lectured on the afternoon of Sunday, 18<sup>th</sup> March, and also Sunday, 8<sup>th</sup> April, both afternoon and evening. As a result of his lectures, there have been good audiences and a few enquirers. The usual “East Day” social meeting took place on Thursday, 5<sup>th</sup> April, when about 120 sat down to tea, including brethren, children, and friends, and a very profitable and enjoyable evening was spent.

(May 1883) WESTMINSTER (*Victoria Hall, 327, Vauxhall Bridge Road, Sundays 11 a.m. and 7 p.m., and Thursdays 8 p.m.*)—Brother F. Jannaway reports the addition of a sister from Islington, and also of ALFRED JAMES WHITE (33), cabinet carver, and his wife, ALICE CHARLOITE WHITE (32), both of whom have been meeting with the Renunciationists at Westminster Bridge Road. They were received into fellowship on March 25, without re-immersion, as their faith at their former immersion was considered (on examination) to be Scriptural. Last month we lost, by removal, our Sister Edwards, who has gone to Canada, where she has arrived safely, after a somewhat tempestuous and prolonged voyage.

(Excerpt from June 1883) GLASGOW— We have lost, by removal to America, Brother James Paterson, jun., and Sister Flora Brown, also Brother James Jarvie, jun., by removal to New York. On the other hand we have gained one by immersion, viz., MATTHEW MCBRIDE, who had been looking into the truth for some time; also Sister Cameron (who left us with Sister Hamilton, mentioned last month), has followed her example, and is now in fellowship with us. We have again commenced evening lectures, but the attendance is very small.

(June 1883) LEAMINGTON— Brother Need bemoans the stoniness of the ground here, about 150 having turned out to hear a lecture from Brother Ashcroft, on Friday, April 6, who have apparently shewn no further interest in the matter. He also reports the return to fellowship of Brother Charles Gantham, and the lapse from fellowship of Brother James Murcott, on account of conduct, for which the brethren refuse to make themselves responsible by participation therein. Lectures have been regularly given by various brethren during the month. The brethren have procured the insertion in the public papers of two letters, calling popular teaching in question, and setting forth the gospel as Apostolically proclaimed.

(July 1883) ABERDEEN— Bro. Craigmyle reports the following additions to the number of the brethren here:—William Pratt, who returns to fellowship after an absence of about three years; Mrs. PRATT, his

wife, who put on Christ by immersion, on the 24<sup>th</sup> of May. The annual social tea meeting of the brethren and sisters, and interested friends, was held in the Music Hall buildings, on June 2<sup>nd</sup>, when over 170 assembled. Bro. Abram Garden occupied the chair, and four hours were spent to much spiritual profit in fraternal intercourse and in listening to address by various brethren

(July 1883) GLOUCESTER- Brother Roger reports the return to fellowship of Brother and Sister Baker, who left the ecclesia here under circumstances mentioned in the last January and April numbers of the *Christadelphian*. Sister Kate Weeks has returned to Bristol.

(Excerpt from July 1883) NOTTINGHAM-Brother Kirkland reports the obedience of ELIZA HAZLEDINE (formerly Methodist). She was immersed May 27<sup>th</sup>; also on June 4<sup>th</sup>, LYDIA WALKER (19), daughter of Brother and Sister Walker. We have also another addition by the return to fellowship of Brother A. Verner, who has been enabled to see his way out of the Renunciation heresy, We have hope of some others who are earnestly looking into the truth.

(Excerpt from August 1883) MANCHESTER-Brother Yardley reports the obedience of HELEN DONALD (20), formerly neutral, who was baptised June 30<sup>th</sup>. She is brother Donald's eldest daughter. On July 2<sup>nd</sup> Mr. H. WALKER, of Nelson, near Burnley (formerly Scotch Baptist), was buried with Christ in the same way. Sister Freeston, of Leeds, has come to reside in Manchester, and meets with the brethren. There have also been added to the ecclesia brother and sister Carr, who for several years have been separated from the brethren by the Renunciationist schism. Others are likely to follow their example after similar careful and independent inquiry into the truth on the point which has so long kept them apart from the brethren.

(October 1883) BRIERLEY HILL-The brethren here have at last procured a suitable room, in which they hope permanently to set forth the truth; and have also been encouraged and strengthened by the return to fellowship of sister Bird, who was for sometime connected with the Renunciationists.

(January 1884) VALLEY SPRING, TEX.—Brother Magill reports the return to fellowship of brethren P. D. Beacham and F. A. Gerdes, after a proper understanding on both sides.

(March 1884) EDINBURGH-We have to report the addition to our number, by the removal from Aberdeen to this city, of sister D. Meal, and also the return to fellowship of sister Sutherland. The brethren and sisters here have been much cheered and gratified by a visit from brother Ashcroft, who exhorted on the two Sundays during his stay, and delivered four lectures, which, it is to be regretted, were not so well attended as on former occasions. The weather was exceedingly stormy, which was probably the cause of the thin attendance.—W. M. SMITH.

(April 1884) WESTMINSTER.—(*Wilcocke's Assembly Rooms, Westminster Bridge Road, Sundays 11 a.m. and 7 p.m. Thursdays 8 p.m.*)—Through some mistake was omitted last month, the immersion of ALICE STAPLEY (16), on January 27<sup>th</sup>, daughter of our sister Stapley. During the past month, two have been added by the obedience required, on the 17<sup>th</sup> February, FREDERICK TAYLOR (28), hairdresser, formerly Congregationalist, and on the same date we received into fellowship Mrs. MARY BLEUMAN (64), of whom there was no need for re-immersion, as she gave satisfactory evidence of her knowledge of the truth, at the time she was immersed by those who left us some eight years since. Our number has also been augmented by the removal of sister Elizabeth Bramley from Halifax, brother Smither from Sheffield, and brother Thomas Jackson from Grantham. Through the zealous enterprise of a sister, we have arranged for a special course of four lectures to be delivered at the seaside town of Hastings, in Sussex, the first of which will (D.V.) be delivered next Sunday. Particulars later on. Our own lectures at Westminster receive a good attendance in every respect.



(Excerpt from May 1884) GLOUCESTER-Brother Rogers reports that brother G. A. Thody has returned to fellowship.

(May 1884) WHITBY-Brother Clegg writes:—"It affords me much pleasure to forward to you the report of the obedience of ALBERT MALLANDER, decorator (19); also LUCY MALLANDER (17), who were baptised into Christ April 3<sup>rd</sup>. They are son and daughter of brother and sister Mallander. Their examination made manifest how much easier a thing it is to acquire a knowledge of the truth, when the mind has not been previously befogged with orthodoxy. Children of the brethren have a great advantage in this respect. Might I also request you to insert in the *Christadelphian* the following letter, the contents of which will explain itself:—"Ruswarp, 26<sup>th</sup> March, 1884. *To the brethren and sisters assembling at 14, Silver Street, Whitby.* DEAR BRETHREN AND SISTERS, —Having had an interview this evening with brother Clegg and brother Mankin touching the matters of misunderstanding between them which has so long separated brother Mankin from your fellowship, I am able to say, with their concurrence, that the misunderstanding has been founded on mutual misapprehension of facts. Bro. Mankin withdraws his charges against brother Clegg, and brother Clegg consents to the resumption of fellowship between them. The object of this note is to ask you to allow brother Mankin to resume the place among you which he left seven or eight years ago, in which request the two brothers hereby join. Faithfully your brother, ROBERT ROBERTS. Signed also by THOMAS MANKIN, THOMAS EDWARDS CLEGG."

(June 1884) LEICESTER-Brother Gamble reports five additions. Brother Coleman, who has been out of fellowship a long time, has returned again, which is the cause of general thanksgiving, and we have assisted the following to put on the name of Christ by baptism:—POLLY MARLIN, formerly of the Salvation Army; MARY WEST; WINNIFRED KATE COLLYER (daughter of brother and sister Collyer), and ELIZABETH ANNIE COLE (daughter of brother and sister Cole), all three members of our Sunday school. Brother Archer has returned to Mansfield.—"The lectures are much better attended now, which we think is the result of a daily advertisement, both in a morning and evening paper, as well as the usual weekly advertisement. We pray that God's blessing may follow our work, and, with patience, wait for the manifestation of our Saviour Jesus Christ. Brother Ashcroft gave us a splendid lecture on Sunday, May 10<sup>th</sup>. Subject, 'Religious pretence.'"

(July 1884) DERBY-From the *Visitor* we quote the following:—"On Sunday, June 8<sup>th</sup>, I was at Derby, where there is a prospect of an improved state of things. A number of worthy brethren (associated with bro. Thomas Meakin) have been standing aloof for some year or two in consequence of a misapprehension of duty, the removal of which is likely to lead to re-union. In the evening there was a crowded meeting. I lectured on 'The Mount of Olives,' in its associations with Christ at his first and second Comings. On Monday evening I lectured on 'Hell and the Devil,' and, by request of the brethren, answered a number of questions, the putting of which, being ungoverned by regulations, led to the usual result of confusion and clamour. It was this result in past times that led to the abandonment of questions in Birmingham and other places. Mr. Jackson proposed to put some questions, but having no relish for quibble-spearing on the holy subject he wished to ask about (or indeed on any subject with a man of his propensity), I declined to answer."—R. R.

(September 1884) SYDNEY.—Brother Burton (for brother Bayliss) reports the immersion into the sin-covering name of the following persons:—L. F. PITTARD (18), formerly Congregationalist; and DAVID FRERE, who was for a time amongst the Plymouth Brethren. Also that brother Tunnicliffe has seen and confessed his error in absenting himself from the table, and has been re-admitted. "We have also been strengthened by the arrival from Brisbane of brother and sister Keenan, formerly of Liverpool. Our lectures are well attended, and we hope soon to see some results."

(March 1885) Glasgow.—During the month we have had added to our number on January 17<sup>th</sup> by baptism. DUNDAS WILLIAM PORTEOUS (31), master engineer, and his wife, MARY PORTEOUS (30), both formerly United Presbyterians. This was through the exertions of our bro. G. W. Robertson. Being possessed with a fair share of this world's goods, they have not allowed this to be, as many do, an obstacle in the way, but have openly confessed the name, and cast in their lot with us a poor and despised people, as God's people have ever been. Also on 25<sup>th</sup>, JESSIE NEILSON, formerly Renunciationist, was re-admitted to fellowship, and on 8<sup>th</sup> February, CATHERINE NAPIER, connected with a small meeting here, who believe as far with us, put on the sin-covering name, as did also JOHN JARDINE, he having sufficiently recovered from his accident to enable him to do so.

(March 1885) Nottingham.—Brother Kirkland reports the death of brother Kirk, on Sept. 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1884, after a painful illness. Sister Beals has removed to Walsall, and will likely meet with the brethren at Birmingham. Sister Ward has returned to fellowship, being fully satisfied we hold the truth. She is now in London, but we are expecting she will return to Nottingham shortly. Brother Redden has removed from Mansfield to Nottingham, and is now numbered with this ecclesia. We have also another addition by obedience to the truth, rendered by SARAH ANN ALDRED (47), who put on the sin-covering name by immersion, on Feb. 8<sup>th</sup>. The work appears to move very slowly here, considering the efforts put forth.

(April 1885) Tranent.—Bro. Marr reports an addition to the household of Faith here, in the person of ROBERT HENDERSON (25), son of sister Henderson, whose baptism took place on Feb. 15, subsequent to his having given evidence of knowing and believing the truth as it is in Jesus, and desiring to 314arasse its requirements.—On Feb. 22<sup>nd</sup>, James Henderson, father of the above, was re-admitted to fellowship. On the other hand, there is a loss by removal (to Edinburgh) of bro. and sister Todd.

(June 1885) FULHAM.—Bro. Hutchinson reports that Bro. Pegg has been received back into fellowship. Our report on the subject of inspiration in the *Christadelphian* for March, is somewhat misleading. There has been no formal meeting (as the report implies) on the subject, the secretary only intending to report what appeared to *him* to be the mind of the brethren as gathered.

(July 1885) Spalding.—It seems it ought to have been reported in December last that bro. Allenson had returned to the table (Psa. 133.)

(September 1885) Cardiff. — Brother Symonds reports another addition to the ecclesia here in the person of AMOS SEARLES, brother in the flesh to brother J. Searles—who, after an intelligent profession of the “one faith,” put on the sin-covering name, on July 22<sup>nd</sup>. Brother Albert Hough has been received again into fellowship.

(Excerpt from September 1885) Brisbane.—Bro. Weldon reports the return to fellowship of brethren Sinclair, Watson, and Dallis, on their acceptance of the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection and judgment.

(February 1886) Nottingham.—Brother Kirkland reports the death of sister Boot, the beloved wife of brother John Boot, after a long and painful illness (cancer), during which she was always patient and cheerful. She fell asleep on November 23<sup>rd</sup>, 1885, aged 62 years. Sister Boot had been in the truth about 17 years. Brother Boot has the sympathy of the brethren and sisters in his sorrow and bereavement.—I have also to report the withdrawal of brother Webb, (of New Basford, Nottingham). He, having lost confidence in the reliability of the word, has now taken up the theory of Universalism, and wishes to sever his connection with the Christadelphians. On the other hand, I have pleasure in reporting the return to fellowship of brother Kirk, who, after remaining in fellowship with Renunciationism for some years,

left off attending any meeting some considerable time. In the mercy of God his interest in the truth has again been awakened, and he is now in fellowship with us.”

(June 1886) Spalding.—Bro. Godley reports that Brother Simpson (who has been absent for some time) has returned to fellowship, after concurring in the resolution declaring faith in a wholly inspired and infallible Bible.

(September 1886) Spottsville (Ky.)—Brother Green reports the return to fellowship of brother W. Ingram and sister Ingram, who have been standing aside since the separation in 1882. Others are attending the meeting and manifest considerable interest. Brother Thos. Williams, of Waterloo Iowa, visited in April, and delivered a course of lectures, which were very instructive and interesting to all who are in any wise concerned about a future life, and which, says brother Green, greatly assisted us in bearing our reproach. Sister Annie Ingram, daughter of brother and sister Ingram, has also returned to fellowship. Brother and sister Jodie Griffin are at present sorrowing the death of a son who died a few days ago. Instinctively we sorrow with them. The great panacea for all our woes is close at hand.”

(October 1886) Derby (*Athenæum, Victoria Street, Sundays 10.30 and 6.30.*)—Brother A. Leadbetter, who has not met with us since the division, owing to a misconception of our position, returned to fellowship on September 12th. Brother Davis has removed temporarily from Birmingham to Derby. Brother W. Clark and sister L. Chandler were united in marriage on July 26<sup>th</sup>

(October 1886) Sheffield.—Brother Shemeld writes: “Since last report, two additions have been made to this ecclesia as follows—first, by the return to fellowship of sister L. LEE, who has been absent from the table a long time on account of ill-health and other causes. During her absence the ecclesia declared its position on inspiration, which excluded her until such time as her health would permit her to speak for herself. When she got well, she was made acquainted with what the ecclesia had done, and readily expressed her desire to be united with us on the basis adopted, which was accordingly done. The second addition is by the marriage of sister Rose L. Brown, of Nottingham, to brother H. B. Smither, of Sheffield.

(December 1886) Crewe. — Brother Heath reports: Brother and sister Burden have returned to fellowship. Sister Burden’s absence was voluntary. It was a mistake last month in the condensation of bro. Heath’s report to say she had been withdrawn from. There have been two lectures this month, one by brother Clothier, of Chester (“Who are the Christadelphians”), the other by brother P. Hall, of Sutton Coldfield (“Life and Death.”)

(December 1886) Cumnock.—We have this month to report the removal of sister Reid to Kilmarnock. Our meeting place being above the house occupied by sister Reid, we miss our sister in a two-fold sense. We hope the house will be filled with persons with whom it will be agreeable to arrange with in attending to the needs of our little room. Our reports from this quarter from time to time have not been very encouraging. While others are reporting their additions, we are reporting deductions, but over these things we have no control. Those who break bread with us seldom exceed three or four, but we continue to do so in the hope of better things to come. Whether this may be on this side the judgment seat or not, we know not, but it seems to us that reasonable grounds exist for reunion with some who are separated from us. The principle has been admitted which would admit of this, and it is to be hoped that each of us may have been sufficiently led to the Spirit as to sink in oblivion any *feelings* which would stand in the way. It would be a joy to us to be found again all striving *together* for the hope of the gospel. Brother Wallace has applied for re-admittance to fellowship. Considering his desire for this, and our unconsciousness of any present barrier, we have decided to receive him and expect him next first day of the week.—ALLAN MACDOUGALL.

(December 1886) Derby.—(*Athenæum, Victoria Street, Sundays, 10–30 and 6–30*). Brother Clark reports the return to fellowship, on September 26th, of brother F. G. Webster, who has been meeting with the Partial Inspirationists since the division. The meetings are well attended

(December 1886) Pemberton.—Brother Rylance says:—We are still doing our best for the spread of the truth, though with little result. He adds:—A few months ago, we were divided on the inspiration question, but those brethren that did not meet with us have seen their way to accept the resolutions that were passed sometime ago, and we are now all meeting in fellowship together

(Excerpt from January 1887) Peterborough. — Writing again at a later date, brother Bruce reports an application for re-union from two of those from whom the brethren with him were obliged to separate about twelve months since, on the subject of inspiration. Brother Bruce says: “I feel confident if others would only give their earnest thoughts and search to the subject, as these have done, the truth in Peterborough would soon have free course again. But it is the Father’s moulding process, and we humbly submit.” He appends the application, as follows: “We the undersigned, having come to the conclusion, after careful examination, that your belief and action with regard to the inspiration question were right, desire to unite with you in fellowship; we, believing that the originals of our Bible were inspired by God, thus giving them his authority, and we, feeling that a loose position on this point is both detrimental to the truth and to our individual growth therein.—(Brother) LOUIS S. HARVEY. (Sister) JANE E. HARVEY.”

(February 1887) Kilmarnock.—Brother Haining reports another addition, viz., Mrs. GRAY (60), formerly of the Free Church of Scotland. After giving evidence of her comprehension of the first principles of the oracles of God, she put on the sin-covering name in the way divinely appointed, on the 23rd ult. Sister Reid, who recently removed with her family from Cumnock to this place, has been in fellowship with us since. Brother James McCrindle, at one time of the Irvine ecclesia, now residing in Galston, a village about five miles distant, and who for a short time evinced a disposition to wander out of the way, but came to see his error, is now in fellowship with us, on the basis of a wholly inspired and infallible Bible, Scriptural fellowship, &c.—Our annual tea meeting took place on the evening of the 1st inst., and was conducted in the usual manner. A few brethren and sisters were present from other places. Amidst various drawbacks, we have been endeavouring to bring the truth before the alien. We are still deriving encouragement from one and then another coming in at intervals. We are in much need of a capable public speaker, resident in the place. We cherish the expectation that if our Heavenly Father sees meet so to do, He will provide as required in due course, we doing our part.

(April 1887) Glasgow.—Bro. D. Campbell writes: “We are giving a second course of four lectures in Pollockshaws. This time we have secured the Tontine Hall for the purpose, and the change has had a good effect upon the attendance. The number of strangers present each evening has been very fair and the attention give excellent. Very fair notices of the lectures have appeared in one of the local papers and we are hopeful of being able to create a permanent interest in the truth with God’s blessing. I have to report the removal here of Sister Cree who left us some time ago, but having obtained a situation in Glasgow has returned.”

(June 1887) London (South).—*Surrey Masonic Hal, Camberwell New Road, S.E.—Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays, 8 p m.*—Brother Clements reports that a sewing class has been commenced in connection with the ecclesia. It is held from a quarter to seven till eight o’clock on Wednesdays. The class is made profitable in a spiritual direction by the reading of *Eureka* by a sister. Brother Albert P. Froggat has removed to London from Spilsby, in Lincolnshire, and is in fellowship with us. Our lectures continue to be well attended. Some in the audience come regularly. Our surroundings are a little against us. The buildin we meet in has a meeting-room for Theists, who reject the Scriptures, but yet feel entitled to offer

uninvited worship. In addition to them, a so-called Gospel service is held on Sunday afternoons by a “religious” body. Opposite our hall is a Roman Catholic Church. Hard by is a Catholic Apostolic Church, and one or two other small churches. Besides this, on Sunday the “Salvation Army” people march by, but this, fortunately, is just before our meetings commence. Occasionally, too, we get a visit from some zealous adversary from New Cross, some three miles distant, who delivers leaflets at the entrance. Notwithstanding all this, we go on, knowing that the work is God’s.

(June 1887) Nottingham.—Brother W. H. Kirkland reports: “We have had one addition to our number by the return to fellowship of brother Dakin, who has been away from us for some years. Brother J. Stones and sister Jane Dabell have been united in marriage; as have also brother W. Reddan and sister Florence Lovett. A difficulty has occurred once or twice recently in connection with brethren visiting Nottingham who are unknown to any members of our meeting. To avoid a recurrence of this, we desire all such brethren to bring a note of introduction from the secretary of their ecclesia, or from some brother known to us.”

(August 1887) Leicester.—Brother Gamble writes: “Since our last report, brother Harry Gamble has removed to Leeds, and brother and sister Moore have come to Leicester from Bedford. We are also pleased to announce the return to fellowship of brother and sister Branson, who have been members of the ‘other meeting,’ but now have decided to meet with us upon the basis of a fully inspired and infallible Bible. The lectures for the month have been as follow: June 12th, ‘Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews,’ by brother Gamble; 19th, ‘Resurrection’ (brother Roberts, of Birmingham); 26th, ‘The land of Palestine, with special reference to a recent visit’ (brother Collyer); July 3rd, ‘Immortality’ (brother Weston); 10th, ‘Honour’ (brother Collyer).”

(August 1887) Nottingham.—Brother W. H. Kirkland writes:—“Since our last report, our number has been added to by the obedience of SARAH ANN ABEY (54), the mother of sister Abey; and the return to fellowship of sister Sims, who has been away from us for a number of years.—Brother and sister John Jardine have removed to Birmingham, from whence they came to us.”

(September 1887) Leicester.—Brother Gamble writes: “I have very much pleasure in reporting that during the month the following have returned to our fellowship: Brother and sister T. Clarke, sister Burton, and sister Wright. Brother Harry Gamble has returned from Leeds. On the other hand, the ecclesia has accepted the resignation of brother Warner. We are very thankful that so many of those from whom we separated have seen their way to return, and hope others will shortly do the same.

(Excerpt from December 1887) Swansea. —Against these losses we have to place the return of sister Hughes to our fellowship, she having been separated from us since the division consequent upon the controversy on inspiration.

(January 1888) SPALDING—Brother Jane reports a visit on the 23rd October from brother J. J. Andrew, of London, who, besides an excellent exhortation in the morning, lectured in the evening to a large and attentive audience, on “Christ is coming to restore the throne of David;” and on October 30th, brother Boshier, of London, gave a practical exhortation in the morning and lectured to a good audience at night on “Eternal Life.” Sister Roughton has returned to fellowship again.

(January 1888) NEW BRIGHTON (near Christchurch).—Brother W. Challinor writes: —As the newly appointed secretary of the ecclesia meeting in Sydenham, near Christchurch, it gives me very great pleasure indeed, in entering upon the duties of this office, to report to you the following immersions:—J. BARTLEY, formerly neutral, and Mrs. SALT, formerly Church of England, a resident of Port Lyttelton. These, after an intelligent expression of belief in the true gospel, were duly baptised into the name of

Jesus, our Lord. I am also truly thankful to be able to record upon a full endorsement of our basis of fellowship, the return to our table of brother and sister Scott, and sister McIntyre, their daughter. The above were separated from us by the lamentable division of some seven years ago. They are Christadelphians of long standing, who have grown grey in the faith, and who may be truly termed the pioneers of Christadelphianism in Canterbury, N.Z. Their return to our table is gratifying in the highest degree, and gladly do we open our ranks to receive such a welcome addition. We have others who are interested, the result of which will be duly reported. This is the best side of our intelligence. I will now give you the other.—Brother Wilstead has left to search for work upon the other side of our island; also brother and sister Kirby have left to fulfil a business appointment in Wellington. We can ill spare them or any of our little flock; but we must submit to the inevitable. It will not always be so. We shall not always be so so rudely separated by the force of circumstances. The time is coming when the social arrangements of mankind, at present so miserably inadequate to the feelings and aspirations of our race, will be properly adjusted upon a basis that will yield the highest honour and glory to our Father in heaven, and at the same time will minister to the highest social well-being of universal mankind. Meanwhile we pray, come Lord Jesus, come quickly.”

(February 1888) ABERDARE—Brother Pugh reports the return of brother Roper, after some months absence, with the partial inspirationists; also his wife, who was immersed some months ago at Cwmamon, with a deficient understanding of those things necessary to be known for salvation, and not feeling satisfied with her immersion, was immersed into the sin-covering name on Saturday night last, December 31st.

(February 1888) LEICESTER—Although there have been no immersions during the month, we are pleased to report that three more names have been added to our register. Brother Burton has returned to fellowship, and brother and sister Torr have removed to Leicester from Nottingham. Unfortunately this gain has been counter-balanced by the removal of brother and sister Thos. Clarke, to Foleshill, near Coventry, where we are afraid there are no other brethren at present—and the death of sister Waterfield on December 22nd. She was thoroughly in love with the truth, and, for one nearly 70 years of age, had a remarkably lively interest in things pertaining to it, and looked hopefully forward to the coming of the Lord, when he will reward his servants, as their works have been. We sorrow not as those who have no hope, but cherish the thought that we may again be associated in the Lord’s service, under the beautiful and lasting conditions that will pertain to the accepted.—T. GAMBLE.

(February 1888) SWANSEA—Brother Randles reports the return to fellowship of sister Eusebin Winston and sister Roberts, lately in fellowship with the meeting in the Agricultural Hall. The annual social meeting was held on Monday, the 26th December. A number from the Mumbles ecclesia were present. The children of the Sunday School took tea with the brethren. After the tea, the evening was profitably spent in exhortation and singing. During the month, brother Roberts, of Birmingham, accompanied by sister Roberts, paid a visit to Swansea. Brother Roberts addressed the brethren at the breaking of bread in the morning, and lectured in the evening on “Some interesting aspects of fulfilled prophecy.”

(April 1888) LEAMINGTON—Since last report, we have had a series of lectures by brethren from Birmingham and other parts; and on Sunday, the 4th, by brother J. Andrews in the afternoon, to about 70, and 100 in the evening, at the Albert Hall, Kenilworth Street, where, after several previous futile efforts, we have succeeded in obtaining a very much superior room for holding our regular meetings and lectures, at a trifling extra cost; and we have arranged to commence there on the 1st of April, Easter Sunday, with a lecture by brother J. Andrews; also, if arrangements can be completed, we contemplate holding a social tea and fraternal gathering on the Monday, which will be duly announced. This commencement with the programme of able lecturing brethren we have secured for the ensuing quarter, we trust will be the means (by God’s help) of extending that deep interest which appears to have been created on the minds of a considerable number of those who have listened to the lectures of late. We have a brother W. Shepherd

formerly of Birmingham, who has been here for some time past, and has resumed fellowship with us; also his wife has become very much interested, and has desired a preliminary examination, with a view to immersion. About two months ago, we had an invitation from the Vicar, to join with him and others, on behalf of the funds of the Hospital. Although we could not do this, it gave me an opportunity for handing *Brother Sulley's Temple Book* for his inspection, which he had for two days, when I called and had about twenty minutes interesting conversation with him on general topics, he speaking very highly on the subject of the book. Harmony exists in the ecclesia, and a desire to work together for the spread of that glorious truth, which is the centre of our hope. Further, our financial position is very satisfactory, considering the additional efforts recently put forth, as before stated.—JOHN HUDSON.

(June 1888) BOSTON.—God has been pleased to give us a further increase in our numbers during the month. April 13th, sister CRANSHAW, wife of brother John Cranshaw, of this ecclesia, after an absence of years, has returned to fellowship. April 17th, PHILLIP PINEL (45), formerly Episcopal. April 24th, Mrs. ELIZABETH WALLACE PINEL (28), of Quincy, formerly Episcopal. May 1st, WALTER PHILLIP PINEL, formerly Episcopal, husband of the latter. Other immersions are pending. The cause of so many coming from Quincy is this: we have a brother Adams living there who for some years has been sowing the seed. This seed has taken root in an Episcopal Church, causing its members to see things they never saw before. The result being our increase, which continues steadily. A member of the Episcopal congregation (now a brother) did not like to see one and another leave the church, so he went to the “Rev.” minister to get some passages of Scripture to try to stop them. But, alas, the minister, unable to give that which was required, only heaped hard names, which made things worse for himself and his church. All who ask to come among us have first to pass a strict examination, so that the peace of the ecclesia may not be disturbed by false doctrine or otherwise. Our Sunday School is going on remarkably well. All these things give us fresh energy to continue our labours on behalf of the truth until that pleasant and terrible announcement—“The Lord is come.”

(July 1888) SWANSEA—We are pleased to report the return to fellowship of brother D. J. HUGHES, who separated from us when the division on inspiration took place. Since our last report our lectures have been as follow:—May 20th, “Heaven, where the Righteous are to be” (brother G. Palmer); 27th, “God’s conditions of Salvation” (brother Evans); June 3rd, “Hell, where the wicked are to be cast” (brother G. Palmer); 10th, “Who is this that cometh from Edom” (Is. 63:2), (brother D. Clement).—THOMAS RANGLES.

(July 1888) NEWPORT—We have to report that our number has been increased by the admission to our fellowship of brother and sister Chilton, late of Abergavenny, but now in Newport. They have been for some months in town, but being young in the truth, were undecided as to accepting our basis of fellowship. After due consideration, however, they decided to throw in their lot with us, and now meet with us upon the basis of a wholly inspired and infallible Bible. We have been gratified with flying visits of brethren Evans and Guest, London; the former of whom broke bread with us on Sunday, 8th July, and gave us words of counsel and exhortation. Brother Guest met with us on the following Tuesday evening. For the information of any brethren passing this way, I may say our Meeting room is 1, Caxton Place, Baneswell, Newport.—F. J. CROSS.

(July 1888) SWANSEA—During the month we have been much encouraged by visits from brother Martin Evans and brother Guest, of London. We are also pleased to report the return to fellowship of brother Roberts, Oxford Street.—THOMAS RANGLES.

(January 1889) STOCKPORT—I have the pleasure to report the return to fellowship of sister Beaumont, who left the brethren in 1877 (being then sister Kate Sutton), on the “no-will theory.” Brother Sulley was with us, as announced, on Nov. 25th and 26th, and in the morning spoke words of comfort and edification

to the brethren. On the Sunday evening, notwithstanding the heavy rain we had about the time of meeting, the room was full, every seat being occupied, a few having to stand. On Monday evening we had not quite so many. The greatest interest was manifested throughout. A short report of the lectures appeared in the *Stockport Advertiser*, which I enclose. If you have space you will, perhaps, let it appear in the *Christadelphian*. Our regular meetings have been much better attended during the last few weeks.—W. NORMAN.

(January 1889) CAMP VERDE (Kerr Co., Tex.)—Some time ago brother and sister Kelley were withdrawn from by the brethren of this locality, and it was reported in the *Christadelphian*. We are now very glad to inform you that they are in fellowship with this ecclesia, there not being any scriptural grounds for separation. Meetings are held at the Verde school-house every Sunday for the “breaking of bread” and lecture.—A. BALDWIN

(January 1889) ELMIRA.—Brother George Walker reports the return to fellowship of brother and sister Spencer and sister Hall, upon their acknowledgment of the entire inspiration of the Bible. The meeting now numbers eight, who meet in the Elmira Oddfellows’ Parlour, Richardson’s block, at 11 a.m. on Sundays, for the breaking of bread.

(March 1889) HUDDERSFIELD—Brother Heywood reports withdrawal from brother Frank Cheetham for continued absence from the meeting of the brethren; also from sister Mary Ann Hirst for other reasons. A few are interested, and we are hoping for some fruits to the Spirit.

(April 1889) HUDDERSFIELD—Brother Heywood reports two applications for fellowship; also, that the action in the case of brother F. Cheetham, reported last month, was re-considered on March 8th, at the instance of the Golcar ecclesia, in harmony with the suggestion of the Ecclesial Guide (Sects. 40–42). As the result of the re-consideration (at a joint meeting of the two ecclesias), the resolution of withdrawal was unanimously rescinded, and brother Cheetham, after a two years’ absence, was present at the table on the following Sunday.

(August 1889) LONDON (SOUTH)- *Surrey Masonic Hall, Camberwell New Road, S.E. (Sundays at 9–30 a.m., 11 a.m., and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays at 8 p.m.)*—Brother Purser writes:—“During the month ROBERT HOLDER (19), son of our brother Holder, of Frome, and HENRY LLOYD were immersed into the Saving Name. We are pleased to be able to report the return to fellowship (from the Westminster ecclesia) of the following brethren and sisters:—Sister Ashwell, sister Butt, brother Hammond, brother and sister Leng, brother Leng, jun., brother and sister Ploughwright, sister Shuttle, brother and sister Webb, sister Mary Webb, brother Lenton and sister Culley. The debate (mentioned last month) took place on July 1st and 3rd. Both meetings were very well attended. The lectures for July are as follows:—7th, ‘The Bible divine’ (brother G. F. Lake); 14th, ‘The Destiny of man’ (brother A. T. Jannaway); 21st, ‘Come unto me all ye that labour’ (brother F. W. Porter); 28th, ‘Christian England’ (brother F. G. Jannaway).”

(November 1889) HUDDERSFIELD- Brother Heywood writes:—“The meeting are sorry to lose brother Robert Welshman, who having suffered various misfortunes in which he has had the heartiest sympathy and assistance of brethren, has been compelled to accept a situation in Canada, kindly offered by a brother. He safely arrived with his wife and two children and will be glad to hear from brethren. His present address is, ‘Robert Welshman, care of Mr. Peter Paterson, 44, Allinson Street, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.’ We have decided to reopen the Sunday school. We are having good attention at lectures, and hope for results in favour of the truth.” Brother Heywood also reports the return to fellowship of brother John William and sister Jane E. Edwards, who recently allied themselves with those who refuse to



repudiate while professing not to accept the doctrine of partial inspiration. They were gladly welcomed back after a satisfactory interview.

(Excerpt from December 1881) ROCHESTER CITY (N.Y.)—Brother J. D. Tomlin reports that on Sunday, October 16<sup>th</sup>, HENRY CULROSS (21), put on the sin-covering name; and also SARAH E. CULROSS, his mother, being one of the many who were led into the unfortunate movement for a union without a unity, in August, 1878, between Christadelphians and Renunciationists, which, for the cause of truth in Rochester, is sadly deplored. Sister Culross, upon mature consideration, and on account of heretical doctrines taught at the Renunciationist meeting, and an unsatisfactory knowledge of the things of the name and the doctrine of the devil, was re-immersed, and has reunited with us in full fellowship; Lake Ontario being the typical grave out of which they rose to newness of life, by faith in Christ Jesus. At the examination we followed the “Birmingham Statement of the Faith” item by item. If brethren everywhere would adopt the “Birmingham Statement of the Faith,” each new brother and sister would have it as a reference for their faith and belief when immersed, which might save many doubts and re-immersions.

(Excerpt from January 1882) NOTTINGHAM—Since our last report, a few of the brethren who reside on the Basford side of the town have, with the consent of the brethren meeting in Peoples’ Hall, formed themselves into a separate Ecclesia, and have engaged a room at Basford, in which, a few months past, we gave a course of lectures on Monday evenings. Many appeared to be interested. The brethren desiring to follow up this work are giving lectures on Sunday evenings in the same room, where they also meet in the morning to break bread.—I have great pleasure in reporting the return to fellowship of Sister Goodacre (mother of Sister Annie Goodacre, Norman Cross); also Sister Parks. Both these sisters were left at the Synagogue at the time of division. We have another addition to our number by the removal of Brother John Thomas Hawkins from Grantham to Nottingham.

(November 1882) NORTH LONDON.—(*Wellington Hall, Wellington Street, Upper Street, Islington, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.*) Brother Owler, in reporting the formation of two new ecclesias in London, says, “We are all anxious that it should be widely known that the new ecclesias have been formed on the principles of love and peace and goodwill.” He refers to the circumstances leading to their formation, thus:—“The work has for years been carried on quietly and perseveringly, and the good seed has been carried into the public parks and in the by-ways by zealous brethren; while at various times and in different districts, halls have been hired and the gospel proclaimed. The result of these labours has been recorded in the *Christadelphian* from month to month, and many of those who obeyed the truth resided in districts far distant from our hall. Until recent years the majority of the brethren resided in North London, where our efforts have been chiefly concentrated. The truth, however, has now penetrated south, east, and west. This fact led to a proposal—which was not unforeseen by those who have eagerly and anxiously watched the progress of the truth in the metropolis—to plant another light stand in the extreme west. This proposition was made twelve months’ ago, by brethren residing many miles from our hall, requesting the ecclesia to sanction the establishment of a new one at Fulham. When the proposition came up for consideration, another was made embracing the district in question, and extending it still further. The object of this latter proposal was in effect simply to widen the area, and consequently appealed for co-operation to a larger number of brethren. Both propositions were considered, and the ecclesia (the Fulham brethren consenting) sanctioned the second proposition, as being more likely to maintain a separate organization. The brethren, however, were unable to obtain a hall in the locality agreed upon, and, after waiting some months, the Fulham brethren intimated that they had formed themselves into a separate ecclesia, on the same basis as at Islington. The brethren in southwest London then applied for, and obtained, the sanction of the ecclesia to establish another light stand in the City of Westminster, or neighbourhood. A hall was shortly afterwards obtained, and on Sunday afternoon, Oct. 1, 51 brethren and sisters left us to carry on the work of the Lord, as a separate ecclesia, at Westminster. There are now three ecclesias in London, meeting on the basis of ‘the one faith,’ and all in fellowship. I consider this event unique in the history of

the truth in these closing Gentile times. Meetings have been formed many times, and oft out of contention, or in consequence of error, and have become synagogues of Satan. But in this instance, at least, the arrangements have been made in harmony with the principles of the gospel, and in a fraternal spirit, so essential in provoking each other to love and good works. Brethren visiting London will now have no difficulty in discovering a meeting-place within a reasonable distance of the stations of the principal railways, and will, no doubt, be glad to find all of one body, and members in particular. I have also to announce that Brother and Sister Benton have left London for Southampton; and Sister Geo. Phillips has gone to Peterhead. Brother Franklin, who was immersed in 1873, and has been in fellowship with those holding erroneous views on the taking away of sin, has been added to our number.

(Excerpt from February 1886) Blackpool.—Brother Allen reports the return to fellowship of brother John Booth and sister Mary Booth, of South Shore, Blackpool; also sister Bell, late of Birmingham, who has recently come to reside here.

(April 1887) Crewe.—Bro. Heath reports the return of Brother Wakefield, who had for some time ceased to assemble with the brethren. The brethren have taken a room in the town where they meet for the reading of the Scriptures and exhortation, on Wednesday evenings. The sisters have also commenced a sewing class for the manufacture of articles of clothing for the Jews.—A further course of lectures by Brother Hall is going on. The lectures are noticed in the paper each week, but the religious teachers keep silence. The audiences are good.

(January 1888) LEICESTER—Brother Gamble writes: “I have much pleasure in reporting that brother T. J. Thorneloe, who went away from us in the division about two years ago, has returned to our fellowship

(Excerpt from December 1889) NEWPORT (MON.) - Writing later, (in November) he says:—“We still continue to hold forth the Word of Life in this place to the very few who attend. Sister Brown (who has been separated from us for about three years on the partial inspiration question), has returned to our fellowship. She said in answer to our questions that she had ‘no sympathy whatever with partial inspirationists,’ and that she would abide by our constitution, which was a source of joy to us all. The ecclesia has found it necessary to withdraw from brother and sister Chilton, for maintaining their belief that Paul was not inspired to say that women should not speak in the ecclesia. Also, from brother Harman, for his continued absence from the Lord’s table. Visitors during the month—Brother and sister Waity, from Barry, and brother Appleton from Manchester.” Lectures (sparsely attended).—October 20th, “The white horse, and one sitting upon him: the significance of his name and his dreadful mission;” October 27th, “When shall the meek inherit the earth delighting themselves in the abundance of peace?” November 3rd, “Why will the saints be made kings and priests and reign upon the earth?” November 10th, “What must I do to be saved?”

(March 1891) LONDON (SOUTH)-(Surrey Masonic Hall, Camberwell New Road, S.E., Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays, 8. p.m.)—Our lectures are well attended, and we have the satisfaction of seeing continued interest manifested on the part of several in the glorious things we labour to set before them, and we hopefully look forward to some being, before long, able to exclaim with joy—“Eureka.” We are pleased to be able to state that sister Mary Page, who has held aloof from us since the commencement of the inspiration controversy, has returned to our fellowship. Our sister expressed herself as not having been in doubt from the first as to the inspiration of the whole of the scriptures, but confused as to the position of the brethren generally in the matter. This and the pressure of home influences have kept her from the Table, but she has been unhappy away, and is convinced that hope can only be maintained in the path of obedience. At our quarterly business meeting, which was held on January 11th, a letter was read from a number of our New Cross brethren, giving formal notice of a resolution to form themselves into a separate ecclesia, to meet at the Hammersham Hall, New Cross. We could not see eye to eye as to the

wisdom of starting a new ecclesia at the present time, but we were quite unanimous in wishing them God speed, and decided to make a special effort at New Cross, with the view of giving them a good start as an ecclesia in their efforts to proclaim the truth. We are sorry to part, but we have the hope of unending association presently. We have to announce the union in marriage of the following:—Brother George Brett to sister Ellen Richards, sister to our brother Richards of New Cross, both of this ecclesia (this should have appeared in the November *Christadelphian*, but I regret having omitted the same from my report), also brother Edward Augustus Roberts (son of brother Roberts, of Birmingham) to sister Mary Matthews (daughter of our sister Matthews), both of this ecclesia, and brother J. Betts, formerly of Birmingham, but now a member of this ecclesia, to sister Agnes Smyth, of Bradford. We invoke the blessing of God upon each of them, and pray that the union in each case may tend to the glory of God, and the inheritance of His everlasting kingdom. Lectures for the present month are:—February 8th, “The Kingdom of God, &c.” (brother Porter); 15th, “A Veritable Babel: Catholics, Churchmen, Wesleyans, Baptists, Unitarians, Congregationalists, Salvationists, &c., &c. Are they all Christians? If not, which are? How can I decide?” (brother F. G. Jannaway); 22nd, “An Ideal Church,” as sketched by Mr. Stead in *Great Thoughts*; “Who are the friends of Christ” (brother White).—JOSEPH BELLAMY.

(April 1891) WOLVERHAMPTON.—After about six years of comparative solicitude (yet not alone, for “we cannot be where God is not”), we have at last been gladdened by the fellowship of brother and sister Ford, who have withdrawn themselves from the partial-inspiration meeting in this town and united with myself and sisters Brooke and Jordan, upon the Temperance Hall (Birmingham) basis. We have no room, but break bread at brother Ford’s and my house alternately, where we anticipate having some lectures as opportunity admits. Meantime we pray that endurance may be given unto us to “hold fast the profession of our faith, without wavering,” while *en route* for the kingdom. Heb. 3:14, is also encouraging. We think the *Lightstand Bible* will be “Feet to the lame, and eyes to the blind.” Should it go to press, brother Shuttleworth may relay (if the Lord will) upon sending at least two copies this way.—C. A. BROOKE.

(May 1891) ROCHESTER (N. Y.).—“We have the gratifying information for the household that after an absence of about thirteen years and eight months from fellowship, our brother George Ashton has formally adopted the Birmingham statement of the faith and returned to the fellowship of the ecclesia, and we trust he will now continue faithful to the truth during life. And in addition to this, sister ANNIE HUTCHINSON (30), sister in the flesh of brother William Dolph, having died to sin, has put on the sin-covering name by typifying the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ by immersion. Thus we are letting our light shine, hoping to be able to get many more stars that shall shine in the day of glory of our glorious Lord and Saviour, Jesus the Anointed. Sister Tomlin is still unable to get to meeting, but as she is improving nicely, we trust it will only be a few weeks at most ere she can fill her accustomed place in the meetings.”—J. D. TOMLIN.

(July 1891) ROCHESTER (N.Y.).—After a period of over sixteen years in a false fellowship, sister Jane Morse, sister Helen Robinson, and sister Jennie Hastings have returned to the fellowship of the Christadelphian ecclesia, the cause of separation being the nature and sacrifice of Christ. But although the truth on that subject has been seen for some time, it was not until the discussion of the mortal or immortal emergence from the grave, the great truth of the mortal emergence being so forcibly set forth by brother Thomas Williams, assisted to cause these three sisters to see the false fellowship they were upholding, and they resolved to re-unite with those who are holding fast to the unadulterated truth, and refusing to fellowship those who hold renunciationist views, immortal emergence from the grave, and those who hold the universalist idea that God is so kind and merciful that He will give a further opportunity for obedience after death to those who do not succeed in this dispensation of obtaining the hope of life. The term applied to this view I understand to be called “The fair chance theory.” We have commenced a Sunday school for the children, and any brethren or sisters who desire to join us to aid in the good work are invited, and we also hope to get children of other than Christadelphian parents to attend.—J. D. TOMLIN.

(September 1891) BELFAST—We have to report an addition to the ecclesia here in the person of brother Davis, who three years ago retired from the ecclesia, because it was alleged he favoured renunciationism. The present members of the ecclesia not knowing exactly what his mind was in relation to the case, thought it wise to call upon him, which they did; and found him “not guilty” of what he was accused. He states, “nor never was, but wondered how anyone could say so.” Through his isolation, he has been faithful to the dictates of “the truth,” shewing an exemplary character to his family, with the result that his daughter, aged 27 years, has yielded the necessary obedience to Christ’s commands, under rather sad circumstances, her health being very critical for the past ten weeks, the effects of an attack of influenza. We have very little hope of her recovery. Brother Davis and family—who procured a bath for her immersion in their own home—experience deep sorrow. Since the visit of brother and sister Mahan, of Greenock, we have been favoured with a visit from brother and sister R. Hosie; sister Marion Hosie, of Glasgow, also sister Baxter, of Tillicoultry, and brother and sister Walker, and brother T. Ferguson, from Kilmarnock. When circumstances admit, we purpose a special effort on behalf of “the truth.”—A. BAXTER.

(October 1891) DOVER—Brother Brand reports visits from brother and sister M. Holt, sister K. Holt, brother Crosskey, brother Boshier, brother and sister Porter and sister Richard. Brother Porter, during his stay, delivered two lectures which were better attended than any that have been delivered in Dover. The first was August 30th, “The Resurrection of the Dead,” and the last, September 13th, “Russia and the Jews.” Brother Porter has also been the means of bringing back brother and sister Hemmings, who, for some years past, had been separated on what is known as the No-willist Doctrine. They broke bread with us Sunday morning, September 13th. Brother Porter also went to see two brethren at New Romney, Kent, who had been in the same position. (Brother Porter supplies particulars—see New Romney.)

(November 1891) FROME—Since our last communication we have twice had the able help of our brother Morris, of Romsey, to lecture for us. We still get excellent reports—of our own composing—into the local journals. Though our hearers are few the readers are many. We have reasons for believing they are read by the majority here. Some express their interest in them—but no more. Still we faint not—neither feel weary; labouring in hope, and certain of the end if we are faithful.—I have also to report the removal to this town of brother Lowe, of Swansea, hitherto in fellowship with the Partial Inspirationists. Conversation showed there WAS a difference (1 Cor. 7:6). This was cleared up, and brother Lowe now meets with us on the basis of a Bible wholly inspired and free from error.—O. C. HOLDER.

(January 1892) HAMILTON—I am glad to report the return to fellowship of sister Fotheringham, who left us about six years ago, not being able at that time to see eye to eye with us on the matter of the inspiration of the Bible. She thought then that the question of the wholly inspired character of the scriptures should not affect fellowship. But she has now changed her mind, with the result as above stated. She is a welcome addition to our ecclesia. We have also gained by removal during the month two more—a brother and a sister. The latter comes to us from Kilmarnock, under the name of sister James Craig (see Kilmarnock intelligence last month), and the former comes to us from Strathaven—brother John Mackenzie of that place, he having found employment here. Three more lectures have been delivered here since our last report—one by brother Ritchie, one by brother Campbell, and one by brother Hosie. To meet the growing demand for room, we procured a larger hall (one of the adjacent halls of the building) which was held in reserve, but not used, as our anticipations with regard to increase in our attendance were not fully realised. Nevertheless, we are thankful for the attendance and attention of the alien at our lectures, and we are hopeful of good resulting therefrom. May the God of Israel add His blessing.—HUGH BROWN.

(February 1892) DOVER—We have been much cheered by the return to fellowship of Sister Gatehouse, followed two weeks afterwards by her only daughter, EDITH MARY. Both made good confession, and

were immersed into Christ, Sunday, January 10th, 1892. The Lectures for the month have been “The Evil One,” “Shall the Dead Live,” “Angels,” and “The Royal Family of the Future” (by brothers Brand, Horn, Whitehead, and Hennings respectively).—H. J. ROBBINS.

(May 1892) DUDLEY—We have received two additions to our ecclesia by the immersion (Sunday, April 3rd,) of W. WOODALL (67), father of our brother Joseph Woodall; and by the separation of brother EDMUND BATSFORD from those whom we withdrew from some years ago on account of the inspiration question. He signified his acceptance of our resolution on that subject, saying that he did not understand all that was involved in the partialist view before. We continue to make the best of our opportunity in making known the blessed truth of the Gospel. The lectures for the past month have been as follows:—March 20th, “The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus” (brother E. Challinor, of Birmingham); 27th, “‘Prepare War’: a Divine commandment: what it’s purpose and ultimatum” (brother A. H. Horsby, of Birmingham); April 3rd, “Salvation” (brother A. H. Allen); 10th, “The present silence of God” (brother P. Hall, of Birmingham).—H. HUGHES.

(September 1892) HAMILTON—We are pleased to report that brother Mackay, who for some time was separated from the brethren, has been readmitted into fellowship.—EDWARD HAUGHTON.

(January 1893) DUNEDIN.—Sister Barclay reports news good and bad. As the bad news would be of no advantage, and touches on debatable matters, as we judge from a voluminous epistle from those affected, sister Barclay will not blame our omitting it and giving place to the following:—Brother and sister Ward, brother Benfell, and sister John Holmes have returned to our fellowship. Within the last few weeks three have been added by immersion into Christ, Mrs. Redman, mother of sister Peterson; Mr. Cotton on the 9th of October, and Mrs. Pettie on the 25th of October. Sister Barclay says sister Pettie is sister in the flesh to sister Neilson and myself. Our Heavenly Father has been very merciful in having raised her from what we thought to be a bed of death to health and a hope in the Kingdom. May she ever be mindful of his mercies to her, and serve Him in love to the end.”

(January 1893) KEIGHLEY—It is my pleasing duty to report that sister A. E. Hodgson has returned to fellowship after being separated from us for several years on the doctrine of the atonement. We still hold forth the word of life, but we are able to awaken only a mild interest on the part of the alien. We rejoice that the time is rapidly approaching when the judgments of the Lord will be abroad in the earth, for then the people will learn righteousness and the household of faith will receive according to its works.—A. S. WADSWORTH.

(February 1893) HEDNESFORD—Brother Harry Jackson, jun., reports the obedience of ELIZABETH TWIGGER, wife of brother Twigger; also of SAMUEL COOPER, husband of sister Cooper, jun., who put on the sin-covering name in the way appointed, the former being immersed at Birmingham and the latter at the house of brother Dawes. The number of the ecclesia has also been increased by the removal from Clydach Vale of brethren Berry and Green. The brethren in that locality were as sorry to lose them as the Hednesford brethren were glad to gain them. Also, brother Jackson reports the return of sister Genders to fellowship, she having expressed herself as being fully in harmony with the position taken by the ecclesia on the question of inspiration. Brother Jackson refers to the visit of brother Roberts, on December 4th. In the morning he gave us the refreshing and comforting word of exhortation, and other lectures have been given as follows:—“The events of the past year” (brother Taylor); “The song of the Angels” (brother Dawes); “The ancient Apostolic Faith” (brother Ryder); “The new era” (brother Jardine).

(February 1893) LINCOLN—*Masonic Hall, Sundays: 10.30. a.m.; 6.30 p.m.*—Since our last report, brother George Burnett, who has been meeting with the brethren at the Coffee Palace, has been received

into our fellowship, having expressed his willingness to submit to our basis. Lectures have been as follows:—December 18th, “Utopia: A Statesman’s Ideal Scheme of what might be; will it be realised?” (brother Todd); 20th, “Glad Tidings of Great Joy for all People” (brother Dracup); January 1st, “The Gospel of the Grace of God” (brother Todd); 8th, “Where are Our Dead Friends?” (brother Dracup).—W. H. GREEN.

(February 1893) WARRINGTON—Since our last report two have rendered obedience to the truth in baptism, namely, on November 26th, Mrs. FANNY BARNES (26), sister in the flesh to brother Jennings; on November 30th, ANNIE HARPER (29), wife of brother Harper. Brother Dale, who has been absent from the Table for some time, has also been received back into fellowship. Sister Weller, at one time connected with the Manchester ecclesia, but who has not met with any ecclesia since the inspiration controversy, has also been received into fellowship upon the basis of a pure Bible.—J. HARPER.

(March 1893) TORONTO.—I have much pleasure in reporting the addition of three to our numbers since last writing. Sister CUTLER, wife of brother Cutler, senr., who since the separation has been meeting with the Cecil Hall party, having arrived at the conviction that the attitude we have assumed in regard to partial inspiration is the scriptural one, has thrown in her lot among us. Sister Vanluven has removed here from Victoria Harbour, and brother John Shaw from Muskoka. Both are meeting with us, both are earnest and intelligent believers, and we rejoice to have their company. Many of us have been deeply interested in the articles appearing in *Christadelphian* on “The Day of His Coming,” and our hearts are made glad by the accumulating evidence that the time is at hand for the advent of the Great King to inaugurate His glorious reign.—WM. SMALLWOOD.

(April 1893) KILMARNOCK—Brother McDougall reports that the ecclesia here has recently passed through some trouble, arising from the necessity of withstanding the corruptions of partial inspiration and unsound views of fellowship, &c., &c., &c. The conclusion of his report, however, shows the healing of the trouble to some extent. It arose from brother Clelland’s, jun., association with some who are not in a sound position, which led the ecclesia to refuse its fellowship to him. On this his father and mother, brother and sister Clelland, brother and sister McCrindle, sister Culbert, and brother Culbert, junior, left in sympathy. Subsequently brother Culbert took a similar course to brother Clelland, which had to be similarly dealt with by the ecclesia. “Before sending in our report, the ecclesia was willing that an opportunity should be granted to those who had left, of returning to fellowship if an agreement on Scriptural grounds could be arrived at. Accordingly invitations to a meeting for this purpose were issued, to which they responded. This meeting resulted in brother and sister McCrindle resolving to return to our fellowship. They have now come to the conclusion that in order to be in a position to maintain the truth in its purity and entirety, it was absolutely necessary to avoid having association or fellowship with those who were separated from us on the question of inspiration and fellowship, &c., &c., &c., as they consider that to have fellowship with these would be equivalent to having fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, as they had become convinced by what they had heard while with them, that the Truth is not with them. Through lack of understanding the true character of the situation, they had considered the ecclesia had acted arbitrarily and without Scriptural warrant in refusing fellowship to brother Clelland, junior. But having discovered the facts, they have come to perceive that the ecclesia was not only just in its action in this case but had exercised much patience and forbearance.” Brother MacDougall concludes: “I need scarcely add that it gave us great satisfaction and joy to see brother and sister McCrindle in their old places at the breaking of bread on Sunday, 12th March.”

(May 1893) LONDON (NORTH) *Barnsbury Hall, Barnsbury Street, Islington, N.* —Sundays: 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays and Fridays: 8 p.m.—Brother Owler reports that a great deal of interest has been manifested in the lectures in opposition to Roman Catholicism, and that this has been fostered no doubt by the publication of long reports of the lectures in the *Islington Gazette*, which is largely circulated in the

northern suburbs. Mr. T. R. White, who was inducted into the saving-name about nine years ago, but was too weak to withstand outside influence, has been received once more into fellowship after the necessary preliminaries. Since last report ARTHUR J. ROSE has been baptised into the name of the Anointed Jesus in the appointed way. The quarterly business meeting of the ecclesia was held on March 26th, brother Thompson presiding. The various reports were satisfactory, and the slight deficiency (occasioned by extraordinary circumstances) was nearly cleared off before leaving the hall. On Easter Monday, a tea meeting was held, to which brethren and sisters from different ecclesias were invited. Many availed themselves of the opportunity of meeting the Islington brethren, there being visitors from Camberwell, Cambridge, Grantham, Bexley Heath, Enfield, &c. About 140 partook of tea and at the after meeting, there were close on 200 present. The brethren had made arrangements for an address on "Ancient Jerusalem," explanatory of a large model, and a description of Modern Jerusalem (illustrated by a smaller model) by Herr J. M. Tenz, a gentleman who has been an agent of the Palestine Exploration Fund Society for 30 year. The brethren and sisters were delighted with his exposition of the ancient city, and were greatly interested in the description given of how it had been buried and the means taken to bring hidden things to light. Herr Tenz spoke simply (with a strong Swiss accent), and, although orthodox, in no way affected the ministerial style. He dealt with facts, and these alone. There was Mount Zion, Mount Moriah, Mount Calvary, the Tower of Antonia, and the Palace of the Kings. Some portions of the ancient city were found 80 to 100 feet below the surface, and many of the tablets, pillars, and figures which had been found had done much towards establishing the Bible as the inspired word of the Living God. Herr Tenz exhibited a model of an ancient tomb, and its presentation indicated what the troubled sisters meant when they anxiously enquired, "Who will roll away the stone?" The stone was so fitted that it could be rolled from one side of the entrance of sepulchre to the other; but in the case of Christ it would have been difficult for anyone (except an angel) to have done so without breaking the seal. Questions were asked and answered; and brethren and sisters availed themselves of the opportunity of thoroughly examining the models, both before and after the address. Altogether it was considered by those present that a most enjoyable and profitable evening had resulted, on account of the forethought of the arranging brethren. The Wednesday evening (Bible class) meetings are fairly well attended, and the programme shows that the Mutual Improvement Society, in the course of the quarter, dealt with a variety of subjects. These meetings strengthen the young brethren, and enable them to assist, in other ways, in holding up the hands of those who are responsible for the work of the truth in the district.

(July 1893) HEDNESFORD—Since our last intelligence, LIZZIE BARKER, daughter of brother and sister Barker, has been immersed, and brother Twigger—who has been absent from the table for several months—has returned to fellowship. There has also been another acceptable addition through the coming of brother Charles Berry, brother in the flesh to brother John Berry. He has removed from Barnsley to Hednesford. We have lost by removal to the south of England brethren Ryder and Green, mainly owing to depression in the trade of this district, but there is a probability of their returning for the winter, should the Lord delay his coming. We have commenced an open-air proclamation of the truth. At the conclusion of the Sunday evening lecture in our room, we adjourn to the centre of the town, where the lecturing brother for the day speaks for half-an-hour. This has aroused considerable interest, and we hope will yield permanent results. Lectures for the month have been by brother Dawes, of Rugely, and brethren Allcott, Lawton, and Jardine, of Birmingham.—HARRY JACKSON.

(July 1893) IRVINE—Brother Thomas Mullin reports the return of brother and sister O'Harra, who have been separated since the inspiration division, not that they ever changed their minds with regard to the inspiration of the Scriptures, but they thought that it should never have been a question of fellowship. They now see differently on the occasion of their return; brother and sister Howatson, of Ayr, broke bread with the brethren, who were glad to see them. Brother and sister O'Harra will in future break bread with brother and sister Howatson at Ayr. The Irvine brethren have changed their place of meeting. They now meet in the Temperance Hall from 1 o'clock to 3.

(September 1893) NEATH—Brother Williams has removed to Birmingham; brother Morgan has returned to fellowship after a long absence. We have been visited by brother and sister Gregory, of Birmingham, bringing with them many pleasant recollections of former days, also leaving with us words of comfort and consideration.—Sister Phillips, of Aberdare, during her stay at Neath met with us in memory of our absent Lord. There are encouraging prospects of increase as the results of our feeble efforts to contend earnestly for the truth while we wait the fulness of time for the higher and better order of things.—JOSEPH TUCKER.

(October 1893) BRISTOL *Oddfellows' Hall, Rupert Street. Sunday Morning at 11; Evening at 6.30.*—Brother Charles Henry Gurd, who for the past three years has stood aloof from any meeting, because his mind has been somewhat unsettled by the pernicious doctrines which broke up the late ecclesia meeting here, united himself in fellowship with us on September 3rd, after making a profession of the truth as it is in Jesus. Our desire is that we may with him continue to grow in the knowledge and love of it. On the same date, brother M. Wyllie, of Southampton, helped us with a lecture upon the pre-existence of Christ, which lasted nearly two hours. The wish of this ecclesia is unanimous and emphatic that visiting brethren when lecturing for us shall not exceed one hour. We have been cheered by visits from brother J. Hollier, of Great Bridge, and sister Osborne, of Tewkesbury. Brother Roberts is due in Bristol on Sunday, October 8th, and we shall gladly welcome the company of brethren and sisters living near Bristol who can make it convenient to meet with us then. Lectures: August 20th, "The Kingdom" (brother J. Thomas); 27th, "Babylon" (brother Holder); September 3rd, "The pre-existence of Christ" (brother M. Wyllie); 10th, "Future Life" (brother B. Bradley); 17th, "Is the baptism of the Holy Spirit necessary to Salvation?" (brother O. C. Holder).—W. MILLS.

(December 1893) SPALDING—It is with pleasure we report the return to our fellowship, after adopting our basis, of sister Ward, who withdrew from the ecclesia some eight months since on account of the internal strife and dissension spoken of in our report two months since, which is happily now at an end. We were visited on Sunday, October 29th, by brother H. Barnard, of the North London ecclesia, who spoke to us of the qualifications necessary to enable us to be true sons of God.—A. WATKINS.

(January 1894) LONDON (NORTH) *Barnsbury Hall, Barnsbury Street, Islington, N. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays and Fridays, 8 p.m.*—Brother Owler reports that Miss CHARLOTTE CLUTTERBUCK, youngest daughter of brother and sister Clutterbuck, was baptised into the name of Christ in the appointed way. Mr. William Atkins, who was immersed over twenty years ago, but who has been out of fellowship for several years, signified his desire to return. The interview with the brethren having proved satisfactory, he resumed his attendance at the table on December 17th. Brother Limmer, sen., who has been ailing for many months, died on December 13th after great suffering.

(January 1894) MERTHYR—Brother Samuels has returned to our fellowship after sixteen months' alliance with those who, while professing to believe in a wholly-inspired Bible, are content to remain with others who do not so believe. Brother Samuels' experience has not been a happy one since he left us, having discovered that "the ways of transgressors is hard." He has handed to me a few lines expressive of that fact, which I subjoin. He says, "Long and often I have thought of coming back to your meetings; I am very sorry that I have sinned against the Lord, and against my brothers and sisters; I was never satisfied, and I thought it high time to return to "my first love," seeing the danger I was in separated from my brethren and sisters in the Lord. I am very thankful to my Heavenly Father that He has forgiven me" Brother Samuels did not leave us on the "inspiration" question, or on a point of doctrine, but on a point of discipline, viz., refusing to listen to the voice of the majority of the ecclesia. He has, however, now consented to abide by their decision. We are now six in number, "a feeble folk," experiencing, with others, many of the "ills that flesh is heir to." Young sister Powell, never strong, has been confined to her bed two weeks, with no prospect of a speedy recovery, but she, with ourselves, encourages herself with a



hope of a deliverance when the “Redeemer returns to Zion,” and the sons of God are manifested. Until then, or till we “fall asleep,” we intend to “give all diligence” to make our calling and election sure, by using the means God has graciously put at our disposal, for perfecting that which is lacking in each one of us. Among those means, next to the precious Bible, we read, and greatly value, the works of our brethren, especially *Seasons and Further Seasons of Comfort*, and our monthly visitor, *The Christadelphian*.—BROTHER S. JONES.

(February 1894) PONTYPOOL—Our tea meeting duly came off to the satisfaction of us all. Brethren and sisters were present from Newport, Abergavenny, and Aberdare. We were greatly edified and encouraged by the seasonable words of advice and love from brethren Jefferies, Collard, and Hauler, of Newport; James and Ralph, of Abergavenny; also brother Haines, of Aberdare, and our own brethren. “Behold how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.” It is our pleasing duty to report the addition to our small and humble flock of brother JAMES FEWTRELL, of Nantyglo, a mountainous district about nine miles from this, who, after absenting himself from the table for a considerable time, applied to us for fellowship. After adopting our basis of fellowship, he meets with us in remembrance of the Lord’s death, “until he come.” Brother Fewtrell is a very intelligent brother, and will be of great help to us in proclaiming the light and liberty of God’s word in this dark and degenerate age. The lectures have been:—“Is the belief in Heaven and Hell-going at death popular delusion” (brother E. Schofield, Newport.) Others by ourselves have been:—“The Gospel of Christ,” “Glimpses of the Kingdom,” “The Kingdom of God—what is it?” “The pre-existence of Christ,” and “Hell of the Bible.”—W. WHITEHOUSE.

(May 1894) LINCOLN *Masonic Hall, 10.30 a.m., 6.30 p.m.* Since our last report, brother and sister Dracup, who for some months past have been meeting with the Partial-Inspirationists, have again returned to our fellowship, having declared for a wholly-inspired Bible, and expressed their willingness to abide by our basis of fellowship. The lectures for the past month have been as follows:—March 11th, “Prophecy concerning the Kingdom of God: and its King” (brother Thomas Harley); 18th, “The Altar Service” (brother T. Heaton, of Sheffield); 25th, “The Rich Man and Lazarus” (brother George Harley); April 1st, “Angels, their Nature and Office” (brother H. Fidler, of Nottingham).—GEO. HARLEY.

(May 1894) MELBOURNE.—After an absence of some years, Sister Schneider has returned to fellowship, with desire to renew obedience to the appointment of the Master. On the 5th March, Mrs. GEORGINA SEALES, mother of the brethren Seales, of Pyramid Hill, put on the sin covering name in baptism. The following day she returned home to Birregurra. The subjects of lectures to date have been: “Are Christadelphians Bigots?” “On the eve of some great change”; “Accursed Christendom”; “Scriptural Baptism.”—H. ROBERTSON.

(September 1894) ABERGAVENNY (MON.) -Brother Edwards reports that brother and sister Horton and their son and two daughters have returned to fellowship after holding out for a time because of the haste as they thought, with which we declared for the inspiration of the Scriptures; also that sister Roberts, wife of brother Roberts, has been received back after a period of separation. He also announces the union in marriage of brother Ralph and sister Goodchild, late of Newport. As regards the local operations of the truth, a few young men and strangers are interested. He likewise reports that most of the Abergavenny brethren went to the fraternal gathering held at Newport on Bank Holiday, and were entertained by the Newport brethren with the warmest hospitality. The gathering was, in their opinion, a great success.

(February 1895) BARRMILL—I am happy to report the return of brother William Hayes who has been out of fellowship this some time. He has come through a deal of trouble in the interval which has made him

see that there is no true consolation outside the truth as it is in Jesus. He meets with the brethren here on the basis of a wholly inspired bible.—J. MULLIN.

(April 1895) IRVINE—Brother William Mullin has returned to fellowship after being a long time absent. He is of the same mind with us, believing in a holy inspired and an infallible Bible. Brother James Mullin and sister Mullin have removed to Burmill.—THOMAS MULLIN.

(April 1895) KILMARNOCK—We have had the pleasure of another visit from brother C. A. Bower, of Birmingham. A fortnight's release from duty was again taken advantage of in having the truth publicly proclaimed in a course of four lectures, which our brother Bower delivered as follows:—Sunday, February 17th—Subject, "Life and Death;" Monday, 18th February—Subject, "The Hope of Israel;" Sunday, February 24th—Subject, "Born Again;" Monday, February 25th—Subject, "The Hereafter." The audiences were good, and the lectures were listened to with marked attention. It has been quite a season of refreshing to the brethren and sisters; the truth being so plainly and forcibly put forward was a cause for rejoicing. As a result of our brother's first visit we had last month to report the obedience of DAVID DAVIDSON; and now a cause of joy to us all is the obedience of his widowed mother, Mrs. DAVIDSON, 44 years of age, and formerly of the Established Church, who was immersed into the saving name on the 23rd of February. It is our pleasing duty also to report the return to fellowship of brother John Mitchell, who broke bread with us on Sunday, March 10th. During the delivery of brother Bowers' lectures Mr. Walton Powell appeared in town, and bellowed a good deal about the Christadelphians, with the result that the Christadelphians and their doctrines have been much talked about. The brethren have put out an extract from a Dundee paper, which gives a good representation of the truth, a blank leaf being taken advantage of in advertising our literature. It may be the bellowings of this Gentile against the truth may turn to the truth's advantage.—ALLAN MCDUGALL.

(May 1895) BOURNEMOUTH (WINTON)—Brother Wilkinson reports the return to fellowship of brother Frank Witheridge and brother John Randall, senr., also the acceptance into fellowship after a satisfactory interview, of Mr. and Mrs. Hayes, who were baptized by the afore-named brethren while separated. The brethren will hold their annual fraternal gathering on Whit-Monday, in the New Forest at Brockenhurst—a delightful spot which will be made doubly so by the communion of God's sons and daughters. The brethren will be glad to see other members of the Divine on the occasion. A note, announcing intention to be present, would be received with pleasure by J. WILKINSON, Wimborne Road, Winton, Bournemouth.

(May 1895) YSTRAD—Brother Isaac Smith announces that GEORGE SMITH (formerly neutral), residing at Ferndale, has decided to obey the truth (see Ferndale); also that brother FORD (Porth) and brother SOLOMON BAILEY (of Tylorstown) have been received into fellowship again after a lengthy absence; also that two more brethren from Llanelly have come to reside at Clydach Vale, and break bread with the brethren there. He adds: "We have had a visit from brother Thomas, of Bath, for the purpose of propounding the 'truth of God' to the alien. There was a fair attendance at each of the lectures, which were upon the following subjects, viz.: 'God's Kingdom overthrown—the Jews Dispersed—and the Reason Why,' 'The Future History of the Kingdom of God,' illustrated with diagrams. The lectures were delivered in James' Hall, on Sunday, March 31st, and are the first Christadelphian lectures ever delivered in that Hall."

(December 1895) LLANELLY—It is with gladness of heart the little company here welcomed the return to the table of sister Chester, who has been absent for a considerable period. This was on November 3rd.

(March 1896) CREWE *Club Room, Co-operative Street. Breaking of Bread, 11 o'clock; School, 2.30; Lectures, 6.30 every Sunday. Bible-Class, 8 p.m., Tuesday.*—Since our last report we have received an application from our brother Guest for re-fellowship, whose nonattendance at our morning meetings gave

the brethren cause of action. We are glad to report a good attendance at the morning meetings, and we have given those who do not appear to realise the importance of their position and privileges, an urgent and anxious appeal to wake up. We also desire to intimate that we purpose, if the Lord will, holding our fraternal gathering on April 6th (Easter Monday), and we give the brethren a general and cordial invitation to be present. We have invited brother J. S. Dixon, of Leicester, to lecture on the Sunday, April 5th, and also to be present on the 6th. Subject for consideration to be The Daily Reading. Tea on tables 4.30 p.m. I may state that we should like as early intimation as possible from those brothers and sisters who intend to visit us, and also to know whether they would be staying at night, so that provision suitable can be arranged for. My address is 99, Victoria Street, Crewe. Lectures since last report:—January 19th, “The New Jerusalem” (brother W. Heath); 26th, “The Gospel of the Kingdom” (brother J. Wharmby); February 2nd, “Jesus Christ a King” (brother W. Heath); 9th, “Jerusalem, Past, Present, and Future” (brother J. Atkinson).—GEO. J. MAY.

(March 1896) SLEAFORD—After a lengthened silence, we at last make a break; we wish it was for a more cheering duty we do so, but our Heavenly Father knows best. We bow our heads and say, “But we trusted in Thee, O Lord: I said, Thou art my God. My times are in Thy hand.” We have sorrowfully to report the loss we have sustained by the death of our dear sister Lowe, sister in the flesh to sister Fawcett, who died January 5th, at Ferrington, St. Clements, near King’s Lynn, to the intense grief of her relations and friends, and was laid to rest at Sleaford January 9th, amidst many tokens of sorrow and esteem. Our sister was better known amongst the brethren and sisters as sister Darnill, immersed at Dudley, May, 1890, coming to Sleaford shortly afterwards, where she stayed some considerable time; but subsequently she removed, for business purposes, to King’s Lynn, where she met and married a Mr. Lowe, who, unfortunately, was not a brother, and by so doing placed herself out of fellowship with the brethren of Christ by thus ignoring the command, “To marry. *only in the Lord.*” This was a sad time for those who knew her best, and was a source of grief untold; yet we are so pleased to make known to all the Household of Faith that the consequences of this act came home to her fully, and realising her position most acutely, she sought forgiveness, and in August of last year she came to Sleaford, and applied for fellowship again, acknowledging the wrong done to her Lord and Master, and the unscripturalness of the act. We responded by giving to her again the right hand of fellowship with much thankfulness, and her joy and thankfulness was most manifest. We can bear testimony to her sincerity, and rejoice at the prospects we have of seeing our dear sister again soon, “when he (Christ) shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe.” She leaves a baby ten months old, which will be taken care of by sister Fawcett. How transient is life! So short has been our dear sister’s race for eternal life, we do well to take heed unto our ways that we come not short in our standing in relation to the Kingdom of God.—J. KIRK.

(April 1896) NORMANTON—The brethren and sisters in this town are still meeting together every first day of the week to remember our Lord’s death, and to speak words of encouragement one to the other. Although we have no additions to report by immersion, we have to make known that our sister Dowkes, who has been absent from the table for a long time, has returned, and we received her into fellowship on Sunday, March 8th. I have also to report that brother Frank White and sister Francis Froggatt were united in marriage on December 26th, 1895. It ought to have been made known earlier, but has been overlooked. Our brother and sister have gone to reside at Featherstone, which is five miles from our meeting-place, which is rather unfortunate for both them and us.—S. K. EAMES

(June 1896) IRVINE— Writing later, brother Mullin says:—Brother Wiliam Mullin, who has not been in fellowship with us for a considerable time, has been received into fellowship. The earnest prayer of the brethren here is that our brother may hold fast until the end. Our lectures for the month of April have been as follows.—23rd, “The True God not a Trinity, but a Unity” (brother D. Campbell, Glasgow); Sunday, 26th, “Born Again: Popular Belief Contrasted with Bible Teaching” (brother Robert Hosie); 28th, “The

Bible Doctrine of Everlasting Punishment” (brother D. Campbell). We had the pleasure of the company, on Sunday 26th, of a number of brethren and sisters from Kilmarnock, and some from Barrmill, at the meeting for breaking of bread. Brother Hosie gave an excellent address. We had tea in the hall, and afterwards sang hymns and psalms. The afternoon was everything that could be wished for, one that filled our hearts with gladness.—ROBERT MULLIN.

(July 1896) BOURNEMOUTH (WINTON) -It is with pleasure I report the return to fellowship of sister Emma Ludlam, after several years’ absence. She was brought to realise her true position by means of the sad and sudden death of our sister Edith Ludlam last July. We hope she may hold fast unto the end. We have been made to rejoice again by two more obeying the truth in baptism—May 14th, Mr. TAYLOR (23); May 22nd, Miss MARSH (28), both formerly Baptists, members of Mr. Minifie’s congregation. We shall have more fruit to report next month from the same quarter. Brother Reeves has removed to Poole from Salisbury, and is meeting in fellowship with us. Visitors during the month have been—Sister Storer, Derby; sister Reynolds, London; and brother Chittenden, Brighton. The Winton Christadelphian Mutual Improvement Society held a tea and meeting on Whit Monday in a field, amongst beautiful trees. The day being fine, there was a good number of brethren and sisters, children, and interested friends. Nearly 90 sat down to tea, and the meeting afterwards was most profitable, singing of hymns and reading the Word, with some good sound counsel to hold fast the Word of Life, to let our light shine, and to help each other in the race for life. These little gatherings give us but a foretaste of what is coming. Meanwhile, we wait in patience.—J. WILKINSON.

(July 1896) NUNEATON-We were again favoured and cheered by the presence of a goodly number of brethren and sisters to our annual tea here on Whit Monday. There were about 108 sat down to tea, 50 of whom consisted of brethren and sisters from the following places, viz.:—Liverpool, Leicester, Leamington, Coventry, Tamworth, Birmingham, and Acock’s Green. The after-meeting commenced at six p.m. Our hall was well filled, when the things of the Spirit were well-displayed by brethren Gamble, Atkinson, and Cole, of Leicester; brother Islip Collyer, Glenfield; brother James Allen, of Birmingham; brother Smith, of Acock’s Green, and brother Corbett, of Leamington. It also gives me great pleasure to announce the return to fellowship of our brother Turney. During the month we have been visited by sister Lowe, of Birmingham; and brother Stockley, of Glenfield. Our lectures for the month are as follows:—May 13th, “Is Heaven the Dwelling-place of the Righteous?” (brother Pegg); 17th, “The whole Armour of God” (brother Wiggett); 24th, “Seek First the Kingdom of God (brother Todd); 31st, “The Earth’s Destiny as Divinely foretold” (brother Warrender).—W. G. HANDS.

(October 1896) DUDLEY.—Brother Hughes reports the removal of brother and sister Bennett, of Sedgley, to Wolverhampton; also that sister Golder, jun., has removed from Birmingham to Dudley. Brother and sister E. Woodall have returned to fellowship after meeting for a time with the partial-inspiration brethren, which they now regret. The brethren have been compelled to withdraw from brethren Bennett, Williams, and Goodwin, for prolonged absence from the table.

(January 1897) SPALDING.—Brother Jane reports the return of sister Ward to fellowship after accepting the basis. Brother Curry, of Pontefract, lectured November 15th on “Unending Life.”

(February 1897) DERBY.—(*Athenæum, Victoria Street. Sundays, 10.30 and 6.30; Wednesdays, 8 p.m.*) The ecclesia have decided to re-admit brother R. Wood to fellowship. Brother Clark has removed from Allentown to Derby, but is keeping up the week-night Bible-class at the house of brother Barker, which is well attended by interested neighbours.—W. CLARK.

(February 1897) YSTRAD.—“Last month’s intelligence from this place notified the withdrawal from brother J. Smith without stating any of the facts connected with the case, and to rectify matters a little, it

should be made known that the withdrawal from the brother in question was an unscriptural procedure, which brother J. Thomas, of Bath, succeeded in pointing out to the brethren here, with the result that the brethren rescinded the unscriptural resolution, and received brother J. Smith back into fellowship. Brother J. Smith has subsequently removed from Ystrad to Ferndale to reside, and meets with the brethren and sisters there. This is the time when mistakes do occur. But Christ is coming, who will not judge after the sight of his eyes, nor after the hearing of his ears, because he is able to discern the very innermost thoughts and intents of the heart, consequently he will judge a righteous judgment. No fear of mistakes then.”

(April 1897) LEICESTER.—Brother Gamble reports that after a separation of several years, brother and sister F. S. Herne have returned to fellowship. The lectures here and at Glenfield are regularly delivered to attentive audiences, but at present we have no further additions.—“On Good Friday, we shall hold our usual tea-meeting, if the Lord permit, and shall be pleased to have the company of any brethren and sisters who can make it convenient to attend. Lunch will be provided for those coming from a distance, in the Co-operative Hall, High Street, and tea will be on the tables at 4.30. Subject for the meeting after tea: ‘In your patience, possess ye your souls.’”

(June 1897) SWANSEA.—On Good Friday our usual tea-meeting was followed by some excellent addresses and hymns. Brethren from Llanelly and Mumbles took part. We have the pleasure to report the return to fellowship of brother and sister Meade, and sister Louie Winston, who withdrew from us last year, during the Kingdom of God controversy. After an interview with our examining brethren, in which the brother and two sisters unequivocally took up the right position, they were unanimously recommended for fellowship. We are also glad to add that JAMES JENKINS (19) was immersed on the evening of the 13th instant. The Sunday evening lectures have been continued as usual.—T. RANGLES.

(October 1897) BRISBANE.—On July 4th, brother and sister Wolstencroft were received back to fellowship, and on July 14th brother and sister Wheeler, who were out of fellowship for some years were received back. We have answered the challenge Mr. Long, late of Glasgow, gave us, and a committee has been appointed by the ecclesia, viz., brethren Butler, Lewis, and Arnott to deal with the matter, and they have asked Brother Bell, of Sydney (Albert Hall) to come up, and he has very kindly consented. The debate is to last four nights. It will be taken down in shorthand and published, and for this and all other expenses the committee will require pecuniary assistance. We have brother and sister Strout, of the Albert Hall, Sydney, with us; also brother Butler, of Gympie Queensland, visited us. During the month lectures have been delivered as usual. Lectures have also been delivered in the Kumley Hall, South Brisbane, on each Sunday night. On July 24th, 1897, the following were immersed into the sin covering Name, after witnessing the good confession:—Mrs. ALICE MARGARET BELL (38), Life Believer; Miss MABELLA THOMPSON WRIGHT (23), Life Believer; and her sister Miss EVA ELIZA WRIGHT (19), Life Believer. God grant they may be found perfect at the appearing of the anointed Jesus.—ROBERT W. FERGUSON.

## **INDIVIDUALS RECEIVED INTO FELLOWSHIP BY ANOTHER ECCLESIA**

(Excerpt from April 1866) MUMBLES—The immersions referred to last month took place on Sunday, Feb 19, and were those of Rachel Delve, Ellen Hayward, and John Evans. The last belongs to Swansea, and will meet with the brethren there.

(Excerpt from November 1866) BIRMINGHAM.—The ecclesia has received another addition during the month, through the removal of brother J. Turney, of Nottingham, to Birmingham, where it is his intention

to spend the rest of the days of his pilgrimage. In the same period, Maria Henry has resigned her connection with the brethren, in consequence of the attitude taken by the latter toward the Dowieite corrupters of the truth at Edinburgh.

(April 1868) NEWCASTLE.—It appears from a letter received from brother Young, (by brother Dean, of Birmingham,) that there is some likelihood of a Christadelphian ecclesia being formed in Newcastle. For some time past, says brother Young, there have been certain men who held part of the truth in a Campbellite way; these, brother Dunn (immersed at Halifax last year,) has come in contact with, and is likely to succeed in putting them right. Three have been re-immersed; particulars next month. They have been holding meetings for some time past, but brother Young has not yet broken bread with them, desiring to feel his way carefully, and to be sure that they build on a right foundation. He has hope of much good being ultimately done in Newcastle

(February 1869) CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.—Brother W. A. Harris, writing December 11<sup>th</sup>, says the Christadelphians who have recently separated from the communion of the Dowieite or Wilsonite party of that place, number 30, sound and true in the judgment of the writer. The Wilsonites he says are intensely opposed to judgment of the saints, and characterize the doctrine as damnable heresy. A recent addition to the Christadelphians from this body had been immersed in a partial knowledge of the truth, and discovering on investigation, that his faith did not embrace all that is included in a Scriptural profession of faith, he determined to be re-immersed, and join the Christadelphians. On discovering the defect of his position before leaving the Wilsonites, he began to urge his conviction upon those with whom he was in fellowship; but met with nothing but opposition from those styling themselves “brethren of the one faith.” They, however, preferring unity at any cost, delegated two of the leading brethren to persuade, if possible, Brother Norton to remain in fellowship with them. They said he could stay with them, even if he did not hold their views, “thus,” observes Brother Harris, “they were willing to fellowship what some of their body called damnable heresy, rather than allow division to occur. The Christadelphians are unmoved by the bitter things said about them by those they have left, and are only too glad now that they have no connection with such a sickly body, who seek to live in harmony at the expense of the welfare of the truth, and who do not observe the line of demarcation to be broadly drawn in these days between that truth and the apostasy. The Christadelphians know what they believe, and do not hesitate to repudiate any who, under the guise of friends, are in reality most deadly enemies to the truth, and who, ‘by good words and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple.’”

(April 1869) EDINBURGH.—Brother W. R. D. Gasgoyne writes to say that brother Steele is preparing a printed statement in defence of his position, in relation to the late disruption in the ecclesia. Brethren desirous of seeing it, can procure it on application to brother A. Tait, station master, Portobello, near Edinburgh.

(May 1869) GLASGOW.—Bro. Clark writes, April 19<sup>th</sup>, to say that the addition reported last month (Mrs. Campbell) was not a case of immersion, but simply accession. Sister Campbell was immersed ten years ago on a Scriptural confession of faith, but had for some time been out of fellowship.

(Excerpt from 1870) EDINBURGH. — He mentions that the brethren who formerly met in Leith have resumed their meetings there. Brother and sister Tait, are again united in fellowship with the brethren at the Temperance Hall.

(Excerpt from October 1870) LIVERPOOL. — Against these additions is to be placed the removal of sister Grant to Leeds. (If sister Grant will apply to brother A. P. Willis, grocer, Armley, near Leeds, she will obtain introduction to the brethren.)

(January 1871) CHELSEA, (Mass.)—Brother J. Bruce, writing November 25<sup>th</sup>, mentions putting the ecclesia in communication with brother Hodgkinson, from Scarborough, on his arrival from Europe by the *Calabria*. Bro. Hodgkinson wrote, and afterwards visited them, expressing his pleasure at finding an already-formed ecclesia so near Boston, his place of habitation. Brother Hodgkinson writes the Editor, December 8<sup>th</sup>, in similar terms.

(Excerpt from September 1871) SWINDON.—Brother E. Turney writes as follows: “Swansea, Mumbles, Westonsuper-Mare, and thence to Swindon, according to brother Andrew’s instructions, to see George Haines about baptism. A few months ago, Mr. Haines fell upon some Christadelphian publication which upset his Plymouth Brotherism, and he went on in patient search of the truth till he found it. I found him well posted in first principles, and, being very anxious to obey, assisted him on Thursday night, the 20<sup>th</sup> inst. The public swimming bath was full of men and boys, and not at all available for “the washing of water by the word.”

(Excerpt from June 1872) NOTTINGHAM. — There have been added to the fellowship of the ecclesia, Samuel Richards and his wife, Martha, who have been separated from the brethren for some years, under circumstances similar to those existing in the case of sister Wood, whose return was announced two months ago. Having, after examination of the subject, accepted the doctrine of resurrection and judgment as taught by the brethren, they were desirous of again meeting with them, and were received into fellowship on Sunday, April 7<sup>th</sup>.

(August 1872) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Mycroft, writing July 17<sup>th</sup>, reports six more additions, five by immersion, namely, MOSES TERREY (22), formerly Church of England; JOSEPH TUFFLEY (29), formerly Methodist; MARY JANE FISHER (47), wife of brother Fisher, formerly Methodist and much opposed to the truth, but convinced at last, by a patient study of the word, that her former position was enmity against God; SARAH WHITE, for nearly thirty years a Methodist; HANNAH HOLMES (21), formerly Methodist. The sixth is Sarah Clarke, who obeyed the truth years ago, but removed from the brethren at the same time as those previously reported; all differences being now at an end, she re-united herself with the brethren in fellowship on Sunday morning, July 14<sup>th</sup>. The additions mentioned last month, as having occurred during the year, refer to what has gone of 1872, and not to the last twelve months.

(February 1873) CHICAGO (Ill.)—Brother Harris reports that the ecclesia have received again into their fellowship brother and sister Ryder, on their confession of wrong and desire to do right in the future.

(Excerpt from March 1874) NOTTINGHAM. — Sister Kirkland’s father was a minister amongst the sect; and at the time of brother Kirkland’s immersion, some eighteen months ago, she was strongly opposed to the truth, which had made a separation between them. Brother Kirkland prayerfully and patiently waited, and worked in the hope she might be led into the way of peace, and he has been rewarded. She was beginning to awaken to the truth when the Renunciationist heresy arose. She was somewhat retarded by the division, but it did not permanently harm her. It caused her to look more deeply into the subject, and she now appreciates it more than she otherwise might have done.

(Excerpt from July 1874) BIRMINGHAM.—Brethren Edwin Reed and Charles Broughton having seen and acknowledged the error of Renunciationist doctrine and fellowship, have returned to their place at the table, after an absence of eight months

(July 1874) HAMILTON.—Brother Faulk and his family have left this place for England. The brethren miss him much, as he had begun to be useful at the meetings. Brother Farrar preceded him by a month or two. Brother Farrar left Hamilton with Renunciationist convictions; but shortly after his arrival in England, he wrote to brother Pitt, of Hamilton, that the reconsideration of the question had resulted in a

change of mind. "Brother Bairstow, of Halifax," he says "was the first one with whom I conversed, and I must confess that the position I took at Hamilton could not be upheld by me." The article written by brother J. J. Andrew in the *Christadelphian* on the two Adams was the one that convinced me that I was wrong; also your kind letter that I had received was to the point. The verse you quoted in Rom. 6:9, is very conclusive, and cannot be overthrown. I had simply to admit that I was wrong, which I did not like to do."

(Excerpt from November 1874) BIRMINGHAM.—Then the brethren have been gladdened by the return of bro. William Shelton, who was drawn aside by the Renunciationist schism for a time; but has at last had his eyes cleared of the dimness caused by the leaders of that mischief.

(Excerpt from February 1876) BIRMINGHAM.—During the month, obedience has been rendered to the truth by CHARLES DOE (37), printer, of Yeovil, formerly connected with the Plymouth Brethren, whose unscriptural and unreasonable sentiments he is slowly learning to unlearn. Brother Doe had previously been immersed in ignorance of a great part of the truth.

(January 1878) LEICESTER.—Brother Yardley reports:—"On the 21<sup>st</sup> ultimo it was our privilege to immerse into the saving name, EMILY DUNMORE (22) (sister in the flesh to brother Dunmore), formerly connected with the Wesleyan body; also on the 5<sup>th</sup> inst., ANN COLTMAN (59), who nearly all her life has stood aloof from the apostacy, failing to see any consistency in its teachings. When she heard of the truth, it exactly met her case. She was struck with the harmony of its doctrines, and is now no longer in the dark as to the necessity of a resurrection, knowing that the righteous dead are in their graves and not in the realms of bliss beyond the glittering starry sky."

(March 1878) TAUNTON.—Brother Veysey communicates intelligence, which, it appears, was sent before, but overlooked (through being sent to the house instead of the office). He reports the baptism of Mrs. NEWSOME, matron of a large college at the outskirts of the town, and of brother SMITH, a shoemaker, formerly neutral, whose wife is also interested. Sister Newsome was formerly in the establishment, but lately about to join the Plymouth Brethren, was led to hear brother J. J. Andrew, last summer, and steadily advanced in the knowledge of the truth. "These two put on Christ with another brother, JOHN KNOWLES GRIFFIN, mason (neutral), on New Year's Day, when all the saints who possibly could, met for tea and edification in our school room. Another has twice asked for immersion, but we wait to have the benefit of brother Ashcroft's examination of her."

The Taunton ecclesia has received an unexpected addition (*pro tem.*, at all events) owing to the immersion, during the Christmas holidays, of three of the boys now in the school—the SON of brother R. D. Robertson, of Liverpool, not yet reported; the son of brother Collyer, of Leicester, reported this month; and the son of the Editor of the *Christadelphian*, reported last month. These immersions all took place independently of each other, in different towns, and without any knowledge of mutual intentions until the fact was accomplished. They were the result of individual desire in each case, which had been repressed rather than otherwise, from a fear lest it might be prompted by human friendship rather than a sense of what God required at their hands. Manifest sincerity and intelligence in each case compelled the removal of all impediment. The obedience of the lads has been the cause of joy and thanksgiving to all concerned.

(January 1868) WHITBY.—Brother and sister Shuttleworth (transferred from Halifax) have settled here, taking up their abode at 8, Grey street. Breaking of bread has for the meantime been suspended among the friends of the truth gathered by the labours of Mr. Dealtry. The reason of this is that they have seen the fallacy of the belief upon which their immersion was based, that Jesus was the son of Joseph; and are progressing toward a mature comprehension of the truth in its several details. Upon this new foundation



they desire to place themselves, and will shortly be re-immersed and organized as a Christadelphian ecclesia.

(Excerpt from July 1869) LEITH.— Writing again on June 15, he reports another accession by the immersion of WILLIAM KER, who like brother Dowler, (the last reported addition) is employed in the same printing office as brother Paterson, in Edinburgh. He has come to a decision after considerable and painstaking study, and is expected to prove an acquisition. The Leith brethren, after negotiations with that part of the late Edinburgh ecclesia now meeting in the Temperance Hall in connection with brethren Smith and Gascoyne, have come to a friendly understanding and written agreement of fellowship with them on the basis of identity of attitude on “the questions at present in dispute among the professors of the truth in this locality;” but consider it best for the interests of the truth meanwhile to maintain their separate organization in Leith.

(July 1877) DALKEITH.—Brother Stokes reports an addition in the person of brother WILLIAM NOBLE, of Bonnyrigg, who for disorderly walk was withdrawn from last July. Having sought our Father’s forgiveness, he desired and took his place at the table on the 3<sup>rd</sup> instant.

(Excerpt from January 1878) HUDDERSFIELD.—Brother Heywood reports the immersion of three persons into the saving name during this month, at the Lockwood Baths, viz., EDMUND SCHOFIELD, (31), bookkeeper, and his wife, SUSAN SCHOFIELD (29), and SARAH DRAKE (31), wife of brother George Drake. He adds, “our brother and sister Schofield reside at Slaithwaite, three miles from Huddersfield, and some two years ago were in fellowship with Renunciationists at Mumbles.

(Excerpt from February 1878)LONDON.—Brother Elliott reports:—“It is my pleasing duty to forward particulars of the following immersions, viz.:—Nov. 21<sup>st</sup>, SISTER PEGG (wife of brother Pegg), formerly Independent; December 19<sup>th</sup>, HENRY EASTWOOD (son of sister Eastwood), who has attended the lectures at the hall for a considerable time past; December 16<sup>th</sup>, Mrs. ELIZABETH BORE (mother of the brethren Bore), formerly member with the Plymouth Brethren; December 23<sup>rd</sup>, sister Mrs. HARRIETT SENNESCALL (mother of brother Keats), latterly attendant at Mr. Spurgeon’s Metropolitan Tabernacle; and sister DIANA ANGUS, late member of the Free Church of Scotland. Sister Peebles, from Edinburgh, and sister Elliott (late sister Waring), from Swansea, have recently removed to London, and are now in fellowship with this ecclesia.

(Excerpt from April 1878) GLASGOW.—Brother John Leask writes, “Since we last wrote you, we have the pleasure to announce the undernoted additions to our number. The first is that of bro. JOHN BRECKENRIDGE, who has thought fit to follow in the footsteps of his sister’s wife in leaving the Stockwell Street (now Eglinton Street) meeting, and joining himself to ours, breaking bread with us for the first time on Sunday 27<sup>th</sup> January. The second is Brother Jarvie, from Aberdeen, but, being on the railway, may only be here for a short time. Other four have also been added from Montrose (a city probably in Scotland), viz., brother and sister Johnstone and brother and sister Lang, whose employment has brought them thither. I may here state that brother Maxwell has also had to remove from Montrose, and is now alone in Kinghorn, in Fife. His sister wife, however, will be with him shortly.

(June 1878) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland reports: “During the month, brother John Boot and sister Boot (his wife), whom we left at the synagogue, carried away with the theory introduced by David Handley, have returned to fellowship with the brethren who have held fast the truth. After our division, our brother and sister B. with many others similarly deceived, were re-immersed, but in the mercy of God they have been enabled to see the error into which they had fallen, and for months past, have been in a very unhappy condition. They at length came forward and asked to be received into fellowship. Accordingly, as it is our rule in all such cases (and from which we never deviate), they were asked to

meet the brethren for the purpose of ascertaining if anything existed to prevent such fellowship. After a very satisfactory interview, in which they gave clear evidence of their deliverance from Renunciationism, they expressed their sorrow for having been re-immersed, and rely only on their first immersion as the one baptism. I have also to report that sister Lucy Ceedle has removed from Mansfield to Nottingham, and has been added to our number. On Tuesday in Easter week, we had a social tea meeting, a goodly number of the brethren and sisters being present, also a few strangers. After tea the time was spent in thanksgiving, exhortation and singing. Many of the brethren said it was the most profitable meeting of the kind that had been held in connection with the truth here.”

(August 1878) DUNDEE.—Brother Ker reports: “We have had two added to our numbers, I am glad to say: JOHN CRICHTON (attached to no religious denomination) and JOHN MUIR (formerly belonging to the Plymouth Brethren). The immersion of the former into the saving name took place on the morning of April 28<sup>th</sup>, and that of the latter on May 5<sup>th</sup>.

(Excerpt from December 1878) RIDDINGS.—Brother Wragg announces the obedience to the truth of EMMA TATTON (26), wife of bro. Tatton, who put on the saving name on Saturday, Nov. 2<sup>nd</sup>. Sister Hannah Board, from the London ecclesia, now meets with us, being resident at Pilsley, near Clay Cross, a few miles off from Riddings. Since bro. Vernon’s return from Edinburgh we have lectures in our room every Sunday evening, which are well attended, and we have a few interested.

(February 1879) CAVERSHAM.—Brother W. W. Holmes writes: “Since my last communication obedience has been rendered by MRS. REBECCA PARTON (27), wife of brother Parton, on the 16<sup>th</sup> October, her love for and knowledge of the truth being fully attested. She formerly belonged to the Plymouth Brethren.”

(October 1879) CHICAGO.—Brother J. Norman reports “the removal of our sister Selina Spencer (sister in the flesh to John Spencer), from this city to Northampton, England. She has been here about three years, during the first of which she learned and obeyed the truth, and since that time continued in the faith and hope of the gospel; a sister highly esteemed among us, and whose departure we regret. We desire to recommend her, through the *Christadelphian*, to the confidence and fellowship of any ecclesia she may chance to meet with in her native country.”

(Excerpt from January 1880) GLASGOW.—Brother Nisbet writes: “Since brother Leask wrote last month, we have had several additions to our number here. On Sunday, Nov. 30<sup>th</sup>, MR. JOSEPH YOUNG, miner, Kilsyth, who came to a knowledge of the truth through brother Jas. Jarvie, junr. (who has been sojourning in his native village of Kilsyth, since his partial recovery from the effects of a broken leg), was introduced into Christ by baptism; on the Sunday following, Dec. 7<sup>th</sup>, MRS. BIGGAD, wife of brother Biggad, put on the sin-covering name; and since then, brother Charles Hogg and wife, and their daughter Ann, who were in fellowship with the Tranent brethren, some four years ago, have applied for fellowship here, and will hereafter break bread with us. [Compiler’s Note: Fellowship singular from one ecclesia singular to another ecclesia singular]

(January 1880) GREAT BRIDGE.—Brother Hollier reports that the lectures for the month have been as follow:—Nov. 2<sup>nd</sup>, Holy Spirit.—(Brother Wolliscroft). 9<sup>th</sup>, The blood of Christ.—(Brother Bishop). 16<sup>th</sup>, Religion.—(Brother Millard). 23<sup>rd</sup>, Equal to the angels.—(Brother Attwood). 30<sup>th</sup>, The Spirit in its various aspects.—(Brother Parsons). Dec. 7<sup>th</sup>, The Millennium.—(Bro. Taylor). Brother Samuel Davies, of Brierley, and sister Lizzie Webb, of West Bromwich, were united in wedlock, on the 1<sup>st</sup> inst.; they will in future meet with the Brierley Hill ecclesia.

(Excerpt from January 1880) LONDON.—Brother A. Jannaway writes:—“There has been one immersion since last writing, viz., on the 10<sup>th</sup> December, THOMAS BARKER (brother in the flesh to our brother Barker), formerly Church of England. Brother and sister McKillop, whose removal was noticed in last month’s number, under ‘Enfield Lock’ intelligence, were members of our ecclesia. We regret their loss, but are consoled by the fact that the righteous are ordered of the Lord. [Compiler’s Note: See December 1879 Enfield Lock above]

(February 1880) BLANCO (Texas).—Brother Gilliam has removed from here to Colusa County, Cal., and the brethren in Blanco heartily recommend him to the fellowship of all brethren with whom he may come in contact.

(Excerpt from June 1880) TRANENT. — There have been some losses by removal, which is only partially made up by these additions. The removals were brother and sister A. McMillan and brother W. McMillan to Greenock, and brother Gardner Young, to Innerwick. Sister Juan Henderson will also remove shortly to Edinburgh and meet with the brethren there.

(Excerpt from August 1880) EDINBURGH. — Brother Grant reports: “We have an increase of two by the removal of brother and sister William Smith from Manchester, but originally belonging to our ecclesia. Brother Smith was formerly useful in the cause of the truth, and we welcome him on that account.

(Excerpt from August 1880) GLASGOW. — Brother Nisbet reports: “Since I last wrote, we have had several additions and several losses—by removal and otherwise. To begin with our losses: brother and sister Biggar have gone to Springfield, Mass., U.S.; brother and sister Hogg, with their daughter Ann, have removed to Edinburgh; and brother Robert Wallace has made shipwreck of his faith. On the other hand, we have been strengthened by various additions—brother David Culbert having removed from Edinburgh to Glasgow, forms a valuable accession.

(Excerpt from August 1880) RIPLEY.—Brother Mitchell reports that the brethren here continue to strive together for the faith of the gospel. Brother Hollings has left Ripley. Brethren Hall and Atkin, of Swanwick. Having some weeks previously sent in their resignation to the Riddings ecclesia, applied last Sunday for admission into the Ripley ecclesia, and were accepted.

(Excerpt from September 1880) KIDDERMINSTER — We greatly regret to have to announce the loss of two of our members during the month. Brother Steward has left us—we hope for a short time only—for Glasgow. We shall miss him however here, where he has laboured since the commencement of our operations in this town. Sister Taylor has gone to Holland where she will be quite isolated. We shall however be able to correspond with her. A tea meeting was held the week they left us, when a very profitable evening was spent. As a set-off against their loss, I may state that brother Hodges—until lately a member of the Great Bridge ecclesia—who has come to reside at Stourport, has joined our ecclesia, and we have another addition—Miss MILES—by immersion. Our new sister will prove, we trust, a source of blessing to us. She has long been looking into the truth, and has sacrificed a great deal on its behalf. It now remains for her to be faithful unto the coming of the Master, so that she may receive for all that she has given up for the name of Christ—‘an hundredfold, and inherit life everlasting.’

(Excerpt from August 1881) LONDON.— Brother Horsman writes: “Brother Wheeler, who was in fellowship with us in the South of London, left for Aylesbury some years ago, and as the result of his labours, there is now an ecclesia of ten in that place. Having been in communication with him, since I resumed fellowship at Islington, upon the doctrines which had caused separation, and found the barrier removed in his case also, I have availed myself of an opportunity of paying a visit, and testify with pleasure to the fact that the whole meeting (ten) have attained to a clear knowledge of the truth

concerning sin and its putting-away, and hope to see in the Intelligence columns of the *Christadelphian*, from time to time, a record of their progress.”

(Excerpt from August 1881) SWANWICK. — “Brother and sister Turner now meet with us, who formerly met with the Riddings ecclesia.

(Excerpt from August 1881) MELBOURNE.—Brother J. C. Gamble reports that three more have been added to the little flock in this “fair city of the south.” On Sunday, April 10<sup>th</sup>, brother and sister Bowman, late of Birmingham, united with the brethren in fellowship. They were formerly connected with the Birmingham ecclesia, but severed themselves from it some eight years ago, at the division upon the Renunciationist heresy, although it would appear they did not fully sympathise with it. However, they now reject the theory altogether, and are satisfied with the truth in its purity and simplicity. During the time they have been in the colony they have held themselves aloof until two or three months ago.

(Excerpt from November 1881) DONCASTER Brother Edmunds writes to say that on removing from Normanton to Doncaster, he found two brethren and a sister there, who had been living in isolation from five to eight years respectively, and owing to a misunderstanding, had not been in fellowship, but after mutual explanations, finding themselves all of the one Faith, are now meeting every first day of the week for the breaking of bread.

(Excerpt from December 1881) EDINBURGH—We have lost, by removal, Sisters Campbell and Oliphant, the former to Guildford, and the latter to Newburgh, Fife. Sister Campbell hopes to meet occasionally with the London Ecclesia.

(Excerpt from February 1882) LEEDS- Brother Sidney Sherwood, of London, is at present residing in Leeds, and in fellowship with this ecclesia.

(April 1882) DUDLEY- Brother and Sister Killick, and Sister Allen, having removed from Liverpool, now meet with us, at Dudley. Our meetings for the present year have been, so far, better attended, and a few are deeply interested in the truth.

(Excerpt from May 1882) NEATH-The little ecclesia in this place (still earnest in sowing the good seed of the kingdom) received 2 additions on the 18<sup>th</sup> of March, viz.:—ANNIE BEHENNA (16) and AMY AUGUSTA EVANS (16), both of Mumbles ecclesia. We now number 20.

(Excerpt from June 1882) BIRMINGHAM-During the month, the following cases of obedience have occurred: Miss ANN E. D. RICHARDS (21), domestic servant, formerly belonging to the Plymouth Brethren; Miss E. E. BOUCHER (19), servant, formerly neutral; MARY FOX (26), formerly Congregational; Miss MARY ROSINA TURNER (18), daughter of Brother H. Turner; JOHN ROBERTS (20), nephew of Brother Roberts, clerk; T. W. TERRY (22), jeweller, formerly neutral; CHARLES S. LEAVER (19), formerly neutral.

(June 1882) BLANTYRE-Brother Wilson reports the addition of SAMUEL NILSON, who has decided to cast in his lot with the brethren at Stonefield.

(November 1882) NORTH LONDON.—(*Wellington Hall, Wellington Street, Upper Street, Islington, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.*) Brother Owler, in reporting the formation of two new ecclesias in London, says, “We are all anxious that it should be widely known that the new ecclesias have been formed on the principles of love and peace and goodwill.” He refers to the circumstances leading to their formation, thus:—“The work has for years been carried on quietly and perseveringly, and the good seed has been carried into the

public parks and in the by-ways by zealous brethren; while at various times and in different districts, halls have been hired and the gospel proclaimed. The result of these labours has been recorded in the *Christadelphian* from month to month, and many of those who obeyed the truth resided in districts far distant from our hall. Until recent years the majority of the brethren resided in North London, where our efforts have been chiefly concentrated. The truth, however, has now penetrated south, east, and west. This fact led to a proposal—which was not unforeseen by those who have eagerly and anxiously watched the progress of the truth in the metropolis—to plant another light stand in the extreme west. This proposition was made twelve months' ago, by brethren residing many miles from our hall, requesting the ecclesia to sanction the establishment of a new one at Fulham. When the proposition came up for consideration, another was made embracing the district in question, and extending it still further. The object of this latter proposal was in effect simply to widen the area, and consequently appealed for co-operation to a larger number of brethren. Both propositions were considered, and the ecclesia (the Fulham brethren consenting) sanctioned the second proposition, as being more likely to maintain a separate organization. The brethren, however, were unable to obtain a hall in the locality agreed upon, and, after waiting some months, the Fulham brethren intimated that they had formed themselves into a separate ecclesia, on the same basis as at Islington. The brethren in southwest London then applied for, and obtained, the sanction of the ecclesia to establish another light stand in the City of Westminster, or neighbourhood. A hall was shortly afterwards obtained, and on Sunday afternoon, Oct. 1, 51 brethren and sisters left us to carry on the work of the Lord, as a separate ecclesia, at Westminster. There are now three ecclesias in London, meeting on the basis of 'the one faith,' and all in fellowship. I consider this event unique in the history of the truth in these closing Gentile times. Meetings have been formed many times, and oft out of contention, or in consequence of error, and have become synagogues of Satan. But in this instance, at least, the arrangements have been made in harmony with the principles of the gospel, and in a fraternal spirit, so essential in provoking each other to love and good works. Brethren visiting London will now have no difficulty in discovering a meeting-place within a reasonable distance of the stations of the principal railways, and will, no doubt, be glad to find all of one body, and members in particular. I have also to announce that Brother and Sister Benton have left London for Southampton; and Sister Geo. Phillips has gone to Peterhead. Brother Franklin, who was immersed in 1873, and has been in fellowship with those holding erroneous views on the taking away of sin, has been added to our number.

(November 1882) WESTMINSTER.—(*Victoria Hall, 327, Vauxhal. Bridge road, near Victoria Station, Sundays, 11 and 7.* Frank Jannaway officially announces the formation of this ecclesia, in accordance with the intimation made by Brother Owler in the foregoing. (See November 1882 North London-Wellington Hall) After describing the circumstances leading to it (already set forth by Brother Owler), he says, "We have, with the consent of the Islington ecclesia, formed ourselves into the WESTMINSTER ECCLESIA. Nay, I may say, with their *entire approbation*, in token of which they have kindly presented us with a very handsome service for the breaking of bread. The hall is situated within two minutes' walk of Victoria Station, and is at the rear of a bookseller's shop, the entrance being through a door at the side. It is capable of seating nearly 100 persons, and has been taken by the brethren for one year certain, at the end of which time (if our Master has not come) we hope to have obtained a larger hall. We number in all 55 members, among whom I am pleased to say are many experienced and well tried brethren, which at the commencement of an ecclesia is so desirable. Our first general meeting was held on Sept. 17, when the presiding and managing brethren were elected for the ensuing 12 months. Our opening lecture was to have been delivered by Bro. J. J. Andrew, but on account of a severe cold, he had to give way, and the lecture was delivered by our Bro. A. Andrew on October 8, when our hopes were fully satisfied, the hall being well filled; the subject was "Christendom astray." Thus far we have made a good commencement, and our prayer to the Giver of all good gifts is that we individually and collectively shall make a good finish, and receive a welcome into *that* state of things yet to be established. I may add that although we and those at Islington and Fulham form entirely separate ecclesias, yet CO-OPERATION is our motto, and we are thankful for the willing and worthy fellow labourers so close at hand. Our other lectures for the month are:—Oct 15, "What is man?" by Brother A. T. Jannaway; 22, "The Devil of Christendom," by

Brother Atkins; 29, "The future inheritance of the righteous" by Bro. A. Andrew.—FRANK JANNAWAY

To this Brother Arthur Andrew adds the following remarks:—"Previous to the present year there was only one ecclesia in London, meeting on the doctrinal basis recognised by the brethren who refused to accept the heresy known as Renunciationism, and that was the ecclesia meeting in Islington. About a year since, however, sixteen brethren and sisters living in Walham Green and the neighbourhood, near the extreme southwest part of London, finding it inconvenient and expensive to come so far, applied to the ecclesia for its sanction to their forming a separate ecclesia. This application was met by a proposal, supported by brethren living in the west and south-west of London, to establish an ecclesia embracing, in addition to Walham Green, the districts of Brompton, Chelsea, Pimlico, and Westminster, as it was thought by them that a larger ecclesia would be more efficient and better in various ways. This was agreed to, and search was made for a hall for some months without success, and eventually the brethren at Walham Green withdrew from the more comprehensive scheme, and constituted themselves into a separate ecclesia. The advisability of proceeding with the larger plan was then considered, and it was unanimously decided by those concerned to proceed with it, and for some months the matter was in suspense, simply for want of a suitable hall, a thing very difficult to obtain in London, as in most other places. At last a hall has been obtained, not altogether a 'suitable' one, as it is very small, but one which may serve as a makeshift for six or twelve months, by which time, if the Lord does not return in the meantime, we hope to obtain a more commodious place of meeting. It will probably serve for some time for the meetings of the brethren, though we hope it will soon be found to be too small for the meetings for the public. It is situated very near to Victoria Station, and is very accessible from various parts. There are now, therefore, three ecclesias in London meeting on the same doctrinal basis, viz., the one in Islington (numbering about 200), Westminster (about 50), and Walham Green (I believe, about 20 m number)."

(Excerpt from January 1883) KIDDERMINSTER- Brother and Sister Parkin have removed from Birmingham to this town, and have become members of the Kidderminster ecclesia. We are pleased to have their fellowship. Hope to have a further addition to announce next month.

(Excerpt from February 1883) SYDNEY. — The following have joined the brethren at Sydney from other places:—George Mitchell, formerly of Birmingham, long time separate; Bro. and Sister Cook, from Rockhampton, Queensland, recently immersed at Birmingham; Geo. Smart, from America; Bro. and Sister Fox, from Tamworth, England; F. C. Sendall, from London; Sister Salter, from Droitwich; James Molloy and W. Gibson, from Cootamundra.

(May 1883) LIVERPOOL-On the 23<sup>rd</sup> of March about 65 of the brethren and interested friends, and a goodly number of children, met in the Temperance Hall for a social tea meeting, after which addresses were given by several of the brethren, and an enjoyable evening was passed. There have been two immersions since the date of our last report, viz., on March 31<sup>st</sup>, RICHARD FOULKES (27), formerly a Methodist; and on April 7<sup>th</sup>, ROBERT MONAGHAN, smith, until lately associated with the Plymouth Brethren. Brother and Sister Barber, who were in fellowship with the Stockport Ecclesia, have removed from Droylsden to Liverpool.

(May 1883) PETERBOROUGH-On March 16<sup>th</sup>, ABRAHAM BRUCE (26), previously neutral, was baptized into Christ; and on the 17<sup>th</sup> March, Miss RACHEL SMITH (51), member of Church of England before, kinswoman of our Sisters Grocock. Also of MRS. ANNA GROSSMITH (49), who previously attended Church of England, mother of Bro Norman, of Nottingham. On March 26<sup>th</sup>, WILLIAM THROSSELL (63), member of Church of England prior to hearing the truth, put on Christ in baptism. He is the husband of our sister, and father of brethren and sister of that name in London and Peterborough.

He has attended our lectures for some time, but removed to London recently, and will fellowship one of the ecclesias there.—T. ROYCE.

(Excerpt August 1883) WESTMINSTER ECCLESIA (*Victoria Hall, 327, Vauxhall Bridge Road. Sundays 11 a.m. and 7 p.m. Thursdays 8 p.m.*)—Brother F. G. Jannaway reports the addition (June 24<sup>th</sup>) of JAMES DAY (32), son and brother of our sister and brother Day; brought up as a Baptist, but never a member. Our brother for more than twelve years belonged to the Marines, and had just re-engaged for another nine years, so as to be eligible for a pension, when he became interested in the truth through correspondence with his brother, and upon further enlightenment could see that his profession was not compatible with the brotherhood, and became anxious to leave the service as soon as possible, in order to do which he had to purchase his discharge, and now rejoices in having done so for Christ's sake. He is at present without employment. During his journeyings he has visited several of the scenes of the apostle Paul's labours, notably Ephesus, Athens, and Corinth, as well as the Holy Land, which latter place he hopes to re-visit under very different circumstances. We are much cheered in having for a permanency the fellowship as assistance of brother and sister Meakin, who have removed from Birmingham and become members of this ecclesia. We have also during the past month enjoyed visits from brethren Joseph Diboll, junr., of Great Yarmouth, and Mark Wheeler, of Aylesbury, both of whom lent a willing hand. Brother Thorneycroft, of this ecclesia, and sister Lee, late of Birmingham, also brother Septimus Osborne and sister Alice Austin, of the Islington ecclesia, have been united in marriage, and will henceforth meet with this ecclesia.

(Excerpt from November 1883) GLASGOW-Bro. Leask reports that another one has rendered obedience to the truth in this large city, in the person of Mrs. JANE MCLACHLAN (27), who originally belonged to the Established Church, but recently and for a very short time, to the Methodist connexion. She rendered obedience on Sunday, the 14<sup>th</sup> October. On the other hand, we have lost bro. Wm. Pettigrew, by removal to Edinburgh. We recommend him to the brethren there.

(Excerpt from December 1883) WESTMINSTER ECCLESIA. — The brethren have lost, by removal to Brisbane, Australia, sister Emily Oakes, who left a short time since, bearing a letter of commendation to other members of the one body, with whom she may come in contact.

(Excerpt from June 1884) WESTMINSTER (*Wilcocke's Assembly Rooms, Westminster Bridge Road. Sundays 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Thursdays, 8 p.m.*)—Bro. F. G. Jannaway reports the immersion, on April 27<sup>th</sup>, of Miss MARY ANN AKERS (23) School Board teacher, formerly Church of England, sister to brother Akers; May 8<sup>th</sup>, Miss VIOLA BLENMAN (26), needleworker, formerly met with the Renunciators, daughter of our sister Blenman. The ecclesia has been further increased by the removal of sister Nellie Hopper, and brethren William Sydenham and Thomas Dennis, all from Islington, and brother and sister Thomas Barker from Devonport. Bro. and sister Simpson have left for Australia, bearing letter of recommendation to those of like precious faith. Ill health is the cause of their leaving London.

(April 1886) Greenock.—Brother Haugh reports that on February 27<sup>th</sup>, JEANNIE MARSHALL (20), formerly neutral, put on the sin-covering name in the appointed way. She is presently staying in Helnsburgh, and will seldom have the opportunity of meeting with us, as there is no means of conveyance on Sundays. Brother D. Hall has removed to Edinburgh; but on account of the position the ecclesia are holding regarding the partial inspiration question, he will be debarred from meeting with them there.

(November 1886) London.—ISLINGTON.—*Sundays, 69 Upper Street, Islington, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays, 8 p.m.*—Brother Owlser reports that the lectures during the past few weeks have drawn larger audiences than usual. The brethren have decided to try an experiment by giving a course of lectures each

month on matters dealing with the first principles of the oracles of the Deity. This month the special course has to do with the nature of man and the provision God has made for the salvation of His faithful servants. In November the mission of Jesus Christ will furnish material for an interesting course, and in December prominence will be given to the second appearing of the Lord Jesus. Brother and sister Nicholls and sister Smith have removed to North London from the South London ecclesia.

(December 1886) Bournemouth.—Brother Jarvis reports four further additions, viz.: JANE BIRCH (26), daughter of sister Birch, whose immersion was recorded last month. She was formerly Baptist. After a very intelligent confession of the faith, entered into the bonds of the Covenant on October 28th. Brother Bann, of Portsmouth, and brother and sister Jones (late of Birmingham), whose temporal callings have brought them this way. While at Birmingham, they met at the Exchange Hall. Since they came here, they have been led to see that they should unite in fellowship with those who not only hold that the Bible is wholly inspired, but act in conformity with its demands.

(December 1886) Manchester. — Brother Holland writes:—“We have got back to our old meeting room, the Co-operative Hall, 398, Oldham Road. This is the third time we have occupied the room. Shall be pleased to see any of the Lord’s people who may be passing through the town, but deem it our duty to decline the fellowship of those who attribute to some parts of the Bible a fallible authorship. Meeting for breaking of bread in the afternoon 2.30, evening 6.30. We have been cheered by the addition to our number of brother and sister Hollings, of Leeds, who have come to reside in Manchester; also by the addition of sister Poulton, and brother and sisters Johnstone, who have seen it to be their duty to stand aside from the Downing Street meeting, on the inspiration question. We now number fourteen, striving together that we may be accounted worthy of a participation in the glory and honour of the age to come. The Oldham brethren have kindly consented to give us all the help they possibly can in putting the truth before the alien. We commenced operations October 17th. The attendance at the lectures has so far exceeded our anticipation in regard to numbers and interest manifested.

(December 1886) Mumbles. — Brother D. Clement writes:—It is now a little over twelve months since I left the synagogue meeting here, followed by others, who formed themselves into a meeting at the Assembly Rooms. I am very pleased to say that we have grown to 30 in number. During the last two months, several others have left the synagogue meeting, and joined us; their reason for leaving the synagogue meeting has been because that meeting has received into their fellowship and made common cause with those who refuse to make the infallibility of the Bible their foundation stone. Their names are: Brothers—W. H. Jones and Robert Baker; Sisters—Amy Evans, Rachael Delve. Jane Bennett, Mary Ann Baker, Minnie Bates and Jane Williams. We are much cheered to find that there are a few yet left at Mumbles who are not wanting in the duty of standing apart from those who corrupt the Word of God. We are not without hope that a few more will see their way. Our meetings are becoming very profitable and encouraging, and we hope for good results. I hope to be able to send renewal list for *Christadelphian* shortly. We are glad beyond measure to find that the *Christadelphian* is not likely to be wrecked upon the present troubled waters, but will continue (in all probability) its voyage among us of exhortation, comfort, and good cheer, till the storm is past and the haven reached, where all the “ship’s company will meet.” We have just started a book club for the purchase of *Elpis Israel* chiefly, and have commenced to read a chapter in the book, and explain where necessary at our week-night meeting, and whatever his (the Doctor’s) traducers may say to the contrary, we thank God for the man and his work, and look forward with delight to the time when this generation of believers will form an accepted group around him in the kingdom of God.

(January 1887) Devonport.—Brother Sleep reports a visit and lecture from brother Guest, of Bexley, who gave a lecture, December 12th, on “Wesleyans against the Bible.” A few strangers were present. Sister Fletcher, of Cheltenham, has come to reside at Devonport. Though coming from an ecclesia which has



refused to declare itself on the inspiration question, she is a believer in a wholly-inspired Bible, and is willing to stand apart from those who refuse to avow themselves the same.

(January 1887) Leeds.—Brother W. H. Andrew writes:—We have been cheered by additions to our number. The following have been immersed into the saving name:—On November 18th, EMILIE ASQUITH (19), daughter of sister Asquith, formerly neutral; and REUBEN BLACKBURN, formerly Methodist; November 25th, JANE TREDALE, formerly Primitive Methodist; and MARY ANN BROADBENT, formerly Church of England; December 2nd, MARY BROWN, sister of sister Wilson, who was immersed last year, formerly Wesleyan Methodist. Brother and sister Murray were received into fellowship on November 28th. They had hitherto been in fellowship with “The Ecclesia” (“No-willists”); but not being satisfied with the belief of some in that meeting, they decided to leave their fellowship. As they endorsed our basis of fellowship, and believed “the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ” when immersed, we gladly received them into fellowship. Six have removed from Leeds during the year. In addition to those already mentioned in the *Christadelphian*, brother Dutton and sister Wray have removed to Ilkley.

(January 1887) Manchester.—Bro. Holland writes:—“I omitted to state in my last intelligence that brother Brown had also cast in his lot among us, along with Brother John Trueblood and Brother Keay, from the Grosvenor Street Meeting.

(April 1887) Worcester (Mas.)—“I left England for the United States on January 6th, 1886, arriving here the 17th of the same month. After I had been in Worcester two or three days, I began to search for the brethren (in the one hope). I saw meetings advertised in the paper that I thought must be theirs. I went; but I had not been there long before I found that they were wandering out of the way of understanding. It is impossible for me to explain what they believe, as I don’t think they know themselves. Under the circumstances I withdrew from them, and wrote to brother Bragenton, of Kidderminster, and told him about the affair. He wrote back and told me he thought I had not found the brethren, for he had written to one of them, and received an answer, certifying they had neither seen nor heard anything of me. So I concluded I had been misled, and I made up my mind to make another search, when, to my surprise, brother Bemis and brother Jones came to my house and inquired for one who was wandering in the wilderness alone, as it were. You have no idea how I felt to meet true brethren in Christ. I have pleasure in adding they are twelve in number united in one hope, and in the way of understanding. I then found that some eight or ten years ago they separated from those I had been to first, because they contended that Christ was God. We believe that ‘there is but one God, and *one Mediator* between God and man—the man *Christ Jesus*’ (1 Tim. 2:5).”—BROTHER TUNSTALL.

(August 1887) Leicester.—Brother Gamble writes: “Since our last report, brother Harry Gamble has removed to Leeds, and brother and sister Moore have come to Leicester from Bedford. We are also pleased to announce the return to fellowship of brother and sister Branson, who have been members of the ‘other meeting,’ but now have decided to meet with us upon the basis of a fully inspired and infallible Bible. The lectures for the month have been as follow: June 12th, ‘Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews,’ by brother Gamble; 19th, ‘Resurrection’ (brother Roberts, of Birmingham); 26th, ‘The land of Palestine, with special reference to a recent visit’ (brother Collyer); July 3rd, ‘Immortality’ (brother Weston); 10th, ‘Honour’ (brother Collyer).”

(September 1887) Bournemouth.—Brother Sherry reports the obedience of HANNAH HARRIET MONDEY (18), of Southampton, who has been under the tuition of her mother, and gave an excellent confession of the One Faith. Her mother, sister H. D. Mondey, some years ago lost her husband, who was a brother in the truth, and has since had to maintain herself and four children by doing needlework, which at times is very hard. Any little assistance that brethren could render would be greatly appreciated by a

sister who is worthy of it. Her address is—"Mrs. Mondey, Smith's Quay, Hitchen Ferry, near Southampton." She is isolated. A visit from any one passing would greatly cheer them.—Sister Ludlum, of Nottingham, has come to live here, and is in fellowship with us. She previously met with the brethren in fellowship with the Exchange, Birmingham, but upon examination of their position was compelled to renounce it from a Scriptural standpoint. We have had a pleasant visit from brother and sister R. R. Jardine, of Birmingham, also sister P. Jones of the same place, is visiting here.

(Excerpt from January 1888) ELLAND—Brother Drake reports the addition of Brother and sister Joseph Cheetham, John Cheetham, and brother and sister David Akroyde—all from Sowerby Bridge meeting.

(February 1888) PORTSMOUTH—Brother Harding reports the removal of sisters Mann, sen. and jun., to Norwood, near London, also sister Faith Bunidge to London. They will meet with the Islington ecclesia.

(March 1888) GREAT BRIDGE—Brother Hollier reports that brother and sister Hughes have removed from Shrewsbury to West Bromwich, and are now in fellowship with the Great Bridge ecclesia. Lecturing brethren for the present quarter:—Brethren S. Davies, of Rugby; Hollier, of Great Bridge; Rubottom, of Birmingham; White, Great Bridge; Hughes, Birmingham; Ollis, Dudley; and Allen, Lichfield.

(April 1888) KEIGHLEY—I have much pleasure in reporting further additions to our ecclesia. Sister Richardson, formerly meeting with the brethren at Haworth, is now meeting with us. ADA RICHARDSON (17), daughter of the above, was immersed into the sin-covering name on the 19th of February, and afterwards broke bread with us. Also on Sunday, March 11th, sister ANNIE SMITH returned to fellowship after an absence of about three years. We are still trying to draw the attention of serious people to the gospel of the kingdom and the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ, but with little result. People seem disposed to treat only two things seriously; namely, money making and pleasure seeking. Yet we have the satisfaction which comes from the consciousness of duty done, and are anxiously watching for the time when men will be forced to listen to the law as it goes forth from Zion.—A. S. WADSWORTH.

(April 1888) LIVERPOOL—Brother H. W. Leah, of Sheffield, has taken a situation with a leading firm in the city, and has been transferred to the membership of this ecclesia. Sister Robertson expects to leave Liverpool on the 17th of March with her family to join brother James U. Robertson, in New York. While we feel much sorrow at parting with our sister, with whom we have been associated for so many years in the bonds of the Gospel, and who is justly beloved by us for her consistent and amiable walk in the truth, we rejoice with them in the prospect of their speedy re-union after so long a separation, and trust that it will not be long ere they both return again to our meeting.—HY. COLLENS.

(May 1888) PONTHRYDYRUN—I have to report the admission into our little ecclesia of brother and sister Poole, of Pontnewynydd, late of Bilston, Staffordshire. They have been separated for some time on account of the inspiration controversy, but now break bread with us on the basis of fellowship acknowledged by the Newport brethren, and have determined to withhold their fellowship from those who do not acknowledge it. This is a source of great joy to the little flock here as brother Poole is a useful brother, and will greatly assist us in spreading the gospel of the kingdom.—W. WHITEHOUSE

(February 1886) The South London Ecclesia.—*Hanover Hall Assembly Rooms, 334, Kennington Park Road, S. W.* Brother F. C. Clements reports that two have been added to our number by immersion, their names being Mr. WILLIAM JAMES MILES (19), formerly Particular Baptist, and Mr. HENRY CLIFFORD (20), formerly Particular Baptist, both of whom were immersed on January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1886, and will meet with those who have withdrawn from the Westminster ecclesia, as mentioned in the January *Christadelphian*.

(March 1892) BRISTOL—*Oddfellows' Hall, Rupert Street, near Christmas Steps: Sundays at 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.*—Our numbers have been reduced by the removal, on February 6th, of brother J. Hollier, with wife and daughter, to West Bromwich. We regret his loss, and shall miss his usefulness as a ready speaker. Brother Daniells, of Bath, and sister Patchett, of the Leeds ecclesia, have united with us during the month in attendance at the Lord's table. Lectures: "Truth and Error" and "Eternal Life," (brother W. Jenkins); "The Bible" (brother J. Hollier); "Resurrection" (brother F. A. Collins,—W. MILLS.

(April 1892) LONDON (NORTH) 69, *Upper Street, Islington. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays and Fridays, 8 p.m.*—Brother Wm. Owler reports that the meetings continue to be well attended, and that much interest has been created by the publication of the weekly lectures in a local paper. Since last report several additions have taken place by immersion, and by removal, as well as by resumption of fellowship by those who did not see eye to eye on the inspiration question in 1885. Those inducted into the saving name by baptism are:—ANNIE ROBERTS, daughter of brother Roberts (engineer on the "Glen" line); EMILY FORD, daughter of sister Ford and sister in the flesh to brethren Robert and William Ford; and ANDREW JAMES WINGROVE, formerly of the Church of England. By removal, brother and sister Williams from Camberwell; and sister Munday from Southampton. We have also received into fellowship from Wellington Hall brother G. A. Kinnaird, brother James Carr, brother and sister Thomas Carr, sister Emma Brand, and brother and sister Overton; and from Harlesden, brother Robert H. Ford. Sister Smith (mother of sister Weir, formerly of Birmingham), has fallen asleep in the hope of resurrection, and was interred in the Marylebone Cemetery at Finchley, brother Frost officiating at the graveside. Our sister was full of years, having reached her 88th birthday. By the time these lines are perused the Islington brethren, who have met in 69, Upper Street for 19 years, will have removed to a more commodious and central hall—namely, Barnsbury Hall, Barnsbury Street, Upper Street, Islington. On and after March 27th all the meetings will take place in Barnsbury Hall, the lease of the Lecture Hall having expired. Brother Gamble, of Leicester, will be in London on March 27th, and brother Shuttleworth on April 3rd.

(April 1862) SHEFFIELD—Since our last report we have been cheered by the obedience of ELIZA HEATON, daughter of brother and Sister Heaton (January 23rd), and SARAH JANE MOOR, daughter of sister Moor (January 28th), both members of the senior class in the Sunday School; also of CHAS. JUSTIS MARSHALL (March 5th) and HARRIET WRAGG, daughter of brother and sister Wragg, late of Whitting Moor, near Chesterfield (March 12th).—Sister Laister, who was baptised by the brethren at Sheffield some three or four years ago, but since that time has resided in London, has returned to Sheffield, making a further addition to our fellowship.—We have also the sorrowful task of reporting the death of sister Heaton, senr., who passed away on the 6th February, in her 78th year. Sister Heaton's was a remarkable case. It is about six years only that she obeyed the Truth in baptism, being at the time as she has been since, quite bedridden, and unable to help herself, through age and infirmity. From the first she has maintained throughout her trial a simple, cheerful, and child-like spirit; full of confidence, and rejoicing in anticipation of the Kingdom of God. She was interred by the brethren at the Intake Cemetery.

(April 1892) STOCKPORT—We have one added to our number, sister Maggie Sutherland, late of the Grosvenor Street Ecclesia, Manchester.—We intend holding our annual fraternal gathering on Saturday, April 30th, when we shall be pleased to welcome any faithful brethren and sisters. Tea will be provided at 4.30, after which we shall endeavour to spend the evening to edification. We are anticipating the company of brother Roberts, who will also lecture on the following day. The address of our room is Cobden Place, Wellington Street. We continue to make known the Truth to the public so far as is in our power, but the interest manifested is small. During the quarter the lectures have been by brethren Norman, Lake, Smith, Bellamy, and S. Willson, of Stockport, brothers Ormerod and Bamford, of Oldham, and brother Garside, of Ormskirk.—S. F. WILLSON.

(April 1892) BEECHWORTH.—“We have to report the admission, on application, of CHARLES HERBERT LONGMORE, jun., who was formerly in fellowship with the Melbourne ecclesia, but resigned there, for reasons which he has since considered insufficient.”—ALFRED LADSON.

(May 1892) NOTTINGHAM *Chaucer Street*.—Since our last report we have had four additions, one by obedience rendered to the truth by CAROLINE TRUMAN (31), who put on the sin-covering name of the Lord Jesus, January 17th, the other three are brother Lee and brother and sister Hoffmeyer, who had been meeting with the brethren in Shakespeare Street, but have united themselves to this Ecclesia. You will be glad to hear there is some hope of the two meetings becoming united.—J. KIRKLAND.

(June 1892) HEDNESFORD—It is now nearly twelve months since we opened our meeting room, and during this time we have perseveringly held forth the Word of Life. We have had lectures from brethren Roberts, Shuttleworth, C. C. Walker, Challinor, Horsley, and others from Birmingham, and although we cannot as yet report any result, there are several interested. We meet at 11 a.m. for breaking bread, and in the evening at 6.30 p.m. I am also pleased to report that brother and sister Beasley, of Cannock, who for some time have been associated with those connected with the Masonic Hall, have returned to our fellowship.—HARRY JACKSON.

(June 1892) LINCOLN *Masonic Hall, Sundays, 10.30 a.m., 6.30 p.m.*—I have to report another addition to our Ecclesia by sister Burnett (formerly meeting with the Exchange Arcade brethren) having been received into our fellowship, after expressing her agreement with, and willingness to abide by, our resolution adopted April 12th, 1891, which was a refusal of fellowship to all those who refuse to declare themselves for a wholly-inspired Bible. Lectures for the month have been as follows:—April 17th, “The Doctrine of the Resurrection,” Brother Dracup; 25th, “Man’s Origin, Nature and Destiny,” brother Harley; May 1st, “The Gospel of Christ,” brother Todd; 8th, “The Goodness of God,” brother Dracup.—W. H. GREEN.

(August 1892) BRADFORD—Brother Williams reports that brother and sister Brown, formerly of Golcar, and more recently of Mansfield, having removed to Bradford a few weeks ago, have been received by the brethren here on acknowledging the entire inspiration of the Scriptures. Care was considered necessary, as they had been in connection with that section of professors throughout the Kingdom, who, whatever their individual convictions may be, either refuse to confess the infallibility of the Scriptures or to require the confession in others as a condition of fellowship.—ED.

(August 1892) SYDNEY.—*Elpis Hall, Redfern*.—Since I last wrote to you, the Truth has made wonderful progress in Sydney; knowledge is certainly increasing with rapid strides in this part of the earth. This is one of those indications which makes a Bible reader reflect and wonder with the prophet “How long?” Words but faintly convey our appreciation of the knowledge of the truth which we have obtained, through the favour of God, by which we may obtain an entrance into the glorious kingdom. God’s wages are out of all proportion to our feeble efforts to do His will, that is to say, “That the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared to the glory which shall be revealed in us,” if we are faithful. So far as we can see those with whom we are now in fellowship are working while it is called “to-day.” Experience has proved that trials and tribulations have a good effect on the right class of mind. Our late ecclesial troubles have had this effect on the various members of our ecclesia. We have been joined by the following brethren and sisters from the Redfern Ecclesia:—Brother R. Burke, sisters B. Burke, J. Burke, A. Matthews, and J. Matthews; also brother A. Dulvey and sister C. R. Cooper. The last two were not identified with the Redfern Ecclesia when the division took place. I have also to report that brother A. E. Bennett and brother W. H. Payne are now in fellowship with us, as the Bible and experience has shown them the error of a certain course they took some two and a-half years ago, when the division took place in what was then known as the Masonic Hall Ecclesia. The following is a list of

baptisms:—ELLEN BELSHAM (42), December 22nd, 1891; ANDREW ANDERSON (41), December 20th, 1891; JAMES (34) and MARY A. PEARCE (34), his wife, January 3rd, 1892; JAMES JONES (63), ELIZABETH JONES (60), his wife, and GERTRUDE JONES (20), their daughter, January 5th, 1892; CHARLES SLIP (36) and ANNIE SLIP (26), his wife, January 10th, 1892; FREDERICK W. GRAY (19), January 10th, 1892; MARY (24) and NELLY (22) JONES, daughters of brother Jones, January 14th, 1892; JOHN RYALL (27), January 14th, 1892; MARY ALEXANDER (50), January 19th, 1892; BEATRICE HENDERSON (15), daughter of brother Henderson, February 4th, 1892; ANNIE A. SALTER, February 18th, 1892; ALISON RYALL, wife of brother Ryall, February 25th, 1892; HARRIET KEETH (57), March 17th, 1892. You will see from this list that the light has been effective in dispelling at least some of the darkness with which we are surrounded. I may mention that “Christendom Astray” has been liberally circulated, and there can be no doubt that it has been the means of opening the eyes of a good many; also, our brother Bayliss lectures regularly on Prince Alfred Park and also at our hall on Sunday evenings. At both of these lectures we have good attendances, and a lively interest is manifested. I will now conclude by stating that we are endeavouring to be “lights read and known of all men.” We send our best wishes in the Truth, and pray that the word of the Lord may have free course and abound wherever it may be preached.—W. PICKUP.

(December 1892) LEEDS—*Great George Street*.—Since my last report, sister Holden, who formerly met with the (No-will) meeting in Albion Street, Leeds, has united herself with us. Brother W. Fidler and sister E. Booth, late of the Nottingham ecclesia, have been united in marriage. Sister Fidler likewise will be an addition to this ecclesia. The two meetings in Leeds are giving week night lectures—one at each room alternately. The attendance so far has been satisfactory. We are hoping that the results will be further additions to the truth in this town. We have taken the People’s Hall, Albion Street (the most central hall in the borough of Leeds) for our annual fraternal gathering, on Monday, December 26th, 1892. The hall is large, commodious, and comfortable, capable of seating 800 people. We can with confidence give a widespread invitation to all brethren and sisters who can be with us on that occasion. The lectures for October have been as follows:—October 2nd, “God’s purpose in taking out of the Gentiles a people for His Name” (brother Hall); 9th, room closed; 16th, “The Inheritance of the Righteous; where is it; and what is it?” (brother G. H. Cook); 23rd, “Election upon divine principles and to a divine end” (brother Briggs, Sowerby Bridge); 30th, “When the Son of Man shall come in His Glory; what then? (brother Mitchell).—R. W. THORP.

(January 1893) BATH—Since our last we have, in addition to our usual meetings, had a visit from brother Roberts, who gave us a lecture on Monday, November 28th, to a good audience. Subject: “Where did the Bible come from, what is it for, and why do people so generally fail to understand it?” We have also had a visit from brother Guest, of London, who lectured Sunday, 11th December. Subject: “If a man, shall he live again?” The meeting was well attended. Brother Cox has removed from London (Fulham Ecclesia) to this place. He was enlightened in the truth in this city, but moved to London, where he obeyed the truth. He has now declared for a wholly-inspired Bible, and his determination not to fellowship partial inspiration. Sisters Rowell, Chipping Norton, has paid us a visit during the month. Sister Gertrude Daniels was immersed November 3rd, and not May the 3rd as reported.—J. THOMAS.

(January 1893) GRANTHAM—The ecclesia here has received an addition by the return to fellowship of brother Osborn who was immersed at Spalding some few years back. We are pleased to welcome him and hope to enjoy together unending companionship in our Father’s Kingdom. There are several others who are getting anxious and will not be long out of the fold. Recent lectures have all been by our own brethren — Darnill, Johnson, Simper, and the writer.—W. BUCKLER.

(January 1893) LINCOLN—Sister Woodcock, sister Buttery, and sister Reeson, who have been meeting with the brethren at the Coffee Palace, have been received into our fellowship, having expressed their

willingness to abide by our “Basis of fellowship.” Isaac Buttery, the husband of the sister Buttery, was immersed into Christ Jesus on October 25th, after having given evidence of his knowledge of the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ. On October 30th, we had a visit from brother and sister Young, of Warrington.—Lectures for the past month have been:—November 13th. “The Two Minds—Carnal and Spiritual” (brother T. Heaton, of Sheffield). 20th, “The End” (brother Todd.) 27th, “What is it to be born again” (brother Dracup.) December 4th, “A Divine Land Bill for the Nations of the Earth” (brother Burton, of Nottingham.) 11th, “The Death of Christ. Its Sacrificial Import” (brother Harley.)—J. TODD.

(January 1893) LONDON (NORTH) *Barnsbury Hall, Barnsbury Street, Islington, Sundays: 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesday and Friday: 8 p.m.*—Brother Owler reports that during the month several additions have been made to the ecclesia. On December 7th, MRS. PELLA WOODRUFFE, wife of brother T. Woodruffe, was immersed into the saving name in the appointed way. Sister Hamer has left London for Leeds. We have received back in fellowship from Wellington Hall (which left on the inspiration question in 1885) brother and sister King, Sister Alice King, brother Pyle and brother Blay. Sister Crawley, of Newton Abbott, has also come to reside in London, which we omitted inadvertently at the time. The attendances on Sunday evenings are well maintained.

(January 1893) NORTHAMPTON-Sister Lizzie Cole (of Leicester), has come to reside here; through being united in marriage to brother Thorneloe. We have also received into our fellowship, brother and sister Eling, late of Lincoln, **who have previously been on “the Other Side,”** but have now subscribed to our Basis of fellowship. Lectures for the month have been as follows:—“Prophecy” (brother Wood, of Tamworth); “Treasures in Heaven” (brother Batty, of Birmingham); “What is a Soul? Can it die?” (brother E. Challinor, of Birmingham); “Christ’s work on earth not yet complete” (brother Smither, of King’s Lynn).—G. HANDLEY.

(February 1893) LONDON (NORTH) *Barnsbury Hall, Barnsbury Street, Islington, Sundays: 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays and Fridays 8 p.m.*—Brother Owler reports that brother Allman, of Hull, having obtained employment in London, will meet in future with the Islington ecclesia, and also sister Allman. In the note last month one little word was omitted in the reference to the brethren we had received into fellowship from Wellington Hall, which we left on the inspiration question in 1885. The omission of “we” has led to a little misunderstanding, as it referred to the step we took, and not to those whom we now received into our fellowship. We held our usual tea meeting on December 26th (Bank Holiday, and we had brethren with us from Camberwell, Grantham, Hull, Enfield, &c. Brother J. J. Andrew presided, and was assisted in the work of building up in our most holy faith by brethren A. T. Jannaway, Frank G. Jannaway, M. Lewin, G. F. Lake, and W. Owler. The Sunday school had their annual tea and prize distribution on Wednesday, January 4th. The lantern depicted scenes in the life of Jesus Christ, as recorded by Matthew and Luke, the Gospels read during 1892. There was a large attendance of brethren and sisters, as well as children.

(March 1893) DROYLSDEN *-Bank Street, Fairfield Road, Sundays, 2–30 and 6–30.*—We have been refreshed and encouraged by the submission of JOSEPH LAWTON (29), to baptism into the saving name. He was formerly neutral. He first heard of the truth about 8 years ago, at Keighley, where he attended the lectures for some time. We have also to report that brother Peter Wood whom we received in fellowship, as was reported in the *Christadelphian* for April, 1891, under Ashton-under-Lyne intelligence, has removed to Manchester, and decided to go back to the Grosvenor Street Meeting.—J. BATTESBY.

(April 1893) BRISTOL *Oddfellows’ Hall, Rupert Street, Sunday Mornings at 11; Evenings at 6.30.*—Sister Kate Weeks was welcomed to the table of our Lord on February 19th, after affirming her inability

to compromise her love of the Scriptures by continuing to associate in fellowship with those who, whatever their belief, are by their actions, either directly or indirectly, tolerating any teaching which shakes her confidence in them. She was a member of the late Oddfellows' Hall Ecclesia, which was in sympathy with the Masonic Hall attitude upon the inspiration question. We are pleased to record the addition to our numbers of brother O. C. Holder whose form used to be very familiar to the North London Ecclesia. We are anticipating some substantial work from him in the process of upbuilding at our Wednesday evening and other meetings. The Frome Ecclesia has been broken up through the death of sister Chitty, and two of their number, brother Holder and sister Phebe Oliver, have settled with us for the present. They brought back sister Christine Emma Lowe, daughter of brother E. Lowe. During a visit to brother Holder at Frome she obeyed the truth in baptism. On March 6th we immersed MISS CECILY JONES and MISS MARION ALLEN MILLIER, sister of brother A. Millier. Since then sister Millier has removed to Windsor. On the 13th we immersed Miss LILY JONES. Brother Thomas Warwick, of the Camberwell New Road Ecclesia, has removed to Bristol to fill a Post Office appointment in this district, and expects to remain with us for some time.—The Sunday School we started last October is in a flourishing condition under the superintendence of brother E. Lowe. It started with 9 scholars, and the membership has now reached 27. We have just completed a special series of lectures to the alien upon the "Nature and Sacrifice of Christ," the last two being given by brother J. Thomas, of Bath, and brother A. Morris, of Trowbridge. We had an unusually good attendance to the lecture by brother Thomas, on "Are you a friend of Christ?" and a still larger number listened to brother Morris on March 12th, upon the subject "In what way did Christ lay down his life and die for us?" in which was demonstrated that Christ was born under the Adamic condemnation, and that the doctrines of substitution and the broader hope are heresies.—W. MILLS.

(June 1893) DUDLEY—Brother Hughes reports an addition by the transference from Wolverhampton Street of brother T. Turner, on accepting the basis of fellowship recognised by the ecclesia on the question of inspiration. He was gladly welcomed and broke bread for the first time on Sunday, April 23rd. At the quarterly meeting held on April 12th, it was decided to hold a mid-summer tea meeting on Saturday, June 24th, at 5.30 p.m., to which all brethren and sisters have a hearty invitation. Brother Roberts, of Birmingham, has consented to deliver a lecture after the tea, on "The Time of the Dead, the Hope of the Living and the Terror of the Unjust." Lectures for the last month have been as follows:—April 16th, "Absent from the Body" (brother W. H. Mosley, of West Bromwich); 23rd, "The Scoffer's Question, &c." (brother Taylor); 30th, "The Tabernacle in the Wilderness" (brother J. Lawton); May 7th, "The Bible, and the Saints' Everlasting Rest" (brother C. Pollard).

(June 1893) LIVERPOOL—Brother William Roberts and his sister wife have removed from Warrington to this city. We have had to withdraw from brother Henry Elwell Smith, the ex-curate, who was immersed as lately as September last, as he has returned to the Church of England.—HENRY COLLENS.

(June 1893) LONDON (NORTH.) *Barn bury Hall, Barnsbury Street, Upper Street, Islington, N.*—Sundays: 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays and Fridays: 8 p.m.—Brother Owler reports that brother Charles Bore has returned to fellowship, having left the Wellington Hall. There has been added to the members of this one body, by baptism, Mrs. Mary Ann May, who has now become a daughter of Sarah in the appointed way. The Mutual Improvement Society held their first out-door meeting for the season on Saturday, May 6th. The place of meeting was Chingford, where tea was taken at Rigg's Retreat. About 36 adults and four children were present. A profitable season was enjoyed.

(November 1893) LEEDS *Wellington Road.*—Since last writing, our numbers have been increased by the immersion of Mrs. HARRIET ROBERTS, of Hunslet, and also the admission of brother Joseph Watson, who in former times met with those in connection with the Bedford Square meeting. For a long time he had not met in fellowship anywhere, but after endorsing our position as set forth in "the basis of faith" he

decided to cast in his lot with us. On October 8th the united meeting for fellowship was held, when a very large company of brethren and sisters assembled together to remember “the Lord’s death” in breaking bread and drinking wine, and to exhort each other in righteousness and true holiness. Brethren Geo. Pickles and David Hall addressed the meeting. Soon we hope to hear the Master’s voice and see His glorious face in our midst. After the meeting was over, about ninety sat down to tea, which had been provided beforehand. At six o’clock we separated, each going to our own meeting rooms, where two brethren were to address the meetings—Brother Pickles, at Great George Street; and brother Turner, at Wellington Road. Other lectures have been by brethren Grimes, of York; R. Smith, of Halifax; Wadsworth, of Keighley; Howe and Zec. Drake, of Elland. Our meeting are only moderately attended at present, but we hope to have more during the winter months.—G. B. SUGGITT.

(July 1893) CANADA-HAMILTON.—We are pleased to report that brother and sister Brown and their family have safely arrived from Dunfermlin, Scotland, and will reside in this city. Brother Brown’s utterances on Sunday last seemed to come from a heart in love with spiritual things, and we believe we shall be strengthened and encouraged by their presence.—ROBERT WELSHMAN.

(Sorry to hear of renewed division without apparent necessity. These things ought not so to be.—ED.) Brother Parkin reports the safe arrival of sister Styles and family from Birmingham, after a rough voyage.

(May 1895) LONDON (NORTH) *Islington Temperance Hall, Church Passage, Upper Street, N. Sundays, 11 a.m., 3 p.m., and 6.30 p.m.; Wednesdays, 8 p.m.*—We are pleased to report that brother G. C. Harvey, lately meeting with the brethren at Barnsbury Hall, has decided that our basis of fellowship is the right one, and will therefore in future meet with us. Our number has also been increased by removal to London of sister Ludlow, late of Bournemouth. Our lectures have been:—April 7th, “The Teaching of Jesus Christ” (brother A. S. Thompson); 14th, “Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles” (brother G. F. Lake); 21st, “Peter, His Sermons and Epistles” (brother F. Jannaway); 28th, “John, his Epistles and the Apocalypse” (brother W. H. Boulton).—WM. FORD.

(July 1895) MANCHESTER *Geoffery Street, Ardwick; Sunday, 3 p.m., 6–30 p.m.*—I am pleased to report that brother Need, who has been away from the meeting for nearly two years, has been received back to fellowship after the necessary preliminaries. Also brother Stephens, an old-standing brother in the truth, who had got out of touch with the ecclesia, through the changes which have taken place in the past, has again taken his place amongst us. Further, I am glad to announce that brother Wm. Wood, who was meeting with the Grosvenor Street ecclesia, finding that their basis was not such as he could approve, made application for fellowship with us, and after a full statement of his reasons, and a cordial acceptance of our basis, has joined us. We are hoping for further additions of a similar kind to those named. The lectures are not largely attended by outsiders, but there has been a gratifying attendance of brethren and sisters. We have been greatly helped by brethren from Oldham, Stockport, Droylsden, and other places, who have lectured and exhorted at our meetings.—ANDREW MORRIS.

(August 1895) IRVINE-Brother Thomas Mullin reports that brother Robert Hines has been received into fellowship on withdrawing from those who do not believe that the Bible is wholly inspired, and who have loose views on the subject of marriage with the alien, also that the ecclesia has withdrawn from brother William Mullin for the time being on account of his disorderly walk.

(December 1895) MANCHESTER *Geoffrey Street, off Shakespeare Street; Sundays 3 and 6.30.*—It gives us pleasure to announce that our numbers have been increased by the addition of sister Eliza Wood, who formerly met with the Grosvenor Street ecclesia, but recently resigned her connection with that meeting and applied for fellowship with us. After a full investigation of the matter, which was deemed necessary, owing to certain statements made by the brethren from whom she had withdrawn, as to her reasons for



leaving them, it was resolved to accord her a hearty welcome amongst us. The work in connection with the truth seems to make but little headway in Manchester, but occasionally there are openings in unexpected quarters, of which the brethren take advantage. A literary and debating society, of which brother King was a member before he came among us, has afforded a field for the discussion of certain matters where the truth has had a hearing. Brother King read a paper on "The Devil," and brother Morris was invited to lecture on "The only remedy for the present world-wide distress." Discussion followed in each case, and the seed—the words concerning the Kingdom of God—was unsparingly sown. We have an occasional visitor from the Society at our lectures.

(January 1896) PETERBOROUGH *Temperance Hall, Lincoln Road.* — We have pleasure in reporting that brother Charles K. Sanby, formerly meeting with the brethren in Nottingham, has been received into fellowship with us. We have had the help of the following brethren in the proclamation of the truth since last writing:—Brother F. G. Jannaway, August 25th, "A Wonderful Scheme"; brother Buckler, of Grantham, October 20th, "The Signs of the Times"; brother Sulley, November 3rd, "The Eastern Question again"; brother W. Clark, of Derby, December 8th, "Jerusalem."—L. HARVEY.

(April 1896) NOTTINGHAM—During the month obedience to the truth has been rendered by WILLIAM WILLIAMS, formerly Salvation Army; ELIZA ANN TURNER; FLORENCE WILLIAMS; and CHARLES HEMINGRAY, formerly Churchman. Upon her removal from London, sister Ada Horsman signified her desire to unite herself with the Nottingham ecclesia, and accepts the basis of fellowship upon which we stand. A tea-meeting is arranged for Easter Monday, April 6th, when we hope to have brother Jannaway with us, after fulfilling a lecturing engagement on the 5th. Any brethren or sisters who can make it convenient to come from other towns will find a cordial welcome. The report of the debate between brother F. G. Jannaway and Mr. James Marchant, a summary of which has appeared in the *Chirstadelphian*, is now published, together with some interesting letters and explanations necessary to an understanding of the delay in publication. Copies can be had from Birmingham Office, at 6d., or by post 7½d.—S. RICHARDS

(May 1896) MORRISTON -The brethren here have accepted the application for fellowship of brother G. E. Palmer, from whom the Swansea ecclesia withdrew last month, [as reported in their intelligence](#). See further under Swansea.

(July 1896) SWANSEA -On Whit Monday we held our usual tea-meeting; quite a number of brethren and sisters from Aberdare, Llanelly, Neath, and Treorky, joining us. The trouble which had recently afflicted us produced unwonted heartiness among all present, and a very profitable time was spent after tea in singing and addresses, filling our hearts with joy and gladness. This was perhaps the best social meeting we have had. Mumbles and Morrision, who have ceased to be in fellowship with us, were not represented, as they had been on previous occasions. During the month our lectures have been as follows:—May 24th, "The Kingdom of God yet Future" (brother Chidzoy); 31st, "The Wages of Sin is Death—the Gift of God is Eternal Life" (brother Heard); June 7th, "Palestine" (brother Hughes); 14th, "The Crucifixion of Christ" (brother Chidzoy). There is some prospect of a debate here between brother F. Jannaway, of London, and the Christian Evidence lecturer who has been assaulting us lately.—THOS. RANGLES.

(October 1896) SOUTHAMPTON.—Brother Hart, reporting various visits and a lecture by brother Allen, of Birmingham, mentions also that brother Percy Randell and sister Edith Soper have been united in marriage. "Since our last report I am pleased to say we have had an increase in our number. KATE FREEMAN (16), daughter of brother and sister Freeman, of this ecclesia, and scholar from the Sunday School, after a careful examination, proved her knowledge of the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, and was immersed into Christ. There are others interested. Visitors during the month have been:—Brother Randell, senior, of Winton; and brethren Herd and Banard, of

Portsmouth, who exhorted in the morning, and returned home after she morning meeting. On Sunday, August 9th, brother P. Davies, of Newbury, was with us, and exhorted at the breaking of bread, and lectured in the evening, his subject being "The Wandering Jews," showing that in order to attain unto that glorious perfection, as it is in Christ Jesus, we must become Jews in the appointed way. On August 3rd, Bank Holiday, we went by brakes to Battscroft, this side Salisbury, and amalgamated with the Shrewsbury ecclesia, having in our midst brethren Wilkinson and Randell, and brother and sister Foy, of Winton; and several from Portsmouth; and brother Thomas, from Bath, who exhorted to a great length, and with much effect. Our time was divided up into two meetings, and after a time of mutual help and much benefit, we returned home at rather a late hour. We have had a letter from sister Sawtell, junior, of Glastonbury, informing us of the rather sudden death of her sister-mother, which took place on July 15th. It appears that about half-past twelve at night she was taken with an apoplectic fit. Next morning, when they were breaking bread, or had just finished, for they are in isolation, she rose up and said she felt poorly, with pains in her head. The doctor was fetched, and thought she was suffering from acute neuralgia and after prescribing for her, left. Sometime after the fit came on, and she almost immediately fell into a deep sleep, from which she never awoke, passing into the death state at four o'clock on the Wednesday morning.—F. HART.

(February 1897) YSTRAD.—"Last month's intelligence from this place notified the withdrawal from brother J. Smith without stating any of the facts connected with the case, and to rectify matters a little, it should be made known that the withdrawal from the brother in question was an unscriptural procedure, which brother J. Thomas, of Bath, succeeded in pointing out to the brethren here, with the result that the brethren rescinded the unscriptural resolution, and received brother J. Smith back into fellowship. Brother J. Smith has subsequently removed from Ystrad to Ferndale to reside, and meets with the brethren and sisters there. This is the time when mistakes do occur. But Christ is coming, who will not judge after the sight of his eyes, nor after the hearing of his ears, because he is able to discern the very innermost thoughts and intents of the heart, consequently he will judge a righteous judgment. No fear of mistakes then."

(August 1897) DERBY.—(*Athenæum, Victoria Street; Sunday, 10.30 and 6.30; Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m.*)—Brother Clark announces the return to fellowship of brother B. Parsons and sister Alman (formerly of Nottingham).

(October 1897) SOUTHAMPTON.—*St. Andrew's Hall (off St. Mary's Road, opposite Board Schools): Sundays, Breaking of Bread, 11 a.m. Sunday School, 3 p.m. Lecture, 6.30.*—We have been visited by the following brethren during August:—P. E. Davies (Newbury), J. Thomas (Bath), H. Fry (Winton), each of whom spoke at the morning meeting and also lectured in the evening each dealing with his subject in a masterly fashion. Our meeting has been increased by removal of the following from Winton: —Brother and sister Meers, sen., brother and sister E. Meers, jun., brethren Harry, Fred and Birt Meers, jun., and sister Annie Wheatly; also sister Slade from Portsmouth. Brother and sister Barton, who have removed here, applied to us for fellowship. They have been meeting with the partial inspirationists for a number of years, but having adopted our basis of fellowship, we are only too happy to receive them among us.—W. H. BANN.

## INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL DIVISIONS

(Excerpt from September 1866) BIRMINGHAM.—an unanimous resolution, of which three weeks' notice had been given, was adopted by the ecclesia, over 50 brethren and sisters being present, repudiating the fellowship of those professors of the truth, who meet in connection with George Dowie, in Edinburgh. The resolution runs as follows: "That the ecclesia having heard read to them, and having considered the report of a discussion on the bearing of the immortality of the soul on the one faith, which

took place on Sunday, April 8th, Sunday, April 15th, and Sunday, May 6th, among those in Edinburgh, styling themselves “Baptised Believers in the Kingdom of God,” and meeting in Union Hall, 98, Southbridge, the ecclesia consider it their duty, as witnesses of the truth, to disavow, and hereby disavow and refuse all connection with the said so-called “Baptised Believers in the Kingdom of God,” and request the Secretary to write to George Dowie, Secretary of the community in question, apprizing him, for the information of himself and the said community, of this their solemn decision.” The occasion of this resolution, as appears from the wording of it, was the reading of the report of a discussion which took place among the parties referred to, on the question of whether or not it was necessary to reject the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, in order to a reception of the truth; and the necessity for it arose from the fact that the parties referred to claim the fellowship of the Birmingham ecclesia, and stand before the brotherhood (in a monthly magazine, and by a yearly gathering, to which they invite the friends of truth), as representative men. The unfaithfulness to the truth, and even ignorance of it, exhibited in the discussion referred to, was felt to be such as to call for the act of separation resolved on. A virtual disconnection had existed for a long time; but, except in the way of report, nothing had come under the notice of the ecclesia as such, to justify collective action, and collective action had never been taken. It was known that the Edinburgh professors were at best but pseudo-friends of the truth; but their own voice had never been so clearly heard in their own condemnation as now. This is not the place to go particularly into the question; but we may mention, as an illustration of the kind of sentiment current in this pretended tabernacle of the truth, that George Dowie refused to say whether he should immerse a person believing in the immortality of the soul; and James Cameron affirmed that it was “dangerous” to assert that a man must regard Jesus as the author of eternal life, before his immersion could be valid! The discussion may be published *in extenso*, and the brethren will then have an opportunity of judging for themselves, and deciding whether, as faithful witnesses of the truth, they can continue to hold fellowship, and thereby partake of the evil deeds of those who profess the truth in word, but in principle overthrow and destroy it.

(October 1866) MUMBLES.—The ecclesia in this place has gone through a searching process of reexamination, which has resulted in the re-immersion of nearly all its members. Planted under the auspices of Dowieism (which are pleasant and beguiling to the merely sentimental mind, but abhorrent to the tastes engendered by the word understood, and sturdily laid hold of,) it was no wonder that investigation and time should reveal rottenness at the foundation. The result has come, and been courageously accepted. The house has been pulled down, the shaky and uncertain materials at the bottom taken away, and the clean, chiselled foundation stones of the spirit’s exact doctrines laid down, and upon this, a new edifice has arisen, which it will be the individual fault of the constituents, if it prove not a tabernacle of Deity through the truth. The necessity for re-immersion arose upon three questions, wherein are involved some of the first principles of the oracles of God, viz., the judgment, the nature of Christ, and the doctrine of the devil. At the establishment of the ecclesia two years ago, the first was rejected, the second entirely misapprehended, and the third held in the pagan form of belief in a personal supernatural agent of evil. Time and circumstances have unveiled the truth on those subjects, with the result recorded. While the change was in progress, the brethren were visited by brother and sister R. C. Bingley, of the United States, brother J. J. Andrew, of London, and brother and sister John Butler, of Birmingham.—On the 6th ult., a resolution was adopted by the ecclesia, repudiating the fellowship of the Edinburgh professors of the truth, meeting in connection with George Dowie. The following is the document in which this decision was communicated:—

MUMBLES, September 6th, 1866.—*To the Secretary of the Meeting of “Baptized Believers in the Kingdom of God,” held at Union Hall, 98, South Bridge, Edinburgh.* DEAR SIR—The ecclesia at Mumbles and Swansea having heard read, at one of their meetings, the report of a Discussion on the relative bearing of the Immortality of the Soul, on the one faith revealed in the Scriptures, which took place among those in connection with you, and after giving the matter our careful consideration, we are compelled, in consequence of our determination to adhere to the truth, and our duty to the brotherhood, most solemnly and positively to disavow and repudiate all connection or fellowship with the so-called

“Baptised Believers in the Kingdom of God.” We, at the same time, express our supreme regret, that a meeting, claiming to be the church of God, should be bound together by such an elastic doctrinal bond, which can be expanded to such dimensions as to admit and recognize the fellowship of those who willingly or ignorantly nullify one of the most important of “first principles.”

Our present attitude is not caused by anything external to the truth; but, considering the doctrinal basis on which our fellowship rests, how can we fellowship a community where the basis is so seriously defective? Trusting that you will be constrained to reconsider and examine yourselves, whether you be in the faith, We are, sincerely yours, the undersigned.

[HERE FOLLOW 44 SIGNATURES.]

DANL. CLEMENT, *Sec.*

(Excerpt from February 1868) GREEN ISLAND, OTAGO.—Brother J. Brown, of Abbotsford, Green Island, writes under date, November 17th, to say that through the assistance of brother Murray, of Port Chalmers, he, and the brethren with him, saw some time ago the invalidity of their first immersion, which was based upon the repudiation of the doctrine of judgment and other errors; and were re-immersed upon a full apprehension of “the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.”

(Excerpts from letter September 1871) NEW ZEALAND- While our lamented brother lay in death, the following address was on its way from New Zealand, got up and signed by the brethren there as an expression of their desire to encourage him in his warfare for the truth, and as a refutation of their alleged sympathy with *Marturionism*.

By our signatures, the Christadelphians of the various ecclesias of New Zealand, mentioned below, repudiate the speculations and crotchets of the so-called Marturionists and their cooperators, whether in England, Scotland, Canada, or New Zealand, particularly their carnal doctrine of the atonement. We have no sympathy with their vile slander, in terming your exposition of God-manifestation heresy and horrid blasphemy! Having borne with their quibbling for a long time, we henceforth withdraw from their fellowship until they acknowledge their error. We hope they may consider their ways, and be wise in time, and accept the plain apostolic teaching. That they may thereby become an acceptable people in the day of the Lord Jesus, is the prayer of those, the undersigned, in the one faith:

PROVINCE OF OTAGO (Ecclesia Meeting in Caversham): William Wilson Holmes, Margaret Holmes, Edward Holmes, Mary McClugage, John Greig, Mary Sinclair.—PROVINCE OF SOUTHLAND (Ecclesia Meeting in Riverton): Josiah Beer, William Gair Mackay, Alexander Macdonald, John McKinnon, Catherine Beer, John Ward, sen., John Ward, jun., Ann Ward, Annie Ward, James Moore, Thomas Moore, Janet Moore, Peter Lawson, John Hodgkinson, Alexander Clyne.—PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY (Ecclesia Meeting in Eyreton): William Henry Gorton, William Murphy, Julia Murphy. Ecclesia Meeting in Rangiora: John Scott, Eliz. Scott. Ecclesia Meeting at Selwyn: William Scott, Mrs. William Scott, Mary Scott. The last three ecclesias have not been at any time in fellowship with Marturionism or other sectaries.”

(February 1872) GRANTOWN.—Brother James McIntosh announces the withdrawal of the ecclesia from Ellen Clark for immorality.

(Excerpts from November 1872) WHITBY. — Brother Winterburn, writing October 11th, reports that the brethren at Whitby are now re-united, in *one body*, as they have always been *one in faith*, though kept apart by obnoxious elements which have been removed.

The following is a list of those now in fellowship at Whitby: Brethren Argument, Clarkson, Clegg, Coates, Harland, Mallinder, Mankin, Ripley, Robinson, Slade, and Winterburn; sisters Argument, Mallinder, Robinson, Slade, and Tiplady.

(Excerpts from November 1873) BIRMINGHAM. — The following letter, sent through the post, to all the brethren and sisters in Birmingham, will best explain the crisis just at maturity there.

*To the Brethren and Sisters of the Lord Jesus Christ (collectively and individually) assembling in Temperance Hall, Temple-st., Birmingham, from Robert Roberts, a fellow-partaker of the holy calling, and partner in the tribulation of the present evil world, to which the saints are subjected in hope.*

### GREETING IN THE LORD.

Grace, mercy and peace be multiplied unto you abundantly, from Him who is the Father of all, through His beloved one, our Lord and Master, who was manifested to put away our sins, and now sits, glorified, at the right hand of the Majesty on high, waiting the time when his enemies shall be made his footstool.

I find it necessary to address you from the retirement forced upon me by the weakness of this sin-stricken body (Rom. 8:10; Col. 3:3), but from the immediate burden of which I hope presently to emerge, in renewal of the good work to which the truth calls everyone who has ears to hear. You are aware that there have risen up among us those who deny that Jesus Christ was God manifest in our condemned nature, for the putting away of sin by the sacrifice of himself. The doctrine thus denied is a vital element of that truth which constitutes the basis of our acceptance with the Father through His Son; consequently its denial is a barrier to fellowship between those who receive and those who reject it.

Unfortunately there are among us a few who have identified themselves with the rejectors of this saving doctrine of the cross, and who seek to force upon us the heresy which they themselves have accepted. It was hoped that time and the testimony so largely adduced within the last three months, would have enabled them to recover themselves from the snare of the devil into which they had fallen; and removed from our midst the unseemly discord which their departure from and resistance to the truth have caused. But this hope becomes less and less likely to be realised; and it becomes necessary for those who hold fast the name, and have not denied the faith, to take that attitude which duty and their own peace and edification and growth in peace require; and that is, to withdraw from all who persist in their rejection of the important element of the truth now in question.

This is no matter for the action of the managing brethren, whose duties are confined to the superintendence of the working affairs of the ecclesia as established on the truth. They have no jurisdiction in questions affecting the constitution of the ecclesia itself. The question now in agitation is a constitutional question; it affects the foundation; therefore, every brother and sister must act on it individually, as before God. For this reason, I do not address you as one of the managing brethren, nor in conjunction with them. I act in my private capacity as a brother of Christ, whose duty towards Christ cannot be fettered by any artificial rules of convenience we may find it necessary to adopt. I come forward as one striving to be, in this dark day of apostacy, an obedient believer of the gospel, walking in the simplicity and purity of the doctrine apostolically delivered, asking fellow believers to agree as to what duty requires at our hands.

Nor is this a matter to be dealt with under the law of offences between brother and brother. A first principle is openly rejected and assailed. Our foundation is called in question, as to which we are bound

publicly to take positive ground, regardless of consequences to individuals. We must, in this matter, know no one after the flesh. Our partialities, on the ground of personal acquaintance, must never stand in the way of our duty to that gospel of our salvation wherein we stand, and wherein only is friendship of any account. Let us decide on our duty first, and let the consequences take care of themselves. Our declaration will bear unfavourably on no one unless he be unfavourable to the truth, and in that case, he, and not our decision, will be responsible for the result.

I would also say that this is not a matter depending upon any vote that might be given. It relates to individual duty, which cannot be affected by votes one way or other. Voting is all very well for the settlement of mere matters of business or temporal arrangement. It is nothing to do with the question of whether we are to fellowship a lie. I will withdraw from the fellowship of that lie if all were to vote in its favour. I say this not that I fear such a thing, but merely to illustrate that our decision in this matter does not depend upon discussion and voting, like some things we have had to consider; but rests solely on an individual conviction.

There has been time enough for the settlement of mature conviction, since this mischievous controversy was originated three months ago. Further delay would only hinder our edification, impede the inquirer, and disgrace the truth. I, therefore, ask you to join me in a general declaration of withdrawal from all who deny that Jesus Christ was God manifest in our mortal nature. I ask you to do so in a manner that will enable us to give peaceable effect to our convictions, avoiding the turmoil of further discussion, which we may well dispense with after the thorough canvass of the question which has taken place, and which could lead to no good result, while it could not fail to be painful to many, and perhaps productive of some things that would be regarded with displeasure by the Master of the household and the Higher than the highest.

My request is, that if you agree with me, you will sign and return the declaration which you will find at the end of this letter. Addressed to me at the Athenæum Rooms it will reach me in my retirement; and on my return, I will ask you to meet me at the Athenæum Rooms, on Thursday night, October 30<sup>th</sup>, that our united declaration may be promulgated, and that we may take such further steps as the new situation will call for; after which it will be necessary to redraw ecclesia roll, that we may know who thereafter constitute the Birmingham ecclesia, on the basis of the unadulterated truth.

Thus may we hope to secure unity and peace at the table of the Lord, in the company of those who, in all humility before God, and zeal for His name, are waiting for His Son from heaven, in full desire with all diligence to purify themselves from the works of the flesh, and bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, in love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance.

Those who do not join in this act will remain in fellowship with those who deny the truth, and will disconnect themselves from those who may unite in stepping aside from a connection which has become a fountain of every evil work. Please then, if you think well so to do, sign and return (not later than Sunday, October 26<sup>th</sup>, addressed to me at the Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row), the Declaration on the back of this sheet.

ROBERT ROBERTS.

*Tuesday, Oct. 14<sup>th</sup>, 1873.*

(December 1873) ABERDEEN.—The following communication explains itself:—

*“The church assembling in Music Hall Buildings, Aberdeen, to their brother, Robert Roberts, editor of the Christadelphian.”*

DEAR BROTHER.—It will be in your recollection that, while you were a visitor in Aberdeen, in the month of March last, some conversation passed between you and us, respecting the circumstances that have for some years rendered our mutual intercourse, to some extent, a half-hearted and restricted communion. You gave us to understand, that so long as we maintained fellowship with the brethren meeting in King’s Road Hall, Dundee, you could not feel at liberty to hold fellowship with us. At that time, we knew of nothing pertaining to the Dundee ecclesia, that should impel us to stand aloof from them, and we expressed our disinclination to do so, unless we saw it to be duty. Still, as we felt sure that your attitude towards these brethren had not been assumed without reason, we were disposed to assent to your recommendation, that we should inform ourselves of their standing by enquiry.

You suggested, and we employed, a means of ascertaining wherein these brethren, and the great body of the faithful throughout the country, are at variance. The statement of the one faith, contained in the *Record of the Birmingham Christadelphian Ecclesia* (which we, as a church, accepted as expressing Divinely revealed truth and our faith), was transmitted by us to the brethren in Dundee, and also to those who co-operate with them in Edinburgh and Glasgow. We invited them to consider the subject with the serious care demanded by its importance; suggested the desirability of all believers of the gospel being of *one mind*, striving *together* for the faith of the gospel, and asked that if they dissented from any part or parts of the statement, they should state clearly *wherein* they disagreed and *why*. Responses to our communication were received, none of them being of the nature hoped for. It would be neither agreeable nor profitable to set down here their contents in detail. Suffice it to say, that none of the three ecclesias would accept the statement as being to them what it is to us. The brethren in Dundee were the most explicit, their letter in reply to ours containing this very distinct statement of their opinion, regarding the document submitted to them—“that we all, with one exception, consider it is so imperfect in itself, and in some cases so far from Scripture, that it would be foolish, and dangerous, and wrong to adopt it.” This result seemed to us a confirmation of your estimate of their condition; and in course of time, additional testimony presented itself, derived from various reliable sources, so that we were driven to the conclusion, that to the condition of these churches the apostle’s words are applicable, that they really “have need to be taught which be the first principles of the oracles of God.” Since “two cannot walk together, except they be agreed,” and in view of discordances so deplorable as we found existing, we came to the conclusion, that the best interests of all concerned, as well as the cause of the truth, required that we should withdraw from fellowship with these ecclesias. This decision has been intimated to them, not without an expression of our earnest desire that they all might be stimulated to self-examination, and an enlightened study of the word.

With the view of making our position definite and easily appreciable, we have this day formally expressed our adoption of the *Birmingham Ecclesial Record’s* “Statement of the One Faith,” as embodying our faith and hope, and as the standard by which we shall henceforth test the claims of all to fellowship with us in the truth.—In name of the brethren,

J. STEEL, *Secretary.*

(Excerpt from December 1873) BIRMINGHAM. — The meeting referred to in the letter published last month, was duly held on Thursday, October 30<sup>th</sup>. Nearly 150 brethren and sisters responded to the invitation to sign the declaration contained in the letter and assembled in the Athenæum Rooms, to unite their individual signatures in a general declaration of withdrawal from all denying that Jesus came in our flesh. The following communication addressed to those who did not take part in the proceedings, will best explain what took place:—

“The following announcement is communicated to you with a sincere desire for peace, friendship, and your fellowship; if it can be had on the Scripture basis of agreement in the things of the Spirit.

In consequence of the uprising of heresy in our midst, and the desirability of a peaceable adjustment of the difficulty thereby created, the brethren and sisters (to the number of 142) who signed the declaration of withdrawal from all holding that heresy, met together on Thursday, October 30<sup>th</sup>; and being the majority of those formerly constituting the Birmingham Christadelphian ecclesia, they unanimously used the power they have in that capacity, in temporal things, in passing resolutions having the following effect.

1.—Vesting the funds and effects in William Whitcomb and Charles Smith, in trust for appropriation as to be directed.

2.—Dissolving the Birmingham Christadelphian body in a legal sense, by abrogating all the rules and appointments that gave it a corporate existence in the eye of the law, and held its members in corporate association together; of course, not touching the fellowship created by the truth, which is not subject to human legislation.

3.—Ordering an inventory of the funds and effects vested as aforesaid, and the transfer of a proportionate share of the same at the end of three months, to those who may re-form themselves as an assembly on the basis of the doctrine that has emanated from Nottingham, according to the number of the persons who shall, at that time, be shewn to constitute that assembly: all debts now due being first paid.

At the same time and place, the brethren and sisters aforesaid, reconstituted themselves as the Birmingham Christadelphian ecclesia, to meet in the Temperance Hall, on the basis of the truth held from the beginning by them, and received a preliminary proposal, adopting the old system of rules, with some additions and amendments; and they united in a unanimous act of withdrawal from all holding the doctrine concerning Christ which has emanated from Nottingham.

They earnestly invite the brethren who have accepted or parleyed with that doctrine, to reconsider their position, and, casting aside a specious and dangerous travesty of the truth, to re-unite themselves with those who are compelled to stand aside from error, and to stand up for the truth which has been regained in our day with great difficulty, and is as easily lost as in the first century. On the question of how those stand with God who have embraced the new heresy, they pronounce no opinion: they leave this with Him. Their only concern is their duty. This is their rule of action, and this requires them, as the collective pillar and ground of the truth, to reject fables and fabulists, and especially to be wary against those who deny the Father in the Son, and who confess not that he has come in our own mortal flesh.

Those who do not unite with them on the foundation of the old faith (on which they have re-constituted themselves as regards corporate existence only), are no longer members of this body in any sense; and cannot henceforth be invited to participation in fellowship. It is to be hoped there will be no rude attempt to force an unnatural companionship on us at the table. We pray that our subverted brethren may be restored; but, if not, that they may, at all events, submit to the rules of civilised life, accepting a separation which has become inevitable, and peaceably pursuing that course of action which they may consider their duty.

We present to them this statement in all solicitude for our mutual well-being.—For the ecclesia,

THOMAS, DAVIS  
CHARLES MEAKIN,  
R. ROBERTS

Committee, *pro tem.*”



A goodly number among those who refrained from taking part in the withdrawal, hold the truth themselves, but are not yet clear as to parting with the fellowship of those who reject it. It is expected that a number of these will eventually see their way to returning to their connection with the ecclesia on the established basis. The violent among the subverted declared they would disregard the withdrawal, and take their places and break bread as usual. It was, therefore, necessary, in the interest of ultimate peace and edification, to admit by ticket to that part of the building where bread is broken. Those unprovided with tickets were allowed to be present in the gallery. Peace and truth are now restored to the assembly, and the work of God prevails in the comfort of those who are looking for the Lord's appearing, and the enlightenment of the stranger who comes to hear the word preached.

(October 1873) BRIERLEY HILL AND STOURBRIDGE.—For some time the brethren and sisters living in Brierley Hill, have formed part of the ecclesia at Stourbridge, a place about three miles distant, but on Sunday, September 7th, they began to meet together as a separate ecclesia. Brother Shuttleworth of Birmingham, was present to help and encourage in the good work. The new ecclesia consists of about ten brethren and sisters. The step was decided on at a meeting convened on the previous Wednesday. Three reasons for it were written down: 1st, many persons in Brierley Hill are interested in the truth, and would be likely to attend a meeting if there was one. 2nd, the distance from Stourbridge was inconvenient for brethren and sisters. 3rd, favour has been shown to the Renunciationist heresy by the Turney brothers at Stourbridge. For these reasons, the Brierley Hill brethren and sisters decided to withdraw from Stourbridge. Brother Parsons has kindly offered the use of his house for the meeting, till a suitable room can be obtained.

(Excerpt from October 1873) LEICESTER.—The ecclesia here has withdrawn from the fellowship of all who accept the Renunciationist heresy, of whom there are but one or two in Leicester.

(August 1875) HALIFAX.—A second ecclesia has been formed here, consisting of the following brethren and sisters: JOHN BAIRSTOW; MRS. J. BAIRSTOW; MARY BARKER; FRANCES BARKER; MARY BENTLEY; JAMES BRIGGS; MRS. J. BRIGGS; JOHN BROOK; JOHN CHEETHAM; GEO. DUDDING; CHARLES FIRTH; MRS. C. FIRTH; GRACE GARNETT; M. S. GOGGINS; MRS. F. HANSON; JOSIAH HARGREAVES; MRS. J. HARGREAVES; JAMES MCCARTNEY; MRS. J. MCCARTNEY; SELINA RUSHWORTH; MRS. SAVAGE; TOBIAS SAVAGE; ROBERT SMITH; MRS. ROBERT SMITH; MARTHA SMITH; WILLIAM THOMAS; MARY A. TOWN; DAVID WADSWORTH; RICHARD WHITWORTH; MRS. R. WHITWORTH. These have decided to meet separately (in the Assembly Rooms, Harrison Road,) for the sake of edification, which had for some time ceased to be possible in Bedford Square, Lister Lane, owing to the mode of teaching concerning Christ adopted there, of which the following is a specimen: "That Christ had not the power of choice, and therefore did not render voluntary obedience to God; that he was forced to do the will of God: that Jesus did nothing; the Father did everything; that he had no will of his own, and that there is no such thing in the world as free-will: that Jesus was not a probationer nor our exemplar; that the temptation in the wilderness was not to prove the character of Jesus, but to prove that he was the Lord God of Israel." &c. While meeting separately, the Assembly Rooms brethren desire that the others may so change the position they have assumed as to allow of their considering themselves in fellowship with them.

(November 1875) SHEFFIELD.—Brother Boler reports: "Our ecclesia here has been disturbed for several months, through brother John Savage endeavouring to force upon the brethren the doctrine (from Halifax) which we believe is contrary to the teaching of the word, viz., that Christ had not a free will in the least degree in the matter of his obedience; that he was righteous because he could not be otherwise, from which the rest of us argued that his temptations, and his sufferings, and his obedience were in that case a mockery and not an example to us in any form whatever. Brother Savage was entreated to drop the

subject, but he would not be prevailed upon to do so. Therefore, we considered it indispensably necessary to adopt a basis of fellowship containing the following definition:”—

“Christadelphians believe and teach that Christ was the Son of God by Mary, a virgin of the house of David, and therefore, God manifested in the flesh, by the Spirit, yet having, as an individual, a separate and independent will from the Father which he used as intelligently in compliance with his Father’s will as we are asked to use ours, but that, though thus possessing the abstract capability to sin, he rendered a perfect obedience through the strength belonging to him as the Son of God, and was thus fitted to be that sacrifice of a sinless son of Adam which the righteousness of God required, in order that sin might be condemned in a sinless possessor of the very nature of him that offended in Eden, and a propitiation be thus provided for our approach to God from whom sin had severed us.” This basis brother and sister Savage did not agree to after it had been passed, consequently they went out from us. There are also three who have not finally decided what course they will take; also another whom we fear has gone back into the world, and brother McDermott has removed to Halifax, where he is meeting with the brethren, in the Assembly Rooms, Harrison road. The following are the remaining faithful brethren and sisters:—John Dobbs, Joseph Boler, Ann Boler, James Skinner, Henry Leah, John Neale, Henry Graham, Miriam Sorby, Sister Wray, and John Waller.[Compiler’s Note: That which was done, highlighted in light gray caused what’s highlighted in dark gray.]

(Excerpt from July 1876) LONDON. — I must also acquaint you of what has happened to us here in relation to the controversy, which, as you know, has been agitating us of late. On Sunday, the 21st of May, after months of patient and careful investigation, and after the fullest opportunity offered to those who differ, to maintain their position, we resolved to discontinue fellowshipping such as believe that the descendants of Adam were not condemned to death on account of his sin, or that Jesus Christ’s death was not necessary to redeem himself as well as others from that condemnation.

(February 1877) DALKEITH.—Since the Renunciationist schism three years ago, Dalkeith has been in the wrong fellowship. Items of intelligence have been sent to the *Christadelphian* once or twice, but were not used till a right position should be taken. This has been to the grief of some, who now write as follow: “The brethren forming the Dalkeith ecclesia, have now learned experimentally the truth of our Lord’s saying, ‘A house divided against itself cannot stand.’ We have at last arrived at a unity of faith in regard to the nature of Christ, and wish it to be distinctly understood that we can no longer fellowship any one holding what is known as ‘Renunciationism.’ That this may be known, we hope you will take notice of it in the Feb. No. of the *Christadelphian*, and give the names of those who have assented to this, so that there will be no mistake as to who are for or against us. They are John Cunningham, Mrs. John Cunningham, James Harrison, Benjamin Reid, Janet Stokes, Robert Reid, sen., Mrs. Robert Reid, John Reid, Mrs. John Reid, Alexander Bateman, Mrs. A. Bateman, Robert Reid, jun., Elizabeth Reid and the writer, David Stokes. P.S.—Our place of meeting is now changed from Scientific Hall to New Hall, Back Street; hour of assembling, 11 a.m. Bro. Stokes reports the obedience of BENJAMIN READ, of Gilmerton, after a satisfactory confession of the faith once delivered to the saints.

(Excerpt from July 1877) EDINBURGH.— On the 20th of May our Annual Meeting was held, when the reports of the treasurer and secretary were submitted and accepted: the former showing that financially we were in a fair condition, the latter that we numbered 83 members, and this notwithstanding our withdrawal from several who are in sympathy with what is known as the ‘No-will theory;’ a theory which we as an ecclesia repudiate, considering that it neither honours the Father nor His Son Jesus Christ whom He has sent, and deprives the Son of the honour that is due to him for overcoming the sufferings through which it pleased his Father to make him (as the Captain of many sons) perfect.

(Excerpt from September 1877) MANCHESTER. — After a time of much unrest, the ecclesia has had to take a stand against the no-will heresy which emanated from Halifax. It has adopted a resolution declaring that heresy subversive of the apostolic doctrine of Christ, and declining fellowship with those who hold it. The result has been a diminution of numbers, but a restoration of peace and union, with the prospect of a resumption of prosperity as regards those both without and within.”

(Excerpt from July 1879) SCARBOROUGH. - The brethren said they felt themselves encouraged. They had much need of encouragement, for the circumstances of the truth in Scarborough have been very discouraging and hurtful for a year past. These may be briefly summed up as uncalled-for division. Misbehaviour on the part of a brother was the cause—misbehaviour confessed and repented of, and ought to have been forgiven; but this misbehaviour had been magnified ten-fold by rumour and surmise. Well-meaning brethren unscripturally giving way to these, refused to have anything further to do with the meeting in which said brother was received. Other brethren were aspersed on the same unsubstantial and unscriptural grounds, and the gap was unbridgable. Brother Roberts, by personal and thorough investigation, satisfied himself that the seceding brethren (men of upright intention) had, from a right motive, done the wrong thing. He therefore broke bread with brethren Hebden, Kidd, Wallis and White, and sister Kidd, strongly but unsuccessfully pressing upon the others to resume their place. At a meeting held on Thursday, June 12th, the little ecclesia organised themselves on a basis of rules, the want of which had afflicted them in times past. Brother Sawden attended and united himself. Brother Wallis was thankful for the issue, unsuccessful though in some measure it was. He had been standing aloof ever since the division, and dissatisfied with his anomalous position as a brother of Christ, waiting and praying for the clearing of the way. Perhaps the other brethren may see their way by and bye to put an end to the dishonour they do themselves and the others by standing apart. They say they are willing the others should be considered the ecclesia, and are meanwhile “more comfortable” as they are.

(March 1880) PLYMOUTH.—Brethren Sleep and Peline write as follows:—“We, the undersigned, write to inform you that after due and diligent study we have come to the conclusion that Jesus was made in all things like unto his brethren, partaking of the nature of Adam, which is sinful nature, and consequently, subject to the same condemnation. In all other points of doctrine we are agreed with the views held by the Birmingham ecclesia, and others of the same faith elsewhere, in relation to the foregoing statement. We, therefore, reject ‘free life’ and ‘substitutionary’ sacrifice, as taught by the late brother E. Turney and party, and also the latest emanations both from the Nottingham and Birmingham Renunciationists, which we believe to be subversive of God’s plan of salvation. Those with whom we have been meeting were asked, that in order to have sound fellowship, a day should be appointed that we might declare our views, and scripturally discuss them, and to see how many, if any, would believe with us, and if not in accordance with our views, we should withdraw ourselves from them. The managing brethren granted us a hearing, which was to have taken place on the 18th inst., being a clear week and four days from the request being granted. But instead of the meeting taking place, a resolution was passed declining to hold it. We have, therefore, withdrawn, and ask to be recognised by the Birmingham ecclesia, as two brethren holding the same truth with them, and we will endeavour, to the best of our abilities, to advance the truth. If any brother should happen to be coming so far west as Plymouth or Devonport, we shall be glad to see them. Our addresses are A. Sleep, 46, Marlborough street, Devonport; J. Peline, 18, Buckwell street, Plymouth.” [To A.S.: If a man is tormented with doubts with regard to the validity of a previous immersion, doubtless, the Lord, who is “full of compassion,” will pardon its repetition, even if in His estimation it should be unnecessary.—EDITOR.]

(October 1881) JERSEY CITY (N.J.)—See article “The Truth in and about New York,” present number, page—Brother Seach further reports several accessions to the ecclesia so recently reorganised. Names and particulars are as follows:—A. J. GLOVER, formerly Baptist, who had been searching for the truth for some years; NILS PETERSON, formerly Methodist, whose attention was first directed to the truth by

Brother Frank Norton, and who has since, in his somewhat distant isolation, by the study of the Scriptures, in connection with several Christadelphian works, found “the truth as it is in Jesus” JOSHUA SADLER, of the race and stock of Israel (after the flesh), who, through the faithful efforts of an intelligent Christian wife, is no longer a stranger “from the covenants of promise.” These, in the presence of a number of the brethren and sisters, on Sunday afternoon, July 31st, rendered the obedience which the truth enjoins, in being buried with Christ beneath the watery wave.

Brother Vredenburg writes concerning the action described in the article already referred to. He says:— We have all along felt the need of something which would put us in a better light before our brethren, as many had, in these parts, wandered away from the truth, and it seemed questionable whether *the faith* had any substantial advocates. Not until we separated from the West Hoboken meeting were we able to say ‘yea’ to the question whether there were such. We are now able to say ‘yea,’ for which we are grateful beyond expression. God is knitting our hearts together in love, and three men are seeking their way into the name which mantles with a robe of righteousness, so that we are bearing fruit, bless God. To Him be all the glory, through his dear son.” [Compiler’s Note: See article “The Truth in and about New York,” under; Futher Proof / Volumes 1 to 30]

(Excerpt from February 1883) LIVERPOOL.—It is our painful duty to report that we have been compelled to declare to the ecclesia in Birkenhead that we cannot, as it is now constituted, recognize it as in our fellowship. The roots of the matter extend back a few years. Some four years and-a-half ago, when Brother Roberts, of Birmingham, was lecturing in different parts of the country against the fables of Mr. Hine, Brother R. D. Robertson raised the question in our ecclesia, to which he demanded an answer, whether any brother could hold, as a matter of open and pronounced opinion, a different interpretation of the prophecies concerning the House of Israel from that entertained by the brotherhood throughout the world. The answer that we gave to that demand was in effect that no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation, and that we must all speak the same things and be of the same mind and judgment. This caused the separation from us of himself and some others who went out, they affirmed from sympathy with Brother R. D. Robertson but not with his doctrine. They formed a meeting and remained separate and distinct from us for some three years when they sought our fellowship again and submitted their case to Brethren Charles Smith, of Edinburgh, and Henry Sulley, of Nottingham, who were mutually chosen by us to make the necessary examination. This proved satisfactory, and on the 13th of June, 1881, they were able to report to us that they were of “opinion that no cause now exists why the two meetings should not be united,” and they recommended that the union should at once take place. The brethren of the Tranmere ecclesia, however, did not care to become one with us, and so there have been, since then, two meetings in this place; the Tranmere ecclesia meeting on the Cheshire side of the river Mersey, and the Liverpool ecclesia which now meets in the Temperance Hall, Hardman Street, Liverpool.

(January 1885) SYDNEY.—Brother Burton, for brother Bayliss, writes:—“Since our last report, we have had the pleasure of immersing into the sin-covering name, on October 3rd, MARIA HADFIELD (21), formerly Episcopalian. Brethren Mogg and James visited us on their way from Queensland to Newcastle, N.S.W. They now meet with our sister Barton, who has been removed to that neighbourhood. The Balmain ecclesia having found the support of a separate meeting and proclamation of the truth too severe a strain to be any longer borne, have returned to the Sydney ecclesia. Lectures, however, may still be given at Balmain, should it be possible.”

(Excerpt from January 1886) Great Bridge.—Brother W. H. Mosley writes as follows:—“The brethren and sisters meeting at Brother Hollier’s house in Farley Street, Great Bridge, have separated themselves from Great Bridge ecclesia meeting in the Odd Fellows’ Hall, Great Bridge, and are now meeting on exactly the same basis as the Temperance Hall ecclesia, respecting inspiration and fellowship.

(May 1886) Great Bridge.—Nothing would be more pleasing than to receive intelligence from the brethren with brother Hardy if the way were clear. It will become so when there is no fellowship with the compromisers of inspiration.

(June 1886) Newport (Mon.)—Brother Thomas reports the immersion of Mr. ALFRED HARMAN, formerly neutral, and Mrs. S. A. NOAKES, wife of brother Noakes, also formerly neutral.—Brother Thomas, referring to the Cardiff brethren, says the Newport brethren fellowshiped them on the assurance that they had passed a resolution declaring their belief in the inspiration of the whole of the Scriptures, but he found that what they had done was virtually worthless, that they fellowship brethren who do not believe that the Scriptures are wholly inspired. This has led them to amend their own resolution to the effect that “they also refuse fellowship to all who, while believing the whole of the Scriptures to be inspired themselves, yet extend fellowship to those who do not.”

(December 1887) Swansea.—Brother Randles reports that brother Grimes has removed to Birmingham, and brother Martin Evans to London. The loss of both is keenly felt, as they were very active in the work of the truth, in lecturing, &c. Brother M. Evans, being a shorthand writer, was very useful in reporting the lectures, which we frequently get inserted in a local paper. Against these losses we have to place the return of sister Hughes to our fellowship, she having been separated from us since the division consequent upon the controversy on inspiration. We regret to have to report withdrawal from sister Emily Palmer, for conduct unworthy the name of Christ.

Brother Walter Winstone requests the announcement that himself and family and others have resigned membership with the brethren meeting in the Agricultural Hall, after taking every step which they conceived the Scriptures to require of them. They had ceased attending 12 months ago, and have now formally resigned, feeling there was no other course open to them without sacrificing the principles of Christ. They thank God for being delivered from a corrupt state of things.

(November 1888) BELFAST- Brother Hugh Close writes telling of a division that has taken place here consequent on the action of a brother visiting Scotland, who while there fellowshiped those who are not with us on the question of the Inspiration of the Bible. On his return he defended his position, which was called in question by brother Close. Sympathy being shown with the unsound position the brother had taken, has resulted in brother and sister Close and brother and sister Magee withdrawing from the meeting. They express their determination to have fellowship with none who will not make the entire Inspiration of the Bible a test of fellowship.

(Excerpt from 1889) NOTTINGHAM- The brethren associated with brother Sulley will continue to meet in the hall in Shakespeare Street, as heretofore. It is distressing for those who may visit Nottingham that there should be two meetings, both on a sound foundation, so far as the truth in its doctrinal recognition is concerned. If wisdom prevails, their disagreement on a personal matter will not be forced on others; that is, neither side will say, “You cannot have us both.” They will leave all at liberty to do as they wot. Our basis of fellowship is the truth, and not the opinions we may form on disputes that may arise. The brethren associated with brother Sulley held a tea meeting on Easter Monday. The editor of the *Christadelphian* accepted an invitation to be present, having first sent an intimation to the other brethren (who were also invited) to the effect that his presence was not intended as an act of hostility to them, but of friendship to the brethren visited. He did not wish to lose the fellowship of the brethren with brother Kirkland; but he could not consent to be deprived of the fellowship of those with brother Sulley, with the full knowledge he had of the circumstances leading to the separation.

(Excerpt from 1889) NOTTINGHAM-Brother Kirkland also reports withdrawal from brother Sulley, for what is vaguely described as “disorderly conduct.” The act is dissented from by the following brethren

and sisters, who have been compelled to form themselves into a separate ecclesia.—J. Allen, sister Allen, A. E. Abey, S. A. Abey, E. A. Adderton, E. Godber, S. Godber, H. Cave, T. W. Cross, E. Clark. A. Dabell (sen.), A. Dabell, E. Frettingham, E. Hemingway, E. Heath, W. J. Lee, E. Lee, K. E. Lee, E. L. Phelps, M. A. Roper, H. Roper, A. Parsons, H. Parsons, W. B. Sanders, T. Stones, M. A. Stones, J. Stones, E. J. Stones, N. Peel, R. Peel, J. Sulley, and G. B. Whitehead. The event creates a great embarrassment for the friends of the truth visiting Nottingham, who have no alternative but to investigate the matter for themselves, and shape their course accordingly. Brother Sulley is preparing a printed statement for supply to such as may desire to inform themselves of the particulars. The Editor feels at liberty to publish this statement because he has himself investigated the matter, and has no hesitation in agreeing with the above-named brethren and sisters in thinking the withdrawal an unwarrantable act.

(March 1889) NEWPORT (MON.) - There has been an unhappy rupture among the brethren here. Whatever may have been the proximate cause or the course of the differences in detail, the practical result seems to be this, that one section refuses to be bound by any basis of fellowship beyond the acceptance of the Scriptures as the inspired Word of God: "that nothing before, nothing after the foundation on page 7 of our constitution (the paragraph defining the character of the Scriptures) shall be put before any brother or sister coming into our fellowship." Brother Cross, speaking for them, adds this: "We shall fellowship none but those who have been immersed into the name of Christ upon a belief of the gospel as defined in Acts 8:12." As no even orthodox person, believing in the inspiration of the Bible, would object to the phraseology of Acts 8:12, brother Lander truly says that the position taken by these brethren would make it impossible to know whether they were met on the basis of the truth or not. It is a question of understanding the meaning of the Scriptures, as well as recognising their divine character. Brother Lander and those with him require a distinct understanding of the doctrines that unite them; and, consequently, accept the statement of faith received in the Temperance Hall, Birmingham, requiring assent to the doctrines therein defined as the basis of fellowship. Those who take this position are brother and sister Davis, brother and sister Geo. Lander, brother and sister Noakes, brother Henry Edwards (Blewitt Street), brother Holder, brother W. Shepherd, brother Heath, sister Bartlett, brother and sister J. Lauder, and the Pontrhydyrun brethren and sisters. They meet in the same room as before, viz., 1, Caxton Place (large upper room), and will be glad of countenance and company of all brethren who are prepared to maintain the doctrines and precepts of the truth without vagueness, dubiety, or compromise. They are cast down, but not destroyed.

(April 1889) NEWPORT (MON.)- A communication signed by the seventeen brethren and sisters spoken for by brother Cross last month (viz., E. Schofield, W. A. Gadd, W. Lander, W. Collard, G. Williams, R. Chilton, F. Carmick, A. Harman, B. Chilton, S. Schofield, F. Collett, S. Jefferys, M. E. Jefferys, M. Gadd, Elizabeth Cross, J. Waite, P. Jenkins, and T. J. Cross), denies the imputations contained in the paragraph appearing last month under the head of "Newport," concerning those who have left the upper room in Caxton - place. The signatories declare that they "have not opened the door to fellowship error or unsound doctrine, or anything contrary to the recognised standard of Christadelphian faith and practice." They say that though at the time of the separation they "had not accepted the Birmingham new constitution in its entirety," since then, they "have carried out their original intention. Having been carefully through it, they have decided to accept the same with the alterations suitable to limited numbers; and the same is now binding upon them in its code of rules, statement of faith, positive and negative, and epitome of the commandments of Christ," in affirmation whereof they append their names. Under these circumstances, there seems no reason why re-union ought not to ensue. We have to be one if Christ accept us at his coming, and unless for serious reasons, we ought to be one now.

(August 1889) NEWPORT (MON.)- [A meeting was held on July 5th, with a view to reconciliation, which surely ought not to be impracticable in full and frank discussion of difficulties among a people hoping for the mercy of God unto eternal life. The meeting was adjourned to the 11th, but that date not

suiting some, was still further adjourned; not without hopes of coming to a satisfactory understanding.— C. C. W.] Brother Lander reports lectures as follows:—June 16th, “Eternal life;” 23rd. “A review of Mr. Richardson’s lecture, (a Roman Catholic one) on Dissent and Dissenters weighed in the Bible balance and found wanting;” 30th, “The resurrection of the dead scripturally considered;” July 7th, “Partakers of the divine nature.”

(May 1883) KILMARNOCK—All true brethren will sympathise with the scriptural zeal of the little company that here and at Auchinlech are striving to keep themselves unspotted from the world. But there is a wise, and an unwise way of trying to reform the erring. We must be patient with other ecclesias, and not “stand aloof” where there is a professed conformity with the will of Christ, and some endeavor to carry out that profession. Consider the universal weakness and misfortune, and have compassion one of another. Without patience and forbearance, we shall fail to get at the little good that is possible in “the present evil world.” EDITOR.

(Excerpt from March 1891) BOSTON (MASS.)— [Brother Rileigh reports withdrawal from a number, whose names are given, “for persistent accusations against the ecclesia in word and deed.” We have also a protest signed by twelve brethren and sisters against the publication of the said withdrawal, on the ground that the accusations are true and such as faithfulness requires. The dispute turns on identification with labour unions which ignore the commandments of Christ. Those withdrawn from protest against this as being wrong on the part of those who have come out from the world and subjected themselves to Christ. This sounds like a wholesome and apostolic contention. If we lent ourselves to withdrawal for such a reason, from those who make such a contention, we should fear we might be sinning against Christ. Of course, a good deal depends upon the way and spirit in which the objection is urged. It is possible to contend for the right in a way that makes the contender an offender. Of this, parties at a distance cannot judge. The best plan is to ignore the matter for the present, in the hope of a re-union, which ought to be possible in such a dispute, for presumably all desire to be found faithful by Christ at his coming.— EDITOR.]

(December 1891) NEWARK—The ecclesia here has lately been in a troubled condition, owing to false notions being entertained by some concerning the resurrection and judgment, which has resulted in brother and sister Kerry, brother H. Cook, brother G. Hawkins, sister Hage, sister Bocoock, and myself, declaring that “We believe that the books currently known as the Bible, consisting of the scriptures of Moses, the Prophets, and the Apostles, are the only source of knowledge concerning God and His purpose at present extant or available on the earth, and that the same were wholly given by inspiration of God in the writers, and are consequently without error in all parts of them, except such as may be due to errors of transcription or translation,” and that we believe and endorse the statement of faith as issued by the Birmingham brethren, and to further strengthen our position we cordially assent to and endorse the following seven definitions:—1. That Jesus is the appointed judge of the living, and of the dead. 2. That as such, he is the dispenser of life and death at his second appearing. 3. That in order to the exercise of this office of judge, the dead and the living will all be assembled before him at his coming. 4. That therefore, they—all of them, living and dead, are (when they come before him) in the unjudged state, and, therefore, not immortal,—not incorruptible, since immortality is the chief award of his judgment seat. 5. That therefore at the moment of resurrection to renewed life, the dead are not immortal, and that the contention that they are so is inconsistent with the appointed function and honour which God has conferred upon Christ, as the supreme arbiter of life and death. 6. That the recognition of this truth is one of the essential conditions of fellowship among the brethren of Christ. 7. That fellowship with those who deny this truth, is an offence against the truth, even on the part of a brother holding the truth.”—W. WALKER.

(January 1892) MANCHESTER -At a meeting held last night, (December 13th) we decided for the present to meet alternately at my house (16, Larch Street, Hightown), and brother Smithers (57, Carter Street, Greenheys), until we can procure a suitable room for meeting. I have been requested by the brethren here to ask you to kindly make this known through the *Christadelphian* for the benefit of the brethren visiting Manchester. The brethren meeting are: brother J. Astin, brother and sister Allman, brother and sister Deakin, brother and sister Roberts, brother and sister Smithers (of this town), and brother and sister Keay (of Sale)—J. W. ALLMAN.

[The cause of this movement is the division of mind and toleration of crotchets at Oldham Road, where the work of the truth has been nearly killed from these causes.—ED.]

(January 1893) GAINSBOROUGH -There having been some dispute here concerning the trouble that was at Lincoln some time ago, the undersigned brethren have decided not to fellowship those brethren in that town who meet at the Coffee Palace.—JAMES H. BILHAM, JOSEPH BURTON, ALFRED SEDGWICK, LUCY SEDGWICK, E. ROWELL.

(March 1893) SYDNEY.—Brother F. J. Mumby, writing on behalf of the Leichardt ecclesia, reports that matters have arrived at a stage with regard to what is called “the age question,” that leaves them no alternative but to stand apart from those who hold that an age qualification of twenty years and upwards is necessary for the acceptable obedience of the faith. The views of those who hold this idea are formulated in the following definition, which has received the sanction of some:—“We believe the Scriptures teach adult service and adult responsibility, therefore we cannot agree to sink our convictions. That as we believe that God has by His apostles called men and women to his service, and to be His sons and daughters, and as a Christadelphian ecclesia should be composed of His servants only, we cannot receive into our fellowship children, however intelligent they may be. We therefore decline for the future to receive those under adult age, whose age we define from the Scriptures to be twenty years and upwards.” After such an express avowal of an unscriptural doctrine, tending to the hindrance and unjust exclusion of the intelligent young of our families and schools, the Leichardt ecclesia felt they could no longer remain in fellowship with those holding it. Brother Mumby says:—“Ten members of the Temperance Hall ecclesia have left through the attitude of those holding the age qualification, and are now meeting with us. Our present attitude has brought about a good understanding between us and the Fairfield ecclesia’ (who number about a dozen), meeting several miles from Sydney, some of whom regularly pay us visits, and help to “Provoke unto love and good works.’ We trust that the time is not far distant when “the crooked shall be made straight.”

(August 1893) SWANSEA -During the month the ecclesia have withdrawn from Mumbles for retaining in fellowship brother D. Clement, after allowing himself to be appointed and remaining a member of the Mumbles Local Board.—The subjects of lectures have been as follow:—June 18th, “Judgment to come, when and where?” (brother Chidzz); 25th, “The atonement, or why did Christ die?” (brother H. Davis); July 2nd, “The Gospel” (brother Hughes); 9th, “The time of the dead and the terror of the Lord, Scriptural things having an urgent personal bearing” (brother R. Roberts). The brethren and sisters were much encouraged and strengthened by the exhortation of brother Roberts at the breaking of bread, and the lecture in the evening was attentively listened to throughout by a much increased audience. On this occasion we had the company of brother S. Jones and Pugh, of Merthyr; and brother Green, of London.—THOMAS RANGLES.

(November 1894) MELBOURNE.—Brother W. Robertson reports:—On 25th July, HARRY STAVELEY GALBRAITH (21), son of brother Galbraith, of Traralgon, put on the saving name in baptism; also on 3rd August, Mrs. CHARLOTTE CARR (31), formerly Baptist. Ecclesially, in consequence of the underhand activity of G. Cornish, we have been obliged to take action against his



flesh-justifying doctrine, and to ask the brethren and sisters to declare their fidelity to the truth, and their antagonism to this error, by giving their individual re-assent to the Statement of the Faith (Birmingham 1886 edition), by which we are able to give you the names of the re-formed ecclesial roll. The new party can be truly classed as “flesh magnifiers.” They meet in Queen’s Walk, in open antagonism to us, adopting, as a means to disguise their reality, the name “Christadelphian.”

(January 1894) VICTORIA (B.C.).—The starting of the ecclesia here dates back about six years, when brothers Heritage and Buckler came from Guelph (Ont.). At that time, along with brother Nelson, formerly of New York, they met at each other’s houses to remember our Lord’s death, until they were joined by two or three others who partly learned the truth through their endeavours. It was then thought advisable to rent a room on one of the principle streets in which they could invite the alien to hear the “glad tidings,” the result being that fifteen have put on the sin-covering name. The three brothers mentioned above have all removed from our midst—brethren Buckler and Nelson to Portland (Ont.), and brother Heritage through death, leaving the rest of us to do for ourselves that which we depended on them in a great measure to do, viz., properly dividing the word and exhortation. We have endeavoured to supply the loss by reading the works and lectures of able brethren and giving heed to the Holy Scriptures. We have experienced the trials that all the sons of God are subjected to, but we see a wise Father’s hand in bringing about the circumstances connected with them, also in that they should be so frequent as ours has, as not having borne the heat and burden of the day, but having started labour at the eleventh hour, why shouldn’t our trial be severe if short? The latest trouble was brought about by some from Scotland settling in our midst who desired fellowship, but could not subscribe to our constitution (Birmingham). They wished us to rescind it, but the ecclesia refused to do so. They objected to it particularly because it declared the Bible to be wholly inspired and infallible. They said they did not know this to be the case, as they had never considered the question. They also put a very loose interpretation on some of the commandments of Christ, and speak evil of some of the brethren. Some of the ecclesia could not see the wisdom of our action towards these people, so they have gone out from among us. Two meetings is the result. We are thankful to our Father for being able to discern the voice of the shepherd from the voice of a stranger. Next Thursday it is the ecclesia’s privilege, God willing, to assist Wm. J. WYLIE in putting on the name of Christ.—THOS. W. EDWARDS.

(May 1894) LONDON (NORTH) -After a long series of controversial meetings on the new doctrine introduced by brother Andrew, the ecclesia was invited to re-affirm the basis of fellowship heretofore in vogue [popular] among them, in which the doctrine of light being the basis of resurrectional responsibility was avowed [accepted]. A majority refused to do so, in consequence of which, brother Lake issued a circular, of which the following is the principal portion:—

“Dear Brethren and Sisters,—You are aware that at the business meeting on Sunday last, when the Ecclesia was asked to re-affirm its basis of fellowship **against the false theories** introduced by brother Andrew, it refused to do so. **We, therefore, who maintain the truth as it has always hitherto been held and taught in the London meeting, have withdrawn from the meeting at Barnsbury Hall. We invite you to meet with us upon the old basis of fellowship.** Our first meeting will be held on Sunday morning next, at the Temperance Hall, Church Passage, Islington (entrance by the Church in Upper Street, or from Cross Street). We meet at 11 o’clock for the breaking of bread, when all who uphold the truth in its purity, as hitherto taught among us, are cordially invited to attend.”

[The refusal to affirm a doctrine is equivalent to its repudiation; which is a much more serious thing than inability to see it, especially when combined with avowed antagonism to it, as in the present case. The decision of the assembly left brother Lake and those who act with him no alternative but the course they have adopted.—ED.]

(May 1894) LONDON (SOUTH) *Gresham Hall, Gresham Road, Brixton (near Brixton Station)*.

In view of the refusal of a majority of the North London (late the Islington) ecclesia to re-affirm the basis on which they have hitherto existed, the Gresham Hall (late the Camberwell) brethren have issued a circular addressed "To the brethren and sisters of the North and South London Ecclesias," in which they say:—"We deem it advisable to call attention to the fact that the South London Ecclesia adheres to the doctrine of the judgment as expressed in its basis of fellowship, viz:—

"That resurrection affects those only who are responsible to God by a knowledge of His revealed will; that all these, whether just or unjust, faithful or unfaithful, will be raised from the dead at the second appearing of Jesus Christ, and will, with the living, appear in a corruptible nature before the judgment-seat of Christ, to give an account of themselves, and to receive in the body according to that which they have done, whether it be good or bad."

"The South London Ecclesia, therefore, invites the fellowship of those only who assent to this doctrine in its entirety, including that feature of it which recognises a knowledge of God's revealed will as the ground of responsibility." (*Signed by the 12 official brethren: A. T. Jannaway, F. G. Jannaway, Chas. Meakin, F. W. Porter, A. J. White, J. A. Bonds, G. Brett, J. L. Green, J. M. Evans, H. E. Purser, J. Bellamy, and J. Barker.*)

(June 1894) LONDON (NORTH) -Since the circular issued by brother Lake, the following has been printed and circulated: — "*Islington Temperance Hall, Church Passage, Upper Street, N., April, 1894.*— At a business meeting on April 15th, the Islington Ecclesia refused to re-affirm its basis of fellowship against the false theories introduced by brother J. J. Andrew, which are embodied in his pamphlet entitled 'The Blood of the Covenant.' We, therefore, who maintain the truth as it has hitherto been held and taught in the London meeting, have withdrawn from the meeting at Barnsbury Hall. We invite you to meet with us upon the old basis of fellowship, which is explained in the following proposition:—"That we re-affirm our belief that knowledge is the basis of responsibility to God, and that enlightened rejectors are amenable to Resurrection and Judgment, and that we, in accordance with Rule 3, withdraw from those who deny this." We meet at the above address at 11 o'clock for the breaking of bread, when all who uphold the truth in its purity, as hitherto taught among us, are cordially invited to attend. Our meetings for the present will be as follows—Sunday mornings at 11; School at 3; Wednesday evenings at 8. P.S.—The above hall is not at present available for Sunday evening lectures, and other arrangements are being made. Signed on behalf of the Islington Ecclesia, T. Boshier, G. F. Lake, A. S. Thompson, W. H. Boulton, C. W. Clark, C. F. Clements, R. C. Frost, T. Legg, E. Powell, T. M. Bore, Henry Eastwood, Secretary (*pro tem.*), 105, Sotheby Road, Highbury Park, N."

Brother F. G. Jannaway informs us that the majority are with the foregoing, though the voting at the final meeting, from various causes, appeared to indicate the contrary. Out of a muster roll of 175, only 47 are left behind.

Brother Eastwood requests denial to be given to the report circulated by some at Barnsbury Hall that the brethren represented by the foregoing circular believe that Christ had a free life, and that we are still *only* in Adam. Brother Eastwood says: "We expect to immerse two candidates on Friday next, and will report concerning same next month. We expect to commence lectures first Sunday in June, but may have to wait till first Sunday in July."

*Barnsbury Hall.* — The communication from Barnsbury Hall will be found noticed on page 240, also that from 12 brethren and sisters at Gresham Hall, sympathising with them. [\[See The Responsibility Trouble In London\]](#)

## THE RESPONSIBILITY TROUBLE IN LONDON

Brother Owler, on behalf of those in association with brother Andrew, sends a communication in which he says:

“The doctrine which you designate as new has been held by many brethren for the past 30 years, and was set forth in the *Declaration* (prop. 31.) until altered in 1893. Our basis does not contain anything explicit about ‘the enlightened rebel’; the idea is imported into it, and the various sections, when taken in sequence and rightly combined, confine the resurrection to the judgment seat of Christ, to the faithful and unfaithful, the just and unjust of the household of faith.”

REMARKS.—This is an illustration of the unsound reasoning by which the Scriptures themselves are forced into the service of error. We are responsible for the wording of the *Declaration* before and after 1893. We know exactly what it means, and on this point can therefore speak with authority. Brother Owler says it means (in the case of Proposition 31.) the doctrine now advocated at Barnsbury Hall. This is not true. The statement of the Proposition that Christ, at his appearing, will “summon before him for judgment, the whole of his professing household,” was directed against the contention of those who said that *not the whole*, but only a part (and that the faithful part) of the professing household, would come forth at the resurrection. The wording of the Proposition was intended to bar the door against those who denied the judgment by representing it as a mere distribution of prizes of different value. The parenthesis with which the Proposition concludes, shows this. The Proposition was never intended to exclude the resurrection of enlightened rebels, who form no part of the household. It related only to those who are mentioned in the Proposition—not to those who are not mentioned. As to the alteration in 1893 when it came to be used for the purpose of excluding the Scriptural rule of responsibility, it became necessary to make the slight verbal alteration appearing in the edition of 1893, by which it reads, “the whole of those who are responsible to his judgment.”

If any one doubts the correctness of this explanation, and is of the opinion that the paragraph was intended to exclude the resurrection of enlightened rejectors, we have but to refer them to the whole current of Christadelphian literature for 30 years past (including brother Andrew’s own publications). There is scarcely a volume of the *Christadelphian* during all that time in which the doctrine of the resurrection of enlightened rejectors is not pointedly recognised as the teaching of revelation. Let a single volume suffice. In vol. 1870, page 3 (the very first one we search), Dr. Thomas, in his letter to the *Rock*, defining the teaching of the Christadelphians, says, in par. 14, “They teach that it is knowledge that makes responsible, so that man that is in honour and understandeth not is as the beasts that perish.” In the same volume, page 120, in answering a question, we ourselves speak thus: “The words quoted from John 12., on which the foregoing questions hinge, prove the resurrection of a class who are neither the faithful nor unfaithful servants of Christ, but the simple rejectors of his word, and who are therefore appropriately styled by our correspondent a third class.” It would be possible to quote much in the same strain, but one quotation is as strong as twenty. It is a sufficient rejoinder to brother Owler to say that the doctrine of the non-resurrection of enlightened rejectors was not “set forth in the *Declaration* until altered in 1893,” and that his deduction to the contrary from the *Declaration* recognising the presence of “the whole professing household,” is on a par with the argument that extracts a similar conclusion from the command in Psalm 1., to “gather my saints together unto me.” We must suppose that brother Owler honestly imagines that his impression is correct, but it is not so satisfactory to hear him say, “Our basis does not contain anything explicit about the enlightened rebel: *the idea is imported into it.*” What the basis says is this: “Resurrection affects those only who are *responsible to God by a knowledge of His revealed will*—that ALL THESE, just or unjust, faithful or unfaithful, will be raised from the dead,” &c. This is an “explicit” recognition of the knowledge of the revealed will of God as the ground of human responsibility. It was intended to mean this, as brother Andrew plainly teaches, in *Jesus Christ and him crucified*. It is now

denied that men are made “responsible to God by a knowledge of His revealed will.” It is now denied that men who know his revealed will and refuse to submit to it will be raised from the dead, unless they have been baptised. It is of course possible for honest men to change their minds, but it is not nice when they try to make it appear that they have not changed their minds, and that others have done so who have been of the same mind for 40 years.

The rest of the communication relates to details of the heated meeting, at which a confused vote was taken on the proposal to re-affirm the doctrine avowed in the basis. As these are unimportant, and would only lead to rejoinder on the part of those who might wish to give a different version, we think it best to withhold them.—EDITOR.

Brother Guest requests the publication of a circular which has been issued by twelve brethren and sisters who dissent from the position taken by the official brethren of the Gresham Hall ecclesia. So much of it as is of merely local application may be omitted without detriment. The principal feature of the circular is the endeavour to show that disbelief in the resurrectional responsibility of enlightened rejectors is not incompatible with the printed basis of the ecclesia. This endeavour takes the following form:—“Section 19 excludes the ‘resurrection of heathen,’ a term applicable to all out of Christ, and section 9 states that Christ was ‘raised from the dead in consequence of his perfect obedience,’ and that thereby ‘a way was opened from the grave for all who avail themselves of his covering name in the appointed way.’ The unbaptised do not ‘avail themselves of Christ’s covering name,’ and therefore no ‘way from the grave’ has been ‘opened’ for them, either to reward or punishment. This is our belief.”

REMARKS.—The fallacy here arises from a wrong understanding of terms. “Heathen” was never used to mean the knowing rejectors of the truth, but only the utterly benighted of mankind who having no understanding are, as the Scriptures declare, “as the beasts that perish.” “Heathen” was not used by those who wrote the “basis” to mean “all out of Christ,” but the class popularly expressed by that term. Many are out of Christ who were once in Christ, as Christ recognises in saying, “If a man *abide not in me*, he is cast forth,” &c. (Jno. 15:6.) Even those who deny the resurrectional responsibility of knowing rejectors must admit its applicability to men who abide not in Christ, and, therefore go out of Christ. Yet if the above paragraph were correct, they would be compelled to regard such as “heathen” and excluded from resurrection.

The next fallacy turns upon the unnatural construction put upon the phrase “a way opened from the grave.” By this was meant a way into life eternal. It was never intended to mean a way back to mortal life. A man can come back to mortal life without a “way” being opened. This has been shown repeatedly in the history of mankind. Men do not require a way “opening” into mortal life, for they are in that way already. Reviving for another spell of mortal life is not coming out of that way. What they require is a way opening into immortality. This is the way that has been opened by Christ, which is a way to reward only, and not punishment at all. Men do not require a way opening to punishment, for they are “worthy of” that by nature. To say, then, that as “the unbaptised do not avail themselves of Christ’s covering name, which has been given for salvation, no way has been opened for their punishment,” is to state the argument in terms that allow of its absurdity to appear.

It would be far better to allow frankly that the basis does affirm that knowledge, and not partial obedience is the ground of resurrectional responsibility. If some did not understand that this was in the basis or if they have changed their minds, let them say so, and not try to make out the basis to be on their side. We are happy to think that those who have changed their mind are few in number, considering the efforts put forth. The large majority in London, a majority amounting to four-fifths, if our information be correct, adhere to the truth professed from the beginning: not that majorities have anything to do with the question

of what is the truth of God. But it is some comfort to see the truth make some stand in the midst of the terrible odds arrayed against it in the present benighted-state of British society.—EDITOR.

The circular makes a further effort in this form:—

“During the past few months, many statements seriously affecting the first principles of the truth hitherto held by us have been made to support wrong teaching on this subject, some of them being equivalent to affirming that we do not pass out of Adam into Christ at baptism: that the disobedience of Adam is not imputed to his descendants, and that a sacrificial death is not necessary to cleanse them from it. . . .”

“The Bible teaches that ‘by one man’s disobedience’ all men are ‘made sinners’ at birth (Rom. 5:19; Eph. 2:3); that when believers are baptised into Christ they are ‘made righteous’; that they are ‘justified’ (Rom. 5:1) from the ‘condemnation’ under which they were born (verse 18), and ‘receive forgiveness of sins’ (Acts 26:18); and that consequently death cannot ‘reign’ over them for their own previous sins or for Adam’s disobedience. Brethren who say that they are not freed at baptism from condemnation for Adam’s disobedience are depriving Christ of a part of his work as a Redeemer, and in so doing they are partially ‘denying the Lord that bought them’ (1 Pet. 2:1).”

REMARKS.—We are of course unaware of all the statements that have been made in the controversy originated by brother Andrew’s new contention (for it is certainly new with him). But so far as those we are acquainted with are concerned, we cannot recognise the truth of the allegation of the opening sentence of the foregoing extract. It seems to us just the other way round; that the statements seriously affecting first principles have been made by those who are opposing the responsibility of enlightened rejectors. We refer to our pamphlet for illustration. That we do not pass entirely out of Adam into Christ at baptism is a self-evident fact when two things are realised: our physical connection with Adam: the physical nature of Christ. The Christ we are baptised unto is a glorified Christ: baptism does not give us his glory, yet will lead to our getting it. The nature we have received from Adam is a mortal nature: baptism does not deliver us from this nature, yet it will lead to our being delivered. These are themselves “first principles” and not statements “seriously affecting first principles.”

As to the charge of believing “that the disobedience of Adam is not imputed to his descendants,” we own to it. To believe anything else would be to prove Christ a sinner, for he was one of those descendants. And it would be to contradict what God has declared as a principle regulating His procedure towards men, that “The soul that sinneth, it shall die . . . the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.” “Every man shall be put to death for his own sin.” (Ezek. 18:4; Deut. 24:16). Adam sinned and was sentenced to death: and we inherit the nature on which that sentence took effect. But this is a different thing from God imputing Adam’s sin to us. It is testified that “God will not do iniquity.” He strongly appeals to Israel on this point all through Ezekiel 18. What should we think of holding a man guilty of an offence he had never committed? The consequences of another man’s sin may come upon him—such as where the son of a spendthrift, who has wasted an estate, is born into a state of poverty: but who would dream of “imputing” the spendthriftness of the father to the son? “By one man’s disobedience many have (truly) been made sinners”—not “at birth,” as the circular says, and which the Scriptures never say. They become sinners when they are capable of responsible action, and this being the result of the “nature” they have received from Adam, is traceable to “one man’s disobedience.” But this is a different thing from holding them to be sinners before they have sinned, and especially for a sin they never sinned—even Adam’s sin—which Paul expressly recognizes they are not guilty of (of course) in saying, “Death reigned from Adam to Moses over them that had *not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression*” (Rom. 5:14). The idea of imputing the sin of Adam to helpless

babes is one of the old monstrosities of Papalised theology, from which we have become emancipated. We are not going back to that suffocating smoke.

As to believers just baptised into Christ, it is not these to whom Paul refers when he says, “By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.” He is referring to the completed upshot of Christ’s work, of course: for the circular-writer must allow that many are baptised who are unrighteous, and remain unrighteous, like Simon Magus, to whom Peter said, after Simon’s baptism, that he was still in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity (Acts 8:21–3), and had neither part nor lot in the way of life. The many who are “made righteous” are those who are chosen at the last; and they are made so by a double process: first, their sins are forgiven and, second, they are so influenced by the truth as to put away all unrighteousness and become the servants of righteousness, bringing forth fruit unto holiness in walking in the righteous ways of the Lord. All this is the result of “one man’s obedience”; for the operative power at all stages is the work of Christ. It is “for Christ’s sake” (the obedient) that they are forgiven. It is by the love of Christ constraining them that they obey His commandments and thus become righteous. It is not the result of a mechanical imputation of the righteousness of Christ, as the sects teach. God does not impute the righteousness of Christ to other men in the artificial way taught by modern theology. He imputes righteousness by reason of their faith, that is, “*their faith* is COUNTED FOR righteousness,” as in the case of Abraham, and He ceases to impute their sins to them. But as for the righteousness of Christ, that is the righteousness of Christ and nobody else’s. By reason of it we are forgiven and invited to earn a joint inheritance with him by doing righteousness in the obedience of His commandments. This is the testimony and common sense. “Let no man deceive you; *he that doeth righteousness* IS RIGHTEOUS even as He is righteous: he that committeth sin is of the devil” (1 Jno. 3:7). “The unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.” “If ye walk after the flesh, ye shall die.”

These simple and glorious truths are becoming obscured by the unskilful use of words and phrases which though found in Paul’s epistles are capable of being wrested hurtfully from their meaning as Peter testifies (2 Peter 3:16).

The circular points out that “the ecclesia has not hitherto made this a test of fellowship.” This is true; and if it is now becoming such, it is not because of any changed attitude on the part of those who believed, but because some who believed it are now repudiating it, and inviting the brethren by a determined endeavour (by pamphlet and otherwise) to depart from it; and, not only so, but are declaring the maintenance of the truth in the case to be a work of error, and “a serious interference with first principles, &c.” Perhaps we have been wrong in winking at the denial of a truth that has always been recognised as a part of the Gospel from the beginning; and it may be that God in His providence is forcing us into a more prominent assertion of the fact that He will not be mocked by any of the sons of men to whom the knowledge of His sovereign will is allowed to come; but that He will require it at their hands in the great day of His wrath. We were invited ten years ago to unite in the attitude now being taken by the London brethren, on the occasion of an Australian ecclesia having withdrawn from some on this very subject. Our answer, which appears in the *Christadelphian* for April, 1884, page 190, was as follows:—“It seems a pity to make the fate of the rejected a cause of rupture where first principles are not compromised. It is the glad tidings of salvation . . . that is the basis of union in Christ, and not the details as to how the disobedient are to be dealt with, so long as it is recognised that death is the upshot of disobedience. Granted that responsibility should be preached, but it is a point on which there should be patience with those who do not see the full extent of the responsibility. No one can say where, among the rejectors of the word, responsibility exists. We can only recognise the general and reasonable principle that light, when seen, makes responsible.” The Sydney brethren answered “The discussion had lasted three months. A continuation of the proceedings would have been destructive of the unity and peace that ought to prevail in every ecclesia: hence the action, which proceeded from no animus but from a simple desire for a Scriptural state of things

and to maintain the wholesome rule of responsibility laid down by the Lord, that light having come into the world, if men knowingly refuse subjection they come under its condemnation.”

The question has now been raised in a way that defies accommodation. We kept back brother Andrew’s name till he himself published it to the world. Having done all we could to keep the controversy at bay, we can but sorrowfully accept the situation created, believing at the same time that the hand of God may be in it in compelling the assertion and proclamation of the whole truth—concerning the day of His anger as well as the day of His favour.—EDITOR.

(Excerpt from August 1894) LONDON (SOUTH) *Gresham Hall, Gresham Road, Brixton (near Brixton Station)*. Writing again on later date, brother Bellamy says:—“At our quarterly business meeting held on Thursday evening last, July 12th, the following resolution was passed:—‘That in consequence of the stand taken by the Barnsbury Hall meeting in avowing and teaching that unbaptised enlightened rejectors of the Gospel are not amenable to resurrectional judgment, a stand which denies that knowledge is the basis of resurrectional responsibility—the Barnsbury Hall meeting be regarded as out of fellowship; and that any brother or sister fellowshipping that meeting be regarded as infringing Rule 7.—(i.e., Rule 7 in our basis of fellowship).’ We cannot find words to express the grief it causes us in having to separate ourselves from brother Andrew and those whom we confidently regard as being led astray by him; we could see no alternative left us in the matter, the more especially as we were given to understand by brother Andrew himself that we must accept his new teaching or cease to walk with him.”

Brother F. G. Jannaway writes:—“In the *Fraternal Visitor* for June, it is reported that four members have left us on account of being ‘dissatisfied with the spirit that prevails at Gresham Hall.’ The following are the facts: Brother A. Clements was unanimously withdrawn from by our ecclesia over two years ago (April 10th, 1892), at a business meeting, the minutes of which are now before me. ‘We are commanded to withdraw from every brother who walks disorderly’ (2 Thess. 3:6). As to brother and sister J. Smith, they left us on Sunday, May 20th, without any intimation whatever. I immediately wrote asking if such were true, and if so, why they had left us. His reply is also now before me, and the very first paragraph states they were ‘unable to accept the theory of inspiration as held by those meeting at Gresham Hall,’ and therefore ‘have no right to be in fellowship there, unless we could still continue and keep silent on the matter, but such an attitude we consider would not be honest.’ Brother Smith added, ‘It is a wrench to leave those whom we love, because they also long for Christ’s return. We can and must still esteem them. We must meet with those at Kennington as we did this morning; you will not allow us to meet at Gresham Hall.’ The extracts speak for themselves.”

(Excerpt from September 1894) LONDON (NORTH) *Islington Temperance Hall, Church Passage, Upper Street, N. Sundays, 11 a.m., 3 p.m., and 6.30 p.m.; Wednesdays, 8 p.m* Brother Andrew requests the insertion of the following note:—“In the London Intelligence of the August number the Secretary of the Gresham Hall meeting says, in support of their disfellowship action, ‘We could see no alternative left us in the matter, the more especially as we were given to understand by brother Andrew himself that we must accept his new teaching or cease to walk with him.’ If the reason given in the resolution is sufficient, this reason is superfluous; and if not sufficient, the latter reason is no justification. The expression ‘given to understand’ implies either a verbal or written communication to the Gresham Hall meeting, or some of its members, or a report of such a communication to others. As to the former, there has been nothing of the kind. I offered in January last to meet the presiding brethren in South London calmly to go into the evidence of the question in dispute, but they declined. If ‘given to understand’ has reference to a report or rumour, Scriptural principles require that it should be verified, and if found true, that reasons should be asked for such a statement. As far as my knowledge goes, no steps of this kind have been taken. I certainly have said that I would not fellowship with those who denied foundation principles hitherto recognised by the brotherhood generally, but I have not said that brethren ‘must accept’ what is called my

‘new teaching, or cease to walk with me.’ Attempts were made by some who have left Barnsbury Hall to extract such a statement from me, but I did not see my way to make it.

“The same number of the *Christadelphian* (p. 301) contains a portion of the preface to ‘The Resurrection to Condemnation: who will come forth to it?’ When that preface first appeared I wrote to its author and also to you impugning its accuracy, and I have since put into print a brief reply, which the brother who sent you the extract had full opportunity of seeing before he did so. It is not correct to say that I ‘converted all our meetings into a scene of contradiction and dissension.’ The usual meetings were conducted with decorum, and I merely contraverted what I deemed to be false teaching in a perfectly legitimate and orderly way, as I have done on former occasions when circumstances required it. Anything like disorder was at the special meetings, most of which were held subsequent to the writing of the said preface, and this was produced chiefly by those who opposed me. The charge that I called those who taught resurrection outside of ‘the blood of Christ’ ‘liars’ is untrue. I merely quoted Rev. 22:15 at the close of an address dealing with several items of the truth—not wholly relating to the point in dispute. The terms ‘blasphemous’ and ‘fatal error’ were, according to the admission of the brother who reports them, uttered upwards of two years ago. The exact circumstances I do not remember, but I know that I had, at that time, to combat some erroneous statements of an extreme character which had a nullifying effect on vital parts of the truth. Opprobrious expressions, not a few, were applied to me in connection with this conflict, but I ignored them when spoken, and I shall not now condescend to repeat them. I can patiently wait for the day of Divine vindication, when my conduct will appear in a very different light from that represented by opponents who apparently need to be reminded that misrepresentation and abuse do not constitute refutation.”

[This note we insert merely out of courtesy. There is no real need for it. It will be observed that it does not really deny the things ostensibly controverted. Brother Andrew’s hostile intentions referred to by brother Bellamy were not matters of rumour. He had given public and printed notice of an amendment to the constitution which in the event of its adoption would have excluded all who affirmed the resurrection of rejectors; and in the event of rejection would have compelled him in consistency to withdraw. Why chide [scold] the action of the London brethren in recognising notorious fact as if they had been influenced by mere rumours? They had been “given to understand” brother Andrew’s intention by brother Andrew himself in the way referred to.—As to brother Lake’s challenged statement, brother Andrew’s correction is merely another version of the same thing. To allege a thing “inaccurate” is not to deny its truth. A mere wholesale affirmation of inaccuracy cannot be recognised in the absence of details, especially against the statements of a man of known probity and impartiality. It is natural for brother Andrew to seek relief for his feelings in these contradictions, but they are not contradictions of any weight. They are contradictions in form, but not in substance. They virtually allow the things contradicted. It would be far better to fairly face the truth of the case—that brother Andrew, by his change of position, has thrown the London ecclesias into confusion—than to try to make it appear that the cause lies with those whom his action has put upon the defensive.—EDITOR.]

(Excerpt from September 1894) LONDON (SOUTH) *Gresham Hall, Gresham Road, (near Brixton Station)*. [We have a communication from the few who are separated from Gresham Hall, and who are assembling at the old meeting place in Camberwell. They cannot expect its insertion in the *Christadelphian*. It will be more in place in brother Andrew’s magazine, where no doubt it will be welcome, like the omitted parts of their last circular which were duly emphasised by italics. (By the way, is it fair to make us appear blameworthy in having omitted parts? If we had professed to publish the whole, and given only parts, no doubt it would be very proper to hold up our obliquity in the emphasis of italicised lines; but when we openly declared that we omitted parts, where is the offence? Is an editor obliged to publish the whole of everything sent him? Has he no power of omission? Where then would be editorship? Or must the contributors be the editors and the editor merely a letter box to receive their MS.?)



No doubt such an arrangement would suit some very well; but this editor would not consent to edit on those terms. And he is quite sure that none of the critics would do so either. Let reason prevail.—EDITOR].

(October 1894) VICTORIA (B.C.). — Brother Drysdale takes occasion, in ordering some books, to say:—“I have just been in the truth about two and a half years. It was through reading your *Christendom Astray* and through talking with a brother Buckler that I was led to see the truth. I used to be a Presbyterian. I am sorry to see the trouble at present over the resurrectional responsibility question, and hope it will soon end.”

A. P. Blyth, on behalf of self and others, fearing they may be considered reprobates, writes a correction of Victoria intelligence, appearing in the January number of the *Christadelphian*. The correction, however, relates merely to details and not to the main act of their sympathy with partial inspiration. They say: “It is incorrect to say we would not subscribe to their ‘Constitution’ because we ‘had never considered the question’ of inspiration, we having been conversant with the ‘Inspiration Controversy’ from the beginning. We could not agree with their ‘Constitution’ because it demanded acceptance of a theory of inspiration which we could not endorse. We differ from them in our interpretation of several of the sayings of Christ and of the apostles, which, of course, does not necessarily mean a ‘loose interpretation’ as a matter of fact. Then, again, we are accused of speaking ‘evil of some of the brethren.’ This is behaviour we are not guilty of. But we did criticise the actions and sayings of such as yourself and other brethren who have taken part in the ‘Inspiration Controversy.’”

[That is to say, the main facts alleged are admitted, only they are described in the softer language of an elastic periphrasis. There was no need for the correction.—ED.]

(May 1895) SYDNEY.—A communication from the Leichardt Town Hall ecclesia reports a number of immersions. This of itself is a gratifying announcement, but its gratifying character is clouded by association with a formal and public repudiation of the truth affirmed by Christ as a corollary of the work of preaching the Gospel which he entrusted to his apostles, viz., “He that believeth not *shall be condemned*. . . The word that I have spoken shall judge him *in the last day*.” This attitude is accompanied by the avowed belief that it is in harmony with the position occupied by Dr. Thomas, and was accepted by the brethren everywhere till recently, and that we have swerved from the position originally occupied. Believing the professors of this conviction to be honest men, we cannot account for the avowal of it except on the supposition that they have imagined a state of things to exist which did not exist: that is, they have supposed certain expressions to have the meaning which they now attach to them, but which was not intended by those who used them. Whatever the explanation may be, the avowal in question is an outrage upon truth which we deeply deplore but must patiently endure. The “logomachy” complained of, the dust-raising regretted, the change of position alleged, lie at another door altogether. To express the hope of “seeing us again as of yore fighting with the sword of the Spirit for the truth of complete redemption, &c.,” is not intended as an insult, but it comes gallingly near it in view of the fact that we have not changed by a hairsbreadth for 40 years, and that the change is all with those on whose side they now range themselves.

On behalf of the brethren at Albert Hall, brother Elijah Waite writes as follows:—“We have been exercised a little with the responsibility question during the last five months. It reached Sydney in the new form through the brethren Wylle and Davis, late of Southampton, England. Being lecturing and speaking brethren, they have simply out-talked and bewildered the Leichardt ecclesia until they have consented to the adoption of two propositions on Responsibility and Justification that are antagonistic to the position taken by us about twelve years ago. The serving brethren at Albert Hall finding the position and teaching so divergent have enforced *rule 2* which declares all out of fellowship with Albert Hall Ecclesia who

teach error or responsibility. Leichhardt Meeting.—We passed a good number of letters before taking this step. We found that fellowship would be impossible, as most of the charges made against you upon the question of responsibility have been made against us. They belong to the number who declare that the Christadelphian ought to be stopped; that brother Roberts does not know the Scriptures, that Dr. Thomas is unreliable. Dear brother Roberts, we thoroughly sympathise with you in your trials and troubles in contending against error, let us hope and pray that our warfare may soon be over, that the longed and patiently waited for sound may soon be heard, “The Lord has come.”

(May 1895) FAIRFIELD.—Brother F. N. Wood writes:—“You will remember some time ago the Albert Hall, the Fairfield, and the Leichardt Ecclesias settled their differences and were all in fellowship, and these three ecclesias refused fellowship to the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, on account of their closing the doors against the alien at the breaking of bread, and refusing to baptise under 20 years of age. We are sorry we have now had to refuse fellowship to the Leichardt Ecclesia on account of their sympathy with, and teaching the erroneous ideas propagated by, brother J. J. Andrew. Without adding to the much written upon these questions, I just state briefly that you have our sympathy in your trouble, and we agree entirely with you, and we are amazed at brethren who have had the doctor’s ideas and yours in so many different writings, should dare to hint at the idea that you are changing your mind and that even you differ with his teaching on these questions. The more I read your and the doctor’s writings the more I see you both agree. Leaving this unpleasant business, let me inform you that we still meet at Fairfield, and brother Killip still lectures when the weather is favourable in Parramatta Park. We have had another addition to our meeting in the person of Carl Anderson, (32, ) who attended the lectures in Hall and Park, and who read the twelve lectures with understanding. He gave a very intelligent confession of the Faith, and was baptised at the Albert Hall, about the end of 1894, and there are others interested. The Albert Hall brethren continued their aid at Parramatta on Sunday nights in supplying us with lecturing brethren, and we have the company of some as circumstances will allow of at the Sunday morning meeting. Trusting we may weather the squalls that arise in our midst, and at last obtain a participation in the glories of the age to come.

(July 1895) BERLIN.—Considerable time has elapsed since any intelligence has been received from this part. Brother and sister Renshaw and myself have been connected with the Doon ecclesia, but so far as Berlin was concerned our light was to a great extent hid under a bushel [means to conceal one’s good ideas or talents]. We have now severed our connection with the Doon ecclesia, feeling the obligation that rests on all the sons of God in showing our light, and contending for that faith which once for all was delivered to the saints, and for which the apostles poured out their hearts blood to defend. We have united with brother Taylor and sisters Mrs. J. Bechtel, Miss E. Bechtel, and Mrs B. Bechtel, of Waterloo, and formed an ecclesia to be known as the Berlin and Waterloo Ecclesia, meeting every Sunday morning at 10.30 a.m., on the corner of King and Queen Streets, Berlin. Our first meeting was held on June 2nd. Brother A. Renshaw spoke on the “Christian Hope.” The interest manifested was not very encouraging, but this is a day of small things. Our duty is to sow the seed and pray God to give us fruit.—E. H. CHART.

(April 1896) SWANSEA—Brother Shuttleworth visited us lately. His lecture was attended by an increased number of strangers. His addresses were greatly enjoyed. He came to us in a time of trouble. We have been under the painful duty of withdrawing from a prominent brother here for refusal to abandon false doctrine, which, since the beginning of this year had been urged upon us. The trouble originated in an application for fellowship. The candidate for fellowship gave the following answers to the questions put:—I. Do you believe that the Kingdom of God now exists? (Yes.) II. Do you consider that the fact of the Kingdom of God, being now in process of preparation, constitutes sufficient ground for saying that the Kingdom of God is now in existence? (Yes and no.) III. Do you believe that Christ reigns over his household? (Yes.) IV. Are you prepared to reject the doctrine that the Kingdom of God is the Church,

meaning by the Church the body of so-called Christian believers, and also the brethren of Christ? (Yes and no.) These questions were proposed by an arranging brother, who had a knowledge of the belief of the candidate. The answers were voted unsatisfactory by the arranging brethren, and the application refused. During this time the prominent brother before spoken of constituted himself special pleader for the applicant, and on every occasion advocated the teachings which have at last led to our withdrawal from him. This was not done till every effort had been made to recover him. Four or five others (relatives of the applicant) have resigned fellowship.—THOMAS RANGLES.

P.S.—Brother Shuttleworth has written a statement of the Kingdom of God, which we have had printed, and which we shall be glad to send to anyone applying for same, free.

[The paper referred to is enclosed by brother Randles. Several brethren of Swansea, Mumbles, and Morriston send a joint communication to the effect that in their estimation the views of the brother in question are not out of harmony with the Scriptures, and that they believe the same things themselves. Supposing that these brethren understand the Gospel of the Kingdom, it would seem to indicate that the matter is considerably a “strife of words,” and surely ought to be capable of adjustment in the hands of humble and wise men.—C. C. W.]

(May 1896) ABERDARE—We deem it advisable to declare ourselves unchanged in our belief in relation to the “Kingdom of God,” and accordingly refuse to fellowship all those who are not at one with the “Assembly Rooms’ ecclesia,” Swansea, as expressed in their resolution passed at their special meeting, March 4th. Our efforts in the proclamation of the truth are not, we are pleased to say, in vain as regards those who “have no hope,” and we hope to report additions soon, if the Lord will. Lectures:—March 22nd, “Will Christ come again?” (brother Marshall); 29th, “The Covenant with David” (brother Pugh); April 5th, “What is Religion?” (brother Marshall); 12th, “Obedience to Christ” (brother Pugh).—WM. MARSHALL.

(May 1896) MORRISTON -The brethren here have accepted the application for fellowship of brother G. E. Palmer, from whom the Swansea ecclesia withdrew last month, as reported in their intelligence. See further under Swansea.

(May 1896) MUMBLES—An accession to the numbers here is reported by the transfer of some from the partial inspirationist camp, subsequent to their agreement that the Bible is free from error. The controversy over the erroneous views of the kingdom of God affects the situation here; the brethren defending the views of brother G. E. Palmer, from whom the Swansea ecclesia have withdrawn. In view of the most unsatisfactory answers given by the candidate, as reported in the Swansea intelligence last month, it is not helping the truth so to do. The Bible does not speak of the kingdom “now being in the formative state.” We are in “the kingdom of men,” waiting for the kingdom of God to “come,” and no true Christadelphian will be content with a “yes” in answer to the question, “Does the Kingdom of God now exist?” The rejoinder circular to the Swansea resolution (see Swansea intelligence) is a self-stultifying endeavour to accommodate the truth to a crotchet.

(August 1896) NEATH—During the month obedience has been rendered to the truth by the following persons:—Mr. T. JOHNSON (25), formerly Congregational; and ARTHUR STACEY (16), formerly Baptist. They were immersed at Swansea, on July 2nd. After the immersion a company of brethren and sisters retired to the house of brother Chidzoy, where a very refreshing season of joy and comfort was spent. This event we regard as the fruit of much labour and the answer of man prayers. We have recently opened a Bible-class on Sunday afternoons, and also re-started a Bible-class on Tuesday evenings. We omitted last month to note the return of sister A. Moore from London, after an absence of several months. An ecclesial meeting was held on Thursday, June 25th, to consider what course to adopt with regard to

the “Kingdom of of God” controversy at Swansea, at which meeting the following resolution was passed:—“In reference to the ‘Kingdom of God’ controversy at Swansea we fellowship only those who are in fellowship with the Assembly Rooms ecclesia, Swansea; and we also maintain the same position in reference to the inspiration question.” Oh, that divisions would cease! We also note the removal from our midst of sister E. Stock, who has gone to Swansea.—J. TUCKER.

(April 1897) JERSEY CITY (N. J.).—“By way of an introduction, let me say that I have been appointed recording brother of the Jersey City ecclesia for the ensuing year, and it will be my especial aim to keep you and the readers of the *Christadelphian* regularly informed as to the result of our efforts to spread God’s truth in this section of the country. I suppose you are not totally ignorant of the trouble we are having regarding the ‘marriage with the alien’ question. Nearly one-half of our brethren saw fit to withdraw from us and establish a meeting of their own, in our old meeting-place at Union Hall. We have made overtures to them to induce them to return, but as yet, I regret to say, nothing of any account has resulted therefrom. However, at my next writing, I hope and pray that I shall have something good to tell you in that direction. Notwithstanding our trouble, we are still doing our best to give to the unenlightened of the good things of which we have already been partakers, and have good reason to expect that our labours will be productive of sheaves for the Master’s harvest. Praying for the speedy coming of him who shall end all strifes and bickerings, and of our gathering together unto him.—We have been able to assist two more to die and rise again from the waters of baptism. Miss MARTHA A. POND, of Lyme, Con.; and Mrs. WESTERVELT, wife of brother John Westervelt, are the two who have taken up the cross and allied themselves with the despised few of this world. Our sister Pond, whom we regret to say is an invalid, has gone south for the benefit of her health, so will not be able to meet with us around the table of the Lord: but sister Westervelt will meet with us, and it is our earnest prayer that both will keep steadfast and prove worthy to enter the Kingdom of God. On January 31st, we had visitors in brother Rich, of Washington, N.J.; brother Petersen, of Staten Island; and brother Whitmore.”—T. E. PRICE.

PLYMOUTH.—Brother Gruitt expresses the sorrow of the brethren at losing two such able and zealous brethren as brethren Sleep and Williams, who take extreme ground on the right side of the Responsibility Question. Brother Gruitt says: “With one or two exceptions, we are in perfect agreement with them, except as to test of fellowship (and even here we go as far as possible). We called a special meeting on May 30th, in consequence of brethren Sleep and Williams sending a notice of their intention to withdraw from us. We submitted and carried the following resolution:—‘Our ecclesia affirms its belief that light brings responsibility to judgment. If this is admitted by those seeking our fellowship, we would not judge a brother’s doubtful thoughts as to the extent of enlightenment creating such responsibility, and consequently when such responsibility commences. Brethren Sleep and Williams take with them brethren Atkins and Peline, jun. The Lord’s will be done. We shall continue to warn the alien to flee from the wrath to come. Teaching those things which concern the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus the Christ, and knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men. I think it also advisable to explain a matter about which there has been a misunderstanding as to our fellowshipping brother Guest: it was entirely due to a mistake. Brother Guest was coming this way, and wrote to us, saying that the Camberwell ecclesia had repudiated brother J. J. A.’s views, and had prohibited the sale of the *Sanctuary Keeper* at their meetings, and asked for fellowship the following Sunday, on the grounds that they were meeting on the same basis as Gresham Hall. Upon these representations, we permitted brother G. to break bread with us, but it afterwards transpired that these were not exactly the facts; that the Camberwell ecclesia had not entirely severed themselves from brother A.’s teaching, and so we notified brother Guest that we could not fellowship him till his ecclesia had put themselves in a right position. The brethren here wish me to state that they were willing to pass the resolution you advised brother Sleep to submit to them, but he did not think it went far enough.—[If we recollect, it was to this effect: ‘That though God winks at times of ignorance, He does not wink at times of knowledge, but will hold men answerable in the day of judgment for a knowing refusal to submit to the claims of the Gospel.’—EDITOR.]—Nothing would satisfy but the putting of ourselves out of fellowship with all the ecclesias (Birmingham included), with one or two

exceptions, which, of course, we could not do, although we were willing for peace sake to go with them as far as possible.”

Brother Williams forwards the amendment which he and brother Welhams and two others voted for, viz.: “That God winks at times of ignorance but not at times of knowledge, and that men who knowingly refuse to submit to the Gospel will have to answer for it at the resurrection; and that we refuse fellowship to any ecclesia or individual not agreeing with this belief.”— [It seems to us that the resolution and amendment are consistent with one another, and that there ought not to be a division.—EDITOR.]

## INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAL REUNIONS AND REUNION EFFORTS

(June 1867) LONDON.—The ecclesia hitherto existing in the northern part of the city, having divided on the question of resurrection and judgment, those who stood for the truth (brethren Bissett, Andrew, and Greenwood) have re-united themselves with those meeting in the southern half of the city, in connection with Brother Brown, with whom their faith is identical. A compromise has been agreed to in reference to the only obstacle of former experience, viz., the question of excluding strangers from the meeting at which bread is broken

(November 1868) GLASGOW.—Brother Clark states that an effort has been made by the Dowieites in Edinburgh to amalgamate the various discordant bodies in Glasgow, who make more or less a profession of the truth. This took the form of addresses on “Union,” by one of their number, delivered at the various meeting places where permission to speak was obtained. The application for permission to use the meeting-place of the Christadelphians was responded to in the following letter:

“DEAR SIR.—I received your letter and laid your proposal before the brethren with whom I associated, and we unanimously decline having to do with the proposed scheme of unity. The truth rightly understood and affectionately believed, is the only basis from which edification and comfort can be developed. We cannot recognize and fellowship individuals, who are either ignorant or perverters of some of the first principles of the oracles of God, for, in so doing, we should be acting a cruel and wicked part to them in propping them up in a false position, which, in all likelihood they would only come to know when it was *too late*. Our desire is to be found faithful and true witnesses for God’s truth. There are many in Glasgow professing to believe the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Anointed; and if there be disunion among them, it arises from the fact that they either do not know the truth, or that it has no hold upon the affections: in either case, the result is death. Taking your letter in connexion with a short article which appeared in this month’s *Ambassador*, it appears to us that you are one of those whose toleration goes the length of fellowshiping one who denies the only hope of Christ’s brethren, viz., the resurrection of the dead. If so, then it is our duty to warn our brethren everywhere against this modern Oregonism, lest it beguile the unwary.

Were it even possible to patch up a union of all who profess to know the truth, they would have no affinity, like the legs and feet of Nebuchadnezzar’s image. We are not against union among the remnant of the woman’s seed now scattered in the wilderness, but shall be right glad to welcome among us any who have taken the promises of God to their heart, as their only hope and portion for ever. But we have no idea of constituting ourselves churches, after the pattern of the apostacy. You will perceive at once that there is no affinity between us upon this subject; and two cannot walk together unless they be agreed.

I am yours, on behalf of the Christadelphians, meeting at 280, George Street, Glasgow, WILLIAM CLARK, Sec.”

Brother Ellis, of Edinburgh, commenting on the subject, says: “Your friend, Alexander Black, is at present visiting in Glasgow, on the Sundays, with the view of bringing all the parties there into one meeting. His foundation is similar to that propounded by Alexander Campbell some twenty years ago, viz: a confession that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. The grand mistake that he, and other well-meaning people fall into, is the supposition that unity can be attained at pleasure. Unity is the result of certain affinities coming to the knowledge of each other, and wherever these certain affinities exist, and a mutual knowledge of them is attained, unity must be the inevitable result. But the attempt to cultivate unity by ignoring the truth, understandingly loved, will always result in more division.”

(January 1881) MUMBLES.—There is good news from this place. Seven years ago, the large ecclesia, meeting in what used to be a Methodist chapel, was broken up through various causes, principal among which was the outbreak at that time of Renunciationism. Brother W. Clement espoused the plausible doctrines promulgated from Nottingham, and a number with him did the same. About an equal number refusing the new doctrines, separated themselves, and met in the Assembly Rooms. Here they were again afterwards subdivided, through various untoward occurrences. In the progress of time, Renunciationism has come to naught: not to speak of the dissolution of its principal assemblies, its principal support is in the grave; its next, has gone over to sceptical Unitarianism; its next, has become a Josephite, denying that Jesus was the Son of God. The increasing corruption caused our Mumbles friends to re-consider their position. Re-consideration resulted in the acceptance of the truth originally professed. This opened the way for proposals of reunion. The proposals, after consideration and discussion in a written form, were accepted on all sides; and the result has been the coming together of the broken fragments of the original assembly, with the resolve to redeem the past by a better future, should the long-suffering of the Lord provide scope in further delay for that amendment and salvation of which he desires to see all men avail themselves. This excellent result has likewise extended itself to Swansea, where disunion (due, however, to different causes) is now at an end. At Neath also, fellowship has been accepted on the basis of the truth. Brother W. H. Jones reports from Mumbles that several immersions have taken place, including HENRIETTA EMILY BEHENNA, eldest daughter to sister Behenna. The ecclesia now numbers fifty-seven. Brother D. Clement writes, Dec. 12<sup>th</sup>, of arrangements connected with the delivery at Mumbles of a course of lectures by brother Roberts, of Birmingham, in inauguration of the new and hopeful turn of events. He says: “We are expecting next Sunday the largest meeting on the basis of the truth ever held in Wales. We shall have, in addition to our own number (about sixty), sixty or so from Swansea, and representatives from Neath, Llanelly, and Gower. It is quite possible that from 130 to 140 will break bread together. Truth is stranger than fiction. Who would have suggested such a thing was among the order of probability? We have resolved to open the Assembly Rooms (which is ours till Christmas), for the purpose of making a general spread for the brothers and sisters from Mumbles, Swansea, and all others attending, to dine and tea together on Sunday. We intend to give up the Sunday school after dinner, and hold a fraternal meeting at half-past two.”[Compiler’s Note: Because of dark gray; light gray took place]

(Excerpt from January 1881) SWANSEA. — The news of the month from this quarter is particularly encouraging. The brethren, who have for a long time been divided, are again united, with the intention of devoting their whole strength to the cause of the truth in its purity. The united body broke bread on Sunday last (December 12<sup>th</sup>) together. We are looking forward to better things for the truth in South Wales. May the Lord grant our desire.”

(Excerpt from February 1881) MUMBLES. — Brother D. Clement reports on the matters referred to last month. Space is so occupied this month with intelligence from all parts that we are obliged to curtail. The first meeting of the united ecclesias for the breaking of bread was held November 20, 1880. Many an eye was dimmed with a ear—not of sorrow but of joy. Brother Roberts agreed to give us the joy and profit of a visit from him, and I am sure that his words of warning, reproof, exhortation, and comfort will never be

forgotten. He delivered a course of lectures, which was announced by placard, and commented upon by the local paper (enclosed). Already is to be seen the advantage of brethren dwelling together in unity. The Lord has added six to our number by immersion, and several by a return to fellowship. We have adopted the daily readings by the *Bible Companion* and the advantages are manifest even now, for our minds are all occupied at the same time with the same subject, and we can talk together of these things in a way we could not before. We have been employed on Sunday evenings with lectures by various brethren since brother Roberts's visit, and the result is satisfactory so far. We are now looking out for a visit from brother Ashcroft, who has promised to give us a lecture on the Monday following his Sunday visit to Swansea, January 22<sup>nd</sup>.

The following are extracts from the newspaper notice referred to by brother Clement: "The extraordinary quiet of an extraordinary quiet time has been considerably disturbed lately at the Mumbles, by a Christadelphian muster at this village, forgive me, I should, perhaps, have said fashionable watering place). Considerable excitement has been created by the announcement of the bills that 'Christ is coming.' The interest was, no doubt, increased by the announcement in the placard that 'the friends of the truth at the Mumbles are now re-united, and that the villagers are invited to come and hear their testimony.' It appears that for some years past there has been two meeting places at the Mumbles, not on the best of terms with each other on matter of doctrine, and this fact, doubtless, somewhat hindered the progress of the work. It now is made known that for the future there will be one meeting instead of two, unity being strength, we are quite prepared to believe that considerable activity and earnestness will be seen in the carrying on of their work for the future. The Christadelphians make no secret of the fact that they consider the various religious bodies of the Mumbles have left the old faith of the Scriptures, and are now believing doctrines out of harmony with the Bible, and they contend that their mission is to call attention to what God has been pleased to reveal in his Word, as the Truth whereby men are to be saved, and we are certainly called on to respect at least their earnestness in dealing with Biblical topics. Their inaugural meeting was held in the Christadelphian Synagogue, the body of which was quite filled. I have been told that the number of the members of this body (in Mumbles) are about 60, and that over 100 were present at the meeting we are now speaking about. At the night meeting, December 19<sup>th</sup>, the chapel was literally crammed, and it was difficult to obtain a seat. After the singing, reading, and prayer, Mr. Roberts was called on to deliver his first lecture—'Christ is Coming.'—The lecture was a very clear and able defence of the teaching that the Lord Jesus Christ will come again in power and great glory to this earth, to reign as King. The second lecture was well attended, the subject being 'What Christ was coming for?' Mr. Roberts contended that it included the Resurrection—the subsequent reward of the righteous, and the reign of Christ. The last lecture was on the prophecies connected with the Turkish Empire, and the return of the Jews to Palestine."

(Except from August 1881) TRANMERE (Birkenhead). — Brother Parker reports that as one consequence of the re-union recently effected here, the brethren at Tranmere feel that a new impulse has been given to their operations. They have decided to exchange the passive attitude which they have maintained for some time to a certain extent, for one of vigorous and aggressive activity.

(February 1881) LEICESTER.—Brother Dixon reports that the brethren who left the ecclesia about ten months ago, returned to fellowship on June 12. By this event, a state of affairs which militated against the work of the truth here has been removed. (There is a prospect of a return of some, if not all, of those who separated at the time of the Renunciationist Schism, and such as have since joined them. So the editor was reliably informed when at Leicester—EDITOR). There have been added to the ecclesia during the month, by removal, brother and sister Frank S. Herne, from Birmingham;

(Excerpt from March 1882) MELBOURNE.—Bro. Hardinge writes:—"Thanks for publishing and commenting on my letter of February, *re* the question of designating serving brethren. I have carefully

read your remarks, and also those of the other brethren, who have written on the subject, and, while I do not endorse *all* that has been written, yet I think, all things considered, that as a matter of expediency it is best to adopt those names only which define their duties, while not obscuring their brotherhood, and therefore if I were to have to again decide upon the matter I should do so in favour of your mode of resignation, viz., as “managing” or “presiding” brethren. But I regard the matter of so little importance, and as one calculated only to produce contention, that I shall not take any steps to reverse our previous decision. I am very happy to state that the division which has existed for the past year, is now on a fair way to be removed, as our Bro. Betts, who with several others had withdrawn from us, and had formed another Ecclesia, owing to some misapprehension (the particulars of which I was never able to learn) has now applied for re-union, on behalf of himself and the others, and our Ecclesia have had a special meeting to consider the matter, when it was unanimously agreed to receive them, provided they would conform to our rules, &c.

(August 1887) Cumnock.—The few in number who attend the meeting in this place have been endeavouring to effect a re-union with those who have gone out from among us. In June of last year, an effort was made in this direction with those who have separated over the matter of marriage in which effort we did all that the law of Christ and conscience would allow us to do to attain our object, but all to no purpose. A professed recognition of Christ’s law upon marriage is full of hypocrisy where a liberty is contended for which sets aside that law and its operations among men. It is a *first* and very important principle of divine truth that those who have been called to the Kingdom of God should marry only in the Lord. Last June, we were again brought together upon the “fast day”; this time at the instance of Brother Haining of the Kilmarnock ecclesia. Brother Haining was with us at the time of our separation and has been interested in our affairs since. Ever ready to promote the interests of the truth, and unsparing in its service in the midst of physical weakness, he gathered us together upon the “fast day” this time not only with those in dispute about marriage but also with those who more recently left us over disputed affairs at Pietermaritzburg... No progress was made in the shape of re-union. For this we are sorry but not responsible... Sister Gemmel from Ochiltree who was immersed by brothers Robertson and Robb was present at our meeting and being at one with us, has been admitted to our fellowship. On Sunday, 3rd July, a number of the brethren and sisters of the Kilmarnock ecclesia together with sisters Murdoch and Gemmel from Ochiltree were present with us at the breaking of bread. Though it is our day of small things, we were glad to see old faces in our little room and spend the day together in praise and thanksgiving. As to our ecclesial troubles, *the time has now come* for us to forget the things that are behind and press onward towards the mark for the prize, plodding along ourselves and trying to keep the narrow way that leadeth unto life looking unto Him who is the author and finisher of our faith.—ALLAN MACDOUGALL.

(October 1878) ROCHESTER (N.Y.)—The intelligence from this place presents a dilemma. Bro. A. Sintzenich writes: “It gives me great pleasure to transmit to you for publication in the *Christadelphian*, by order of the ecclesia through the managing brethren, the accompanying document conveying the gratifying intelligence that the division which has obtained in this city for several years through diversity of views on the nature of the Christ, now no longer exists; and that there is but one body here, as there is but one faith, hope, and baptism; and consequently we are enjoying the peaceable fruits of righteousness in the unity of the One Body of the Christ.” In further remarks of the same pleasing order, a document is introduced certifying the fact of re-union, signed, for the body in general, by Geo. Ashton, C. H. Morse, F. B. Robinson, Augustus Sintzenich, presiding brethren.

But, on the other hand, there comes a declaration repudiating the union, signed by Charles Orlishausen, Emma Orlishausen, Jno. D. Tomlin, James H. Dewey, James Leask, Mary P. Dewey, Sarah J. Leask, Lyman M. Cunningham, Sarah Cunningham, Chas. Boddy, Thomas Boddy, Thomas Boddy, jun., Eliza Boddy, Dr. John Richman, Isabel Tomlin, and Henrietta Richman. The union is repudiated by these on



the ground that the “diversity of views” originally causing the division still exists in substance. and that the re-union is effected for the sake of peace, and is on the basis of mere verbal agreement, and not on identity of doctrinal significance. They believe the truth to be compromised, both as to the sacrifice of Christ and the doctrine of judgment, through false charity, and will have nothing to do with it. They support their assertions by documentary evidence, which apparently confirms them.

The Editor could not, without personal investigation, decide which side represents the unsullied cause of truth; and as personal investigation is out of the question, he can only deal with the matter as it stands in the documents. In all doubtful cases he finds it expedient to give the truth the benefit of the doubt, and so far as the evidence at present goes, the doubt is in favour of the dissenters, and against the unionists. There is a tendency manifest in the phraseology of the latter to hide doctrinal discrepancies under generalities; and in the official declaration of union the condemnation of sin in the flesh effected in Christ is apparently made to have a moral signification instead of the crucifixion of the man Christ Jesus. We hold ourselves open to further light; but, so far, the re-union seems the practical secession of tried friends instead of the return of erring brethren.

(*The Christadelphian*, July 1889, p. 360) – There have been enquiries as to reported efforts at re-union with the brethren who are separated from us on the question of inspiration. The way to re-union is open when the said brethren are prepared to take unqualified ground concerning the divine character of the Scriptures. The doctrine of their partial inspiration is rising like a great flood in all religious denominations of the country, and threatens to submerge even the profession of the faith. It is a doctrine that destroys the Bible as the source of truth and the standard of duty. The *Enquirer* says “it is now *an accepted truth(!)* that the voice of the Bible is as fallible as that of the priest.” It asks, Where, in that case, is the mission of “Nonconformity?” Exactly. The foundation of faith is gone when the inspiration of the Scriptures is surrendered. There is nothing to trust in, and nothing to stand aloof for if the Bible be not wholly inspired of God and infallible. To this the professing Christian world outside the truth is rapidly coming everywhere; and to this we shall come if we consent to take the first step in admitting a fallible authorship in the Bible in the least degree. Some have landed there already. We have heard of cases in Canada; and we are credibly informed that with one who took a leading part in the ventilation of partial inspiration in Britain among us, it is not now a question of *parts*. Such a result is inevitable in process of time. Enlightened men cannot surrender to the evil principle by a hair’s breadth. If our separated brethren are of the same mind with us, they do themselves an injustice in arguing for qualifications that involve the hateful principle, and in refusing to take the position of unqualified defenders of the whollyinspired and infallible character of the Scriptures. If they are not of the same mind (as they manifestly are not), they would earn respect by plainly avowing it, as some do, and ceasing to slander the motives of those who have had to leave them, and to misrepresent the question at issue. It is a question of principle, and not of form. “Resolutions” are a mere accident to the principle—a mere mode of expressing conviction. If men do not express their convictions, what basis is there for a fellowship which consists first of all of identical convictions? If they do express them, they must express them in a definite and examinable form if they are in earnest—if not in resolution, then in some other form that must be equally objectionable to those who object to resolution: for what is resolution? The declaration of the resolve of the mind. It is scarcely conceivable that a man of clear and earnest views would refuse the opportunity of such an exercise at a time of peril to divine truth like the present. And as for modes of withdrawal, there are times and situations when nothing can be done but to “come out from among them.” This was our situation, with two periodicals at work disseminating the poison, and a general favour shown by the leading brethren to the partialist

views. To talk of “individual withdrawal” at such a time was to mock us with a proposal that could not be carried out. Higher than individual interests were at stake, and these were preserved by a process that presented no obstacles to men whose eyes and hearts were fully open in a divine direction. If we speak of those who were left behind that process as “brethren,” it is not in the sense of brethren with whom under the circumstances there can be fellowship, but of men who have placed themselves in the position of erring brethren by taking up an ambiguous position towards the Scriptures, whom by the apostolic law we are forbidden to keep company with.—ED.

(December 1878) ROCHESTER (N.Y.)—Bro. Ashton reports the obedience of EURODA HAYNES, on Oct. 14th. Brethren Sintzenich and Ashton both write in reference to the report of union with former separatists, and the repudiation of that union by certain whose names appeared in the *Christadelphian* for October last. Brother Ashton’s letter is also signed by brother Sintzenich and brethren C. H. Morse and T. B. Robinson, for the brethren and sisters (40 in number) meeting with them. They request the publication of the document. We should be glad to comply with their request, so far as a personal desire to oblige is concerned, but several considerations deter us. The documents are long: they are largely personal, and generally of a nature to lead to endless controversy, and to work otherwise than to the comfort and strength of the brethren in general. Finally, they are not needful to neutralise what has appeared in the *Christadelphian*, since what has appeared is brief and non-committal, and may easily be neutralised by our correspondents without the extensive ventilation of the matter in the *Christadelphian*. Our brethren err in supposing we have judged and condemned them. Our very first words introduced the matter—the union and its repudiation—as a “dilemma,” which is always a matter of equally-poised uncertainty in two directions. We expressly said we held ourselves open to further light. True, there was an expression of view as to how the thing looked; but, with this, there was a distinct recognition of the possibility of its being otherwise than it looked. The matter still remains in that position. The documents now transmitted do not remove the uncertainty: they confirm it. Stress is laid on the fact that the declaration which was the basis of union was “in scriptural language;” and it is stated that at the meeting held to settle the terms of union, “questions were asked freely by both parties *couched only in Scripture language*, according to previous arrangement.” This of itself excites suspicion. If there were no discrepancies of conviction in the assembly, why this care about “Scripture language?” Nobody theoretically believing in the Bible would object to Scripture language, however contrary to the truth their doctrines might be. “Scripture language” is to be reverentially esteemed in its right relation: but there are times when a mechanical adherence to its terms may be a handling of it deceitfully. Bible terms may be assented to when there is a repudiation of Bible ideas. Where Bible ideas are in dispute, it is important to allow unlimited leeway in the use of language. The fact that this liberty was not allowed at a meeting for the union of two bodies reputedly at variance in doctrine, lends countenance to the allegation that actual differences were slurred over by assent to mere Bible terms. If there were no such differences, it is difficult to understand this careful and tender restriction to Bible phraseology. There is no allegation that brother Sintzenich and those who with him have united themselves with the erstwhile Renunciationists, have changed their views a single particle. Brother S.’s declaration on this point is in harmony with all the evidence. The contention is that he and they have united with those whose faith on some points will not stand a peep behind the gauze of Scripture terms assented to. Brother Sintzenich denies this. He says: “I utterly deny that the body we have united with are Renunciationists in any sense of the word. They openly repudiate Turneyism in all its phases, and believe as you and I and all true Christadelphians believe.” Still, in the definition of their faith, the condemnation of sin effected by God in Christ is made Renunciationistically to apply to moral conflict, and not to his crucifixion, thus: “His warfare, like ours, was to condemn sin in the flesh—that spirit of disobedience, or that will natural to his flesh—which was antagonistic to the law of the Deity, and doing that successfully all the days of his life, he finished his work by the nailing of his body of death to the tree.” The truth is that, morally, Christ was spotless, but, physically, he was an inheritor of death in partaking the Adamic nature which had become mortal on account of sin. When this morally spotless, but

physically death-partaking, God-begotten Son of Man was crucified, sin was officially and ceremonially condemned of Adam's Creator. The Jews and Romans were mere providential instruments. The condemnation of sin effected in him was sacrificial. In this sacrifice, the basis was laid for reconciliation for all who should come unto God through their crucified representative. Brother Sintzenich further adds: "Our ecclesia is 40 in number, and embraces all Christadelphians in Rochester but the Boddy and Tomlin families, while of the 16 signatures you publish, all but the two families live in the country, and signed their names at J. D. Tomlin's solicitation without knowing anything of the case except from him." We desire nothing but the truth to prevail, and should grieve to injure true brethren by countenancing a misrepresentation if such it is. Brother Sintzenich thinks we might have corresponded privately first. We admit the cogency of the remark. If we took an easier course, it was because the multitude of public duties with the limited stock of strength at our disposal, precludes extensive private correspondence, such as must have ensued in such a case; and also because we entertain the conviction that true men will not suffer finally in the candid public exhibition of any matter. Brother Sintzenich suggests investigation by some accredited brother or brethren on the American Continent. We recommend a simpler course: Are the forty referred to in his letter prepared to assent to the definition of the one faith contained in the verified statement accepted in Birmingham? Their special attention should be given to paragraphs ii., iii., iv., vi., vii., ix., xv. section D; xviii. and xxv. If they are prepared to endorse these definitions without qualification or reserve, their position would stand vindicated before the brethren in other parts, however much misapprehension may have heretofore prevailed. The "statement" in question is published separately for general circulation.—EDITOR. [Compiler's Note: See October Rochester above for history]

(January 1889) SYDNEY.—*New Masonic Hall, Castlereagh Street.*—Since our last communication the following have put on the sin-covering name and have joined us in patient waiting for the coming of Christ:—F. J. PALMER and his wife, SARAH PALMER, ALFRED CRANE, MARGARET KILLIP, wife of brother James Killip. We have also had an addition of two sisters, Mary and Alice Floyd, from the Bristol ecclesia, England, who contend for a wholly-inspired Bible. Our brother Bayliss, who still continues his lectures in the Exhibition Park, has always a large and attentive audience, several of whom are enquiring into the truth, and we hope will soon yield obedience. At least four of our members have had the truth brought before their eyes by these efforts, and we are hoping that many more will yet be called out of the prevailing darkness into the glorious light of the Gospel. Sometimes he has to put up with considerable interruption from "orthodox" zealots, but these as a rule don't continue long, as they find that truth faithfully proclaimed cannot be gainsaid. The weather here is exceedingly favourable for open air meetings, and as the people are so used to open air, addresses from would-be politicians, infidels, and ranters of all descriptions are plentiful. Physical force is seldom used to stop speakers propagating doctrines which may not be in harmony with the opinions of others. A few weeks ago we received a visit from sister Barclay, of New Zealand, also one from sister Bowman, of Melbourne. Brother Walter Cook, of Rockhampton, en route for Palestine, also paid us a flying visit. We are also pleased to say that as the ecclesia meeting in the Temperance Hall, Sydney, have accepted our statement as their basis of fellowship, we have decided to throw our lot in with them next Sunday. The ecclesias when united will be able to engage a hall and thus resume the Sunday evening lectures.—ERNÉST KILLIP.

[With reference to the last clause of the foregoing intelligence, a joint communication is to hand signed on behalf of the brethren of both the Temperance Hall and Masonic Hall ecclesias, from which it appears that after a series of meetings, they have succeeded in placing themselves in accord with one another. On the Sunday previous to this decision, seven brethren from each ecclesia met at the Temperance Hall to discuss their relative positions, with the above satisfactory and peaceful result.]

(May 1889) SYDNEY.—Brother Bennett reports that on the 31st October, 1888, the meetings in the Temperance Hall and New Masonic Hall were united, but that it has been found advisable to continue the

New Masonic Hall meeting, which had been abandoned. This is now done; the two meetings being in fellowship with each other.

(Excerpt from July 1889) NEWPORT- [An endeavour is being made to bring the two meetings here into unison. It is sincerely to be hoped the effort may succeed; for while the *Christadelphian* is open to any number of meetings in the same town that are in the friendship and co-operation of true fellowship (e.g., the several London meetings that recognise the wholly-inspired character of the Bible), it is otherwise as to meetings that are not in mutual fellowship.—ED.]

(November 1889) NEWPORT (MON.) - The division among the brethren here is now happily at an end. By concurrence of both parties brother Roberts met them in open conference and talked thoroughly over the matters in dispute, which did not involve questions of faith or commandment. Both were united in hearty acceptance of the faith of Christ and of his commandments as the rule of his house. Separation had arisen on questions of disciplinary routine. Concessions were made on one side and accepted on the other, which paved the way for the unanimous adoption of a resolution, recognising the duty of fusing both assemblies into one, and making various arrangements in matters of detail for carrying the resolution into effect on the very next Sunday. It was resolved that one of the two halls should be given up, and that, meanwhile, the responsibility of both should be jointly borne by the united assembly till they could get rid of one. The brethren expressed their great joy at the result.

(November 1889) KIDDERMINSTER- Brother Kimberlin having announced the accomplishment of a re-union among those here separated on the question of inspiration, brother Walker wrote as follows:—"You say . . . 'a meeting was held at which it was shown that your views were similar on all matters essential to salvation.' In view of the question at issue, this is not distinct enough. Do the Worcester Street brethren with you believe (1) that the Bible is wholly-inspired of God; (2) and that it is therefore infallible; and (3) will they with you, so believing, refuse fellowship to those who believe otherwise, or who, while themselves believing this, would fellowship disbelievers. An affirmative answer to these questions . . . would be something that the *Christadelphian* could publish with thankfulness and confidence." Brother Kimberlin replies—"We have on more than one occasion heartily avowed our belief in the entire inspiration and infallibility of the Bible, from which we have not departed. Of course you know the ecclesia has not assented to the resolution adopted by the Temperance Hall brethren, but practically our basis is the same."—The Kidderminster brethren are in fellowship with the brethren in the Masonic Hall, Birmingham, whose position on the question of inspiration is made clear by the correspondence appearing elsewhere in this issue. Their basis is therefore not "practically the same" for while professing "belief in the entire inspiration and infallibility of the Bible" they fellowship those who declare emphatically that the Bible is not "infallible in every jot and tittle," or who, in other words profess belief in an entire inspiration that is not absolutely "entire" at all, a position that will destroy confidence in the Bible in proportion as it is logically adhered to.—C. C. W.

(November 1889) NORMANTON- Brother Warwick reports that the out-door lectures for the present season are over, and that the small company in fellowship with him meet at his house to break bread on Sunday afternoons. Though almost alone, he says "We have our Bibles, and in them we find good company."—The note from brother Lockett, announcing an end to the division on inspiration, which has prevailed in Normanton for some years, is not true as applicable to brother Warwick and the few with him. He says if all now with brother Lockett will accept the Bible as an absolutely divine production, and will refuse fellowship to those who believe or tolerate otherwise, he and those with him will give them not only their hands but their hearts. At present, the basis they have defined on the subject is indefinite enough to admit of the most lax idea of inspiration that prevails among the sects. If the brethren who have adopted it mean a wholly-inspired and infallible Bible, as opposed to the undermining ideas promulgated by brethren Ashcroft and Chamberlin, it would be kindness to themselves and others to say so. If they

don't mean this, their resolution is a deception, even though they may not intend it so. The trouble is evidently the same that prevents union at Birmingham. Faithful men can only do their duty and wait the arbitrament of the judgment seat.—EDITOR.

(February 1891) BRISTOL—Brother Bradley reports at some length the particulars of a re-union effected with the ecclesia meeting at Oddfellows' Hall, in Rupert Street, from whom separation was made four years since in connection with the inspiration controversy. Brother Bradley speaks of it as “the cheering and encouraging turn that Christadelphian life has taken in Bristol.” The following are the principal features of the report:—“The two ecclesias have held five meetings together, at which the position of each has been fully and clearly stated and understood. The Oddfellows' Hall ecclesia were almost unanimous in their belief of a wholly-inspired Bible, and the few objections made as to Paul's cloak, Paul's independent advice to brethren upon marrying, and a few other similar cases were fully argued and satisfactorily explained by the brethren of both ecclesias. Recognising the ‘divers manners’ in which it has pleased God to speak through the prophets and Jesus Christ, we had no difficulty in speedily disposing of an imagination which the brethren had innocently regarded as a fact, namely, that we believed the Scriptures to be inspired only in one particular way, by what is called verbal dictation. The verbal inspiration of the Scriptures is not a question of one way, but of divers manners or ways. The Holy Spirit exercises a guiding or controlling influence which excludes error. The perfection of the whole being impossible without the perfection of its parts, reasonably excludes even the barest probability of any kind of discrepancy finding its way into the original writings.—At our first meeting, the great obstruction to a settlement was a strong impression that it was unscriptural for brethren to consent to human resolutions. The necessity for them was amply proved by showing the value of ecclesial rules for maintaining discipline, and the command to rebuke being of equal force to the one to comfort, made human resolutions the only scriptural course to take (in the absence of direct divine interference), being indispensable in emergencies where ecclesias become divided upon principles of faith. Another obstruction was in the form of a protest against discussing the merits of the original writings, it being urged that the present version was all that concerned us, and contained all the nourishment, stimulant, and comfort needful for our present existence. This matter was handled very ably by their own brethren, in demonstrating the impossibility of faith in a copy without faith in the original: copies being subject to the errors of transmission, &c. If there were errors in the original, our present version would be worthless, excepting to fanatics, who placed no value upon God's gift of intelligence to man, and the acquisition of knowledge as being the first requisite predicated for obtaining eternal life. At our fourth meeting, it was anticipated that an understanding of agreement or disagreement would be attained, as it was considered that all points involved in a re-union had been exhaustively discussed. But an objection was then raised which, in its nature, was undoubtedly the one to test the hollowness or the substantiality of the grounds we had for justifying our withdrawal from them. The following is a copy of the resolution offered for adoption as the condition of re-union:—‘That the doctrine of the divine inspiration and consequent infallibility of the Scriptures in all parts of them (as originally written by prophets and apostles) is the first principle of that system of truth which forms the basis of our fellowship one with another in Christ, and that consequently we are unable to compromise that principle by continuing in association with those who do not believe it, or by fellowshipping those, who either directly or indirectly tolerate any teaching opposed to that doctrine.’ One of the brethren could not see his way clear to accept the resolution, as he had not knowingly fellowshipped any who taught the doctrine of partial inspiration, and he did not believe the doctrine was taught by any who were fellowshipping with the Masonic Hall ecclesia in Birmingham. If this were correct, the resolution would be superfluous, and our own inconsistency would be challenged and proved. We had no evidence with us in black and white to vindicate our position, and the meeting was adjourned for a week to allow time for producing proofs. At our fifth meeting, the position we took was sustained to the entire satisfaction of the brethren present, who constituted a majority of both ecclesias. . . . Duty is our watchword, love is our ambition, and in the flowery or thorny path of human sentiment, the children of God must unhesitatingly assert the supremacy of obedience to Christ's commandments. To support or countenance false doctrine or wrong doing in our brethren is to

share their responsibility by being partakers of their sins. This vexing objection to re-union was surrendered at the dictation of moral courage, and in a full realization of the warning:—"Therefore to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Rebuke and warning are the duties imposed upon a true rendering of the spirit as well as the letter of brotherly love, and demand that we withdraw ourselves from those brethren, who while they are believers in a wholly inspired Bible, yet by their actions support a doctrine which desires or stultifies the truth of their belief.—The formal arrangements for reunion were completed yesterday; the ecclesia meeting in Rupert Street resolving to withdraw from all brethren associating in fellowship with the Masonic Hall ecclesia and extending an invitation to us to unite with them upon a basis of faith which recognises the above resolution as the first doctrine of truth. We had the company of brother Lowe at our meeting in the evening, after which we resolved to dissolve our ecclesia meeting in Bishopston, and to constitute ourselves with them into one ecclesia on the following Sunday morning, January 18th. Our conferences for re-union has served a good purpose in bringing us into closer contact one with another, in removing prejudices which a strong party feeling of separation has fed, and in giving each one of us an impetus to a more earnest appreciation of the necessity of unity and organization in the practise of those things we mutually profess, and of an intenser devotion to those divine principles of which all scripture teaching is but an elaboration."

Brother Lowe, on behalf of the Oddfellows Hall ecclesia, transmits the following resolution adopted by them:—"That we establish ourselves as an ecclesia of Christadelphians, holding the belief of Scripture-teaching as expressed in the Birmingham Statement of Faith, and that we accept the doctrine of the divine inspiration and consequent infallibility of the Scriptures in all parts of them (as written originally by prophets and apostles) as the first principle of the system of truth which forms the basis of our fellowship one with another in Christ, and that consequently we are unable to compromise that principle by continuing in association with those who do not believe it, or by fellowshipping those who either *directly*, or *indirectly* tolerate any teaching opposed to that doctrine."

A second resolution notifies the Masonic Hall body (Birmingham) of cessation of fellowship with them, and invites the fellowship of brethren everywhere who hold the same faith, and are prepared to take the same position in relation to the Scriptures. The brethren and sisters who constitute the united ecclesia (henceforward to meet in the Oddfellows' Hall) are the following:—Brother E. and sister E. Lowe, brother W. and sister A. Palmer, brother F. A. Collins, brother and sister May, of Portishead; brother I. White, brother A. R. and sister S. C. Reed, brother W. Mills, brother W. and sister J. Allen, brother C. Beake, brother C. Wintle, brother G. Sutton, sister C. Gough, brother J. and sister E. Hollier, sister A. E. Hollier, sister F. Chandler, sister S. A. Cross, brother B. and sister A. E. Bradley, sister H. A. Bradley.

Prior to the fusion of the two ecclesias, brother G. Cornish and brother Stainforth, heretofore in fellowship with Oddfellows' Hall, were requested to withdraw, on account of the doctrines introduced by them, and advocated in a pamphlet now in circulation. They did so, and took a number with them. Brother Bamford, of Oldham, thus refers to these doctrines:—

"I received to-day from brother Patchett, of Bristol, a copy of a 24 paged pamphlet by brother G. Cornish, jun., setting forth a number of vital errors in a most confident way, namely, 'Christ, a substitute, died a vicarious death; Adam's condemnation does not pass to his children; baptism not essential, but only good living; salvation for the *good* (?) of all ages and for infants, *large* resurrection, &c., &c.' I cannot think such doctrines will receive a following among those who are enlightened."

### 35. Disputes

There ought to be no murmurings and disputings among the brethren of Christ. It is forbidden. Nevertheless, in the mixed state allowed to prevail in all ecclesias during probation, they are sure to arise. Wisdom, therefore, requires that we be prepared to deal with them in a proper manner when they arise. There is a way of dealing with them

that heals them, and a way that has just the opposite effect. There is no more dangerous and prolific cause of distress and ruin in an ecclesia than the wrong treatment of causes of dispute. This must be the excuse for giving the subject lengthy attention.

There are two sorts, both different, and yet both related as regards the spirit and aim with which they ought to be treated: (1) Individual offences; (2) Ecclesial differences.

No time ought to be lost in dealing with either one or the other. The longer time that elapses in the application of a remedy, the more difficult does the application of the remedy become. Individual misunderstandings spread coldness beyond the persons affected; and ecclesial differences are liable to settle into chronic alienations, which blight every good work. (*Ecclesial Guide* pgs 23-24) See **March 1891 Bristol below compiler:**

(March 1891) BRISTOL—On Sunday morning, January 18th, the two ecclesias met together at the Oddfellows' Hall, Rupert Street, and formed themselves into one ecclesia. The reasons which induced this step appeared in the last number of the *Christadelphian*. In the evening a meeting was held for business purposes, at which a code of 35 rules was adopted for constituting and guiding the ecclesia in accordance with Bible principles and precepts. Brother O. May, living at West Hill, Portishead, who was unable to attend our opening meeting, broke bread with us on February 1st. He earnestly gave the word of warning against sliding into a condition of apathy, and of exhortation to walk in purity and love, and uncompromising fidelity in the use of those things which are entrusted to us. We have had three pleasurable visits from brother Hollier, of West Bromwich ecclesia. Lectures: January 25th, "Social Oppression and Divine Rule" (brother W. Allin); February 1st, "Bible Teaching upon Immortality" (brother J. Hollier); 8th, "The Covenants of Promise" (brother B. Bradley.) The attendance has been good, and our lecturing brethren are making commendable efforts to ensure the efficiency of this department of ecclesial work: to let its light shine, condemning the darkness, and to say, "Come, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." We are also pleased to report the addition to our ecclesia, on February 8th, of brother William Jenkins, from the Mumbles ecclesia, and sister Frances Garland, of the *late* Oddfellows' Hall ecclesia. Both were interested in our conferences for reunion, and the investigating disposition shown has resulted in their falling into rank with us. We hope that we may, with them, so run the race as to obtain the prize.—W. MILLS.

(April 1891) DERBY—*Athenaum, Victoria Street. Sundays, 10–30 and 6–30.*—During the past month, an effort has been made in the direction of a reunion with those separated from us on the subject of inspiration, it having been stated that their basis was the same as ours. Five brethren from each meeting met together on two Sundays afternoons and talked the matter over, but it resulted in nothing, as the other brethren still held the same views on inspiration and fellowship as they did when we parted company

from them five years ago. Brother Jones has removed from the South London ecclesia to Derby. Brother G. Constable (late of Melton Mowbray) has gone over to those from whom we are separated on the question of inspiration. Lectures: February 22nd, "Christ all in all" (brother Shuttleworth); March 1st, "The Gospel" (brother Clark); 8th "The light of the world" (brother Wood, of Tamworth); 15th, "Times of refreshing" (brother Chandler.)—W. CLARK.

(May 1891) NEWPORT (MON.)—Brother Grimes has come to reside in Newport. We shall find him a useful workfellow, you know. We are corresponding with the Cardiff ecclesia, with the view to fellowship. I pray God that the result may be satisfactory.

(June 1891) BOSTON (MASS.)—A communication from brother Rileigh, recording brother to the ecclesia meeting in Friendship Hall, reports the failure of the effort to come to an understanding with the brethren who withdrew themselves on the question of membership in Labour Unions. Brother Rileigh says the Friendship Hall brethren have no sympathy with Trades Unions and kindred organisations; and consider it inconsistent with the calling in Christ that brethren should be connected with them. Still, they cannot see their way to take the strong ground insisted upon by those who have withdrawn themselves, who demand withdrawal from everyone sympathising with labour unions. They would prefer to give brethren time to consider the question, and to try to influence them in the right way by exhortation and example.—Brethren elsewhere will view the failure at re-union with regret; and will indulge the hope that, even yet, there may be found some means of restoring union among men otherwise one in faith and practice; and remove a needless barrier to growth in faith and love. Preparation for Christ is difficult enough in circumstances of peace. With division and strife, it becomes nearly impossible. Such obstacles will be the subject of bitter regret when the end comes. The subjects of lecture during the month of April have been:—April 5th, "The Kingdom of God" (brother H. Hartley); 12th, "The Second Coming of Christ" (brother Joseph McKellar); 19th, "The Kingdom of God" (brother C. McLachlan); 26th, "The Kingdom of God, Past, Present, and Future" (brother A. Pinel). In the city of Quincey lectures have been delivered in Dr. French's Hall, on the Sunday following each of the above dates. Since our removal to Friendship Hall, the attendance has been much better than in our old hall and is steadily increasing, which gives us courage, in the midst of trouble, to go on."

(July 1891) NEWPORT (MON.)—Brother Lander, in a letter omitted from last month's publication, reports that brother Curnock is gone to Philadelphia, also that on May 13th, WILLIAM BRYANT (24), formerly Baptist, and of Abersychan, after showing evidence that he believed the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ was immersed. This is fruit of brother Lewison, of Abersychan, who, no doubt, will be highly pleased to have a fellow-worker. *Inter alia*, I should think that brother Shuttleworth will have no difficulty in finding sufficient subscribers to his proposed "Lightstand Bible," which will be a marvellous production, no doubt.

Writing again (June 14th) brother Lander refers to the reply which brother Grimes has written to the pamphlet issued against the truth entitled "A word of Warning." He also states that the brethren have issued posters announcing a series of lectures in reply to the same. He also reports an ineffectual attempt to come to an understanding with certain in Cardiff, with the view to fellowship. They accepted the Cardiff constitution, and even avowed their belief that the Bible is inspired every jot and tittle, but they refused to discontinue the fellowship of those who cannot, or will not, make the same avowal, consequently the Newport brethren were compelled to cease communication and to allow things to remain as they are.

(August 1891) NEWPORT (MON.)—In the report last month, under this heading, of "an ineffectual attempt to come to an understanding with certain in Cardiff," the statement is made that "they accepted the Cardiff constitution"; this ought to have been *Newport* constitution. It was a slip of the pen on the part



of the editor.—There has been further communication, but no favourable result is yet reported.—Withdrawal has taken place from brethren Shepherd and Cross for continued absence from the table; brother Harry Edwards has separated himself.

(August 1891) BOSTON (MASS.)—Brother F. C. Whitehead, referring to the intimation appearing in the June *Christadelphian*, that the effort at re-union on the labour union question had failed, says:—“We are astonished to learn through the *Christadelphian* that the efforts have failed. We wish to inform you and the brethren everywhere that there has been no failure on our part. We are simply waiting the result of our proposal as a basis of re-union. We are ready to attend any meeting that may be called; and, moreover, are anxious to do so. The resolution we submitted to them was substantially the same as the one you submitted to the Birmingham ecclesia many years ago, and which was adopted. It is as follows:—‘That it is unlawful for a brother of Christ to be a member in any society of unjustified men constituting a brotherhood, or whose objects either rival or oppose the principles of the brotherhood established by Christ himself, of which he is the head.’ That Free Masonry, Oddfellowship, and kindred institutions are rivals in so far as they propose friendship and mutual care as the object of association; and that they are opponents in so far as they use forms and names of honour to one another which Christ forbids, and exclude and discourage faith in God which Christ enjoins. That we wish, at the same time, to leave every brother, as a steward responsible to the judgment seat of Christ, free to make such private arrangements as he sees fit in regard either to the husbanding of the substance God has given him, requiring only that he do not make himself part of any organisation incompatible with the brotherhood to which he belongs in Christ.” . . . We did not withdraw from the brethren in Kneeland Street. On the contrary, the brethren there withdrew from us; and they wrote and informed you of that fact, as you notice in the *Christadelphian*, p. 321, March, 1891. If they had not withdrawn from us, we would have been there to-day, exhorting the unruly to abandon the position they occupied in Labour Unions, Secret Societies, and Fellowships. If there has been a failure to unite, we ask you to submit the resolution to them as the basis of a re-union.

(December 1891) GLASGOW—I have pleasure in reporting this month the obedience of ROBERT H. WILSON, of Sydney, N.S.W. Having occasion to be in Glasgow, and having obtained the address of one of the brethren here from brother Walker, he took advantage of our assistance to consummate a relationship, the necessity for which he had become convinced of during his voyage across the water. He returns to Sydney; and to the brethren there we commend him.

We have also added during the month brother McNeilage and sister Napier, both from the “other meeting.” That meeting having “cleft in twain” as the result of internal strife, a section approached us with a view to amalgamation; but nothing came of it, their views on fellowship not coinciding with ours. The brother and sister above-named having become convinced of the Scripturalness of our position on this question, as well as that in relation to inspiration, have, however, cast in their lot with us. Others are said to be contemplating a similar step. The division afore-mentioned is, we believe, the result of personal feeling, and is not, therefore, to be compared to the division which occurred on the Inspiration question, to which certain would fain liken it.—D. CAMPBELL.

(December 1891) NORMANTON-A meeting was held in Leeds, on Sunday, October 25th, to consider the state of things at Normanton. There were present brethren from Normanton, together with the managing brethren of the two Leeds Ecclesias. The subjoined resolution was agreed to and signed by the brethren affected, who will now constitute the ecclesia at Normanton, in the full determination to hold forth the truth with united effort. *Resolution passed*:—“We accept and are prepared to stand by the Birmingham Temperance Hall basis of faith, including resolution affirming belief in the complete inspiration and consequent infallibility of the scriptures.” Thos. Lockett, Amey Lockett, George Dowkes, Mary Ann Dowkes, Walter Netherwood, Elizabeth Netherwood, S. K. Eames, A. Eames; witnesses;—G.

B. SUGGITT, Recording brother, Wellington Road; R. W. THORP, Recording brother, Great George Street.

(January 1892) LEEDS *Great George Street*.—Brother Thorpe reports the gratifying intelligence of a number of additions from the believers heretofore meeting in Albion Street, from whom, if our impression be correct, the other brethren have been for some years separated on what has been known as the no-will and pre-existence doctrine. Brother Thorpe says:—“We received a letter from them requesting a conference with the George Street and Wellington Road meetings, stating that for some time they had been considering the Birmingham statement of faith, and that with but few exceptions, they as a meeting agreed with it. Seven brethren were appointed to represent the George Street and the Wellington Road ecclesia, and the result was that the following brethren and sisters have been received into fellowship with the Great George Street ecclesia:—Brother and sister D. Hall, sister Middleton, brother Mills, brother and sister Thompson; also a number have been received by the Wellington Road ecclesia. We trust that the addition will prove a blessing and tend to the furtherance of the Truth in this town.”

(February 1892) DROYLESDEN AND ASHTON.—It affords me great pleasure to report that, in the interest of the Truth, the Ashton Ecclesia have decided to unite themselves with us, thus making our number sixteen. We hope that the union will be beneficial to us all and a means of causing us to more earnestly strive to win the crown that fadeth not away. On Christmas Day we held a fraternal gathering, when about 46 partook of tea (including friends and scholars). Visitors were present from Oldham and Manchester. After tea a very enjoyable and profitable time was spent, addresses being delivered by brethren J. Clalford, S. Ormerod, W. Cockcroft (of Oldham), and J. Roberts (of Manchester).—G. BATTERSBY.

(March 1892) JERSEY CITY (N.J.).—Brother W. Andrew reports the end of the division for some time existing here. “In consequence of which,” he says, “nearly all the Brooklyn brethren have identified themselves with us, and so increased the fellowship to a greater extent than has been known in Jersey City before, which has been a source of rejoicing to all concerned. We feel assured that all the brotherhood will rejoice with us in unfeigned joy. The Sunday evening lectures at the Cooper Institute, N.Y., to supplement the work at the American Institute Fair, N.Y., are still going on, and, if not a great success, are at any rate fairly attended. The responses to our proposal with respect to the ‘World’s Fair’ are not yet sufficient to warrant us in proceeding with the definite arrangements, but we trust they will be before many weeks have elapsed.”—W. ANDREW.

(April 1892) MELBOURNE.—On November 24th, JEMIMA FIELDING (25), formerly Campbellite, put on the saving name in God’s appointed way.—On December 11th, Mrs. CHRISTINA PARTELLI (60), formerly Salvation Army, and Miss MARY JANE PARTELLI (19), formerly Campbellite, also Miss ISABELLA WHITELOW (25), formerly neutral, obeyed the Truth in immersion.—We are happy to report that brother and sister T. Vandergrient have resumed fellowship after a long separation.—We have also to add that, through the perseverance of brother Unsworth, the two meetings which have been divided for nearly four years have been united on the basis of an agreement comprising the Birmingham Constitution and Statement of 1886, and meet co-operatively at South Yarra, and in Melbourne.—HY. ROBERTSON.

(May 1892) MANCHESTER.—I am pleased to report that we are now united with the Oldham Road brethren. We anticipated being in a new room on Sunday, April 17th, but the lady who had the letting could not let us have a board up outside. So we had to give it up, and be reminded that we are of the “sect everywhere spoken against.”—J. W. ALLMAN, 16, Larch Street, Hightown.

(May 1892) MELBOURNE.—You will ere this have been gladdened with the report of reunion amongst the friends of the truth in Melbourne. A basis of reunion has been found in the shape of the Birmingham Statement of Faith, each ecclesia, however, still retaining independent organization and sphere of operations, so that now there are two ecclesias existent in this city, one in Melbourne proper, the other in South Yarra, one of the suburbs. A united fraternal gathering was held the first Sunday of the New Year in the hall of the South Yarra ecclesia (which, by the way, is the gift of one of the brethren to the ecclesia), and a very pleasant gathering around the table of the Lord was enjoyed, the appearance on most of the faces being unalloyed pleasure at the conclusion of the long (over three years) separation. That brethren and sisters be strengthened in their most holy faith, and that God be glorified in their obedience to the commandments of His Son, His the prayer and sincere desire of all those who seek to find acceptance at the Lord's hands on his return to take possession of his own, to further the glory of our Father. The union, too, has served to bring large companies of brethren together at all the meetings, which in itself adds that zest which visiting brethren always confer on a meeting, whether they be of the silent and appreciative sort or of the speaking and distributive kind. Our lectures, too, are attracting the attention of strangers one here, one there; the subjects at the M. U. Hall meeting for the past month being:—January 3rd, "Antichrist on his throne" (brother R. A. Creelman); January 10th, "Twice Dead" (brother W. Todd); January 17th, "Israel in Exile" (brother H. Robertson); January 24th, "The Church not the Kingdom" (brother B. F. McGibbon); January 31st, "The Mysterious Book" (brother Creelman). Several cases of interested friends exist, and hopes are not weak as to further evidence being manifested ere long as to the power of the truth to take out of Gentile darkness persons desirous of associating with the light in its present form with a view to future advance. We are in contact with Jews after the flesh also, one of whom (unfortunately "Christianised") attended a recent lecture. Another, a Mr. Citron, has had placed in hands a copy of *Elpis Israel* and other works, by one of our brethren. Bible classes for the supply of Scriptural sustenance are matter of weekly attention, subjects for month being: "Question," "Romans 5," "Eureka, Vol. 2," "The Pale Horse and its Riders," and "Isaiah 55," each of which subjects form stages in regular courses. The accompanying circular will give you also information as to future possibilities in welding together the scattered brethren and far apart ecclesias in Australia.—M. MCGIBBON.

(September 1892) SYDNEY.—After about two years' tossing about on roaring waves of trial and temptation, fourteen of us have (by the hand of providence) been rescued from our perilous position, and are now anchored, as it were, under shelter, where everything is calm and quiet. "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." Our meeting place at present is Town Hall, Norton Street, Leichhardt. We meet on Sunday morning to break bread and drink wine in loving remembrance of our absent Lord, who said, "This do in remembrance of me," and in the evening to proclaim the glorious things of the Gospel and refresh our own minds. We have also established a Sunday School, which we hold in the afternoon. We are also pleased to be able to report having placed ourselves in fellowship with the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, from whom we had been separated, owing to some of their members contending for an age qualification. We have come to the conclusion that the Scriptures did not warrant our action. As we were not compelled to endorse the views held on the twenty years' question, and there being no other reason as to why a barrier should exist, we invited the Temperance Hall brethren to our fellowship and co-operation, which invitation they readily accepted, showing that they had no wish that a barrier should be kept up; and they have since rendered us assistance by way of lecturing, etc.—H. HOWELL.

[We insert the foregoing "without prejudice," as the lawyers say; that is, without committing ourselves to anything that may hereafter appear to be unsound in the action referred to. We are too far away and in the midst of too many engrossments to be able to keep track of the personal evolutions of an unharmonious community. We must necessarily appear very obtuse to those on the spot. We can only do the best we can, like all other mortals. We aim on the one hand to keep clear of compromising associations, and, on

the other, to do no injustice to those who “love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth.” Wherein we fail, we ask forgiveness.—EDITOR.]

(December 1892) NOTTINGHAM-*Chaucer Street*. — I have pleasure in reporting obedience rendered to the truth as follows: September 17th, ELIZABETH HOLMES (the eldest daughter of brother and sister Holmes, of Scarrington). She came over to Nottingham, and after giving evidence of her knowledge and belief of the truth, was immersed on Saturday night, and present at the breaking of bread on the following Sunday morning. On November 7th, Mrs. HARRIETT HOLMES (51), put on the name of the Lord Jesus. These two sisters, though of the same name, have no fleshly relationship, except that common to the Adamic race.—Brother Thomas Fidler and sister Ada Elston, have been united in marriage. They have removed to Leeds, where brother Fidler had obtained a situation. The following 23 brethren and sisters have united with us in Chaucer Street, as the result of brother Roberts’s efforts, made during many months past, to bring about the union of the two meetings in Nottingham. Their names are as follows: Brother and sister J. Bullman, brother and sister H. Cave, brother and sister H. Footitt, brother and sister W. Gore, brother and sister A. Parsons, brother and sister H. Peel, sister E. A. Adderton, brother Robert Cave, brother Ed. Hemingray, sister E. Harris, sister E. Kirk, sister M. Neal, sister M. Parks, sister Sills, sister Argyle, sisters E. and R. Lee. After the addition of these brethren and sisters, we adopted a new constitution, as agreed, and held a fresh appointment of serving brethren. Brother Roberts has decided that under the circumstances, he must transfer his lecturing appointments to Chaucer Street. (Those who may desire to know the reasons, can obtain from brother Kirkland a printed statement of the course of negotiations.) Our lectures during October have been as follows: On October 2nd, “The Blood of Christ” (brother King); 9th, “The Broad Way that leadeth to Destruction” (brother H. Collyer, of Leicester); 16th, “The Narrow Way that leadeth unto Life Eternal” (brother Mabbott); 23rd, “He descended into Hell” (brother Lee); 30th, “A Divine Land Bill for the Nations of the Earth” (brother Burton).—J. KIRKLAND.

(August 1893) SYDNEY.—Good news from this place (of re-union and the restoration of a good understanding, as regards three bodies at least—Leichhardt, Albert Hall, and Fairfield), we are reluctantly compelled to leave over till next month.

(September 1893) SYDNEY.—We are glad to report that a meeting has been brought about by the Sydney (Albert Hall) Ecclesia, with the object of healing the breach which has existed between that ecclesia and ourselves. The result of the conference was successful in arriving at a good understanding. A representative of the Fairfield ecclesia was present, which body had been out of fellowship with the Sydney (Albert Hall) meeting for the same reasons as we have had in the past. They gave us to distinctly understand that they were in sympathy with us, and were satisfied with our standing in the truth; also that the published intelligence regarding us was the outcome of statements circulated concerning our ecclesia. With these and other minor explanations on their part, we were thoroughly satisfied. The three ecclesias are therefore in fellowship with each other, and we trust that nothing will occur to cause disunion again. We are also glad to report that our ecclesia is progressing in the right direction, peace and unity reigning in our midst, and the brethren are endeavouring to build each other up in their most holy faith each first day of the week. The attendance at the lectures is improving, and we hope to see results before long. We also wish to announce the marriage of brother Aaron Butler with sister Sarah Bower, both of whom were members of the Birmingham ecclesia some years ago. The Sunday school numbers about forty scholars, and is zealously watched over by several brethren and sisters who take great interest in training “the young in the way they should go,” with the hope that they will ultimately choose the narrow path which leadeth unto life. Open air addresses have also been started near Leichhardt Park, which will be another useful means of spreading the truth.—F. J. MUMBY.

(September 1893) *Albert Hall, Elizabeth Street*.—Since we last wrote you some radical changes have taken place amongst us. We are pleased to report the obedience of JAMES MCCLUCKIN (47), and

ANNIE (51), his wife, on the 23rd March. We have also to report the marriage of brother Ford to sister Nellie Wilson, daughter of sister Wilson, both of Sydney; likewise the marriage of Brother Jowett to Sister Minnie Reid, both resident in Perth, West Australia, late of Sydney.—Another matter which we are pleased to report is the fact that the long-standing feud between the Albert Hall ecclesia and the Leichhardt and Fairfield ecclesia has been amicably settled. In response to an invitation from ourselves, a limited number of brethren from Leichhardt and Fairfield met in our hall for the purpose of conferring upon matters with a view to reconciliation. After some discussion upon the matters which had caused division in the past (during which a brotherly spirit was manifested), it was unanimously resolved: “That the brethren assembled in conference do not see any barrier to fellowship, and that this decision be communicated to the several ecclesias interested, with a view of obtaining their endorsement of the same.” This resolution was carried into effect, and, we are pleased to state, endorsed by the said ecclesia, so that we have removed one cause for the adversary to reproach. We think that the truth should present a better front to the enemy now that we are united, and we are very certain that the experience which we have had in the past few years will have a beneficial effect in tempering the character of a good many.—In reference to our public efforts to circulate the truth, we may state that we lecture regularly every Sunday evening at 7 o’clock in our hall, at which we have very good attendances by persons of an enquiring mind. Also we deliver lectures regularly every Sunday afternoon (if the Lord wills) upon the Domain—a recognised rendezvous for sects of almost every denomination, from the avowed Atheist to the devout Salvationist. One of the brethren also lectures on Prince Alfred Park on Sunday afternoon, and besides these, other brethren lecture during the week at the corners of some of the prominent thoroughfares of the city and suburbs. You are no doubt aware, by the newspaper reports, that the social condition of the Colonies is not an enviable one at present; what with the floods, bank failures, etc., things are uncommonly depressed. This is felt by a number of brethren, who are unable to obtain work. It reminds one of the time foreshadowed by the Prophet Zechariah, in connection with the erection of God’s House, when there should be neither work for man or beast. The signs of the times most certainly indicate that before very long (unless an entire change in the government of mankind is effected) the earth will be a pandemonium. Fortunately for us, we can see (by the eye of faith) the dawning of the day, when the Sun of Righteousness shall warm every heart with His beneficent rays. Then the beautiful picture of the 72nd Psalm will be realised. May our Heavenly Father strengthen both you and us, so that we may obtain an entrance into His Kingdom, is our earnest prayer and desire.—W. PICKUP.

[In addition to the foregoing pleasing items, brother Pickup reports the withdrawal of the Albert Hall brethren from about 14 brethren and sisters whose names are given, and the said 14 brethren and sisters write simultaneously to refuse fellowship to the Albert Hall brethren on grounds specified in seven propositions, in addition to which there are separate letters from brother Ryall, brother Porritt, brother Stephens and brother Hodges—all of them acknowledging the uncorrupted way of truth, and advocating that which is excellent in all practical ways. There is no question of doctrine in doubt as between Albert Hall and Elpis Hall, so far as we can make out, nor any disagreement as to the obligations arising out of the commandments of Christ. It is a want of harmony in matters of order and discipline. Of this it is impossible for persons at a distance to judge, however exactly they may be defined, without an amount of correspondence which is impossible. There is no advantage in debating what cannot be decided. The quarrel, if quarrel there must be, must be kept to Sydney. There could be no advantage in transferring it to the pages of the *Christadelphian*].

(April 1894) SYDNEY (*Albert Hall*).—It is with much pleasure we report the increasing numerical prosperity of our ecclesia, ten persons having been added to our number during the quarter ending December, 1893. Their names are as follows, by immersion:—October 16th, 1893, ROBERT MCKINLAY (35), and EMILY (31), his wife, who had formerly been connected with those holding the Free Life theory. November 14th, 1893, EDWARD WOLSTENCROFT (24), formerly Salvationist. November 21st, 1893, EMMA E. CHAMBERLAIN (64), brother Chamberlain’s wife, formerly in fellowship with the “Brethren.” November 27th, 1893, Miss ELIZABETH SHEA (37), formerly

Wesleyan; and ABSALOM G. CRANE (31), formerly Church of England. December 28th, 1893, JOHN WILLIAM LANE (37), ELYSEE RICHARD (34), and ELIZABETH (34), his wife. The last three had, with a few others stepped aside from other denominations, having their eyes open to some extent to discern the corrupt teaching and practice of Christendom, and had formed a meeting among themselves. Upon the truth being introduced to their notice by one of our brethren, a division occurred amongst them, the three mentioned accepting the truth and applying to our ecclesia for baptism, to which request we gladly complied, after they had made a good confession of the one faith. We have also had the pleasure of welcoming sister Ingram, from London, N. Against this addition, we have to place the loss of sisters Yardley and Salter by removal, and we deeply regret that it has been necessary to withdraw from brethren Thomas Jarvis and Edward Price for continued absence from the Lord's table. Since peace and unity have been restored between our ecclesia and the ecclesia at Leichhardt, quarterly fraternal visits have been arranged in order to cultivate and show the love and good will that ought to prevail among brethren. These visits have been the means of drawing us closer together. Our Sunday evening lectures, and the addresses delivered in the open air, continue to receive the attention of many who are interested in the doctrines proclaimed. On the afternoon of Sunday, December 31st, prizes were distributed to the scholars of the Sunday school, which, though not as flourishing as we could wish, is well attended, and is certainly an important branch of our ecclesial work. The Australian Colonies are now in a very depressed state financially, and the supply of labour far exceeds the demand. Much distress and poverty therefore exist amongst the working classes, consequently, we as a body, do not fail to feel the effects of the general depression. But we rest in the anticipation of the early Advent of him who alone can remedy the present evil state of affairs and bring in that state of blessedness which God has promised to all nations, through Abraham and his seed.—A. LEE.

(May 1894) SWANSEA *Albert Minor Hall*.—Brother Randles reports that an unsuccessful effort has been made during the month to unite the two meetings in Swansea, but as the result of it, the following have applied for and been received into fellowship at the Albert Minor Hall from Shaftesbury Hall, after endorsing and signing our basis of fellowship, viz.:—*Brethren* Tilling, Williams, Davies, Spiller, Willimont and John Rees (Hafod); *Sisters* Tilling, Williams, Davies, Spiller, Lucina Tilling, Wiggen and Apseth.—The effort at the re-union took the form of a proposal from the Shaftesbury Hall meeting to “act upon entirely independent grounds with respect to the question of fellowship,” leaving members “at liberty to use their own discretion with whom they fellowshipped when visiting out of Swansea.” It was pointed out by the Albert Minor Hall brethren that this left matters precisely in the position which they had occupied all along—a position that could not be accepted by any one resolved upon a course of absolute fealty to the Holy Scriptures.

In consequence of the hall being engaged on Good Friday, the usual tea-meeting was held instead on Easter Monday, when the largest gathering of brethren and sisters for some years met together, including visitors from Morryston, Neath and Llanelly. After tea, stirring addresses were given (interspersed with singing) by six brethren on “Things hoped for and believed and not to be ashamed of.” Also the importance of being prepared to meet the great Judge of all who is so very *near*. A most profitable evening was enjoyed. Since last report the subjects of lectures have been as follows:—March 18th, “Divers Faiths and Divers Churches; which is the Church of Christ?” (brother S. Heard); 25th, “Inspiration; Is the Bible the Word of God?” (brother G. E. Palmer); April 1st, “Inspiration” (continued); some difficulties answered (brother G. E. Palmer); 8th, “The jailor's question answered, ‘What Must I do to be Saved?’” (brother Chidzoy).—THOMAS RANGLES.

(February 1895) SWANSEA -On December 27th, we held our Sunday school treat. Prizes were distributed to the children for work done, and a trip round the world, including a visit to the land where the Seven Churches of Asia existed, mentioned in the Apocalypse, were very intelligently described, through lantern views, by brother D. J. Hughes.—During the quarter, brother John Rees has returned to

fellowship. Also the Mumbles ecclesia, having removed the obstacle which caused our withdrawal, have applied for fellowship, and have been accepted.—Since last report our lectures have been as follows:—December 16th, “Eternal Life” (brother Chidzoy); 23rd, “The Kingdom of God: Its Laws, Conditions, and Blessings”; and 30th, “Peace on Earth: How will it come about?” (brother Geo. Palmer); January 6th, “Outside the Camp” (brother R. Roberts); 13th, “The Power of an Endless Life” (brother D. J. Hughes). Brother Roberts’ visit proved most refreshing to the brethren and sisters, and the lecture in the evening was listened to throughout with great attention by an increased audience.—THOMAS RANGLES.

(March 1895) NORTHAMPTON -Brother Gamble, of Leicester, writes under condensation:—“Brother Cort, of Northampton, wrote to know if Leicester could assist them in the way of providing lecturers, as divisions had taken place, and that they would be glad of help in that direction. Leicester agreed to assist, having understood from other sources that the contention had been with respect to the new doctrines introduced by brother Andrew. But it afterwards transpired that there were three sections in the division, namely—two meetings, and some who declined to fellowship either, and I said that I would be in Northampton on Saturday, January 5th, for the purpose of learning the position, and if I found it satisfactory would lecture on the Sunday. I asked that all the brethren and sisters who declined to accept the new doctrines would meet me on Saturday evening. They readily did so. I found that ten brethren and sisters had formed another meeting and they were not invited. After the interview, three or four who had stood aloof from both meetings expressed their satisfaction, and the result was that they all, with myself, broke bread together on Sunday morning. Thus the breach was healed between two sections of the division. We sent an invitation to the ten who had withdrawn, to meet us at 2.30 on Sunday afternoon, to see if the difficulties could not be removed. They came, but the result was disappointing. They questioned the brethren from whom they had withdrawn, and elicited replies exactly in harmony with those given to me at the previous meeting, but refused to accept them as being a true state of their minds. Upon testing their ideas as to “sin in the flesh” and the “putting away of sin,” it transpired that they associate with the first, the idea of God’s wrath being upon all, and with the second, that God’s anger in some way was upon Christ in bearing away our sins. I placed before the meeting the fact that Christ was the manifestation of the Father’s love, that he was publicly declared to be “My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.” That the bringing him into the world and sustaining him through all his life, is the greatest act of love and mercy ever placed before the children of men. The only reply to this was—Does not the cry of Jesus, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me” show that God had left him in anger?” I quoted “Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom MY SOUL DELIGHTETH.” Need I say that no good resulted from that meeting. One of them in conversation told me that they were in sympathy with brother Andrew’s doctrines, and this is really the root of the whole matter, though sought to be covered by other words. I lectured in the evening, and at the close one said to me, ‘Brother Gamble, for week’s past we have heard nothing but ‘sin in the flesh,’ condemnation, alienation, and judgment,’ and there has been no room at all for the mercy of the Lord. The standing of the ecclesia with respect to the inspiration controversy was challenged. I questioned them very critically as to this, and am quite satisfied with their replies.”

Writing on February 15th, brother Cort says:—“I am glad to inform you that we who are left of the Northampton ecclesia are working harmoniously together, and are keeping the word of truth before the public at the same rooms as formerly. We were cheered last Sunday by a visit from brother Viccars Collyer, of Leicester. Since our brethren have separated from us, we have had in addition to our local brothers Ealing and Cort, lectures from the following:—Brothers V. and J. Collier and T. Gamble, of Leicester, and brothers C. J. Allen, B. Warrender, and G. Creed, of Birmingham

(November 1895) ADELAIDE.—I have much pleasure in reporting that the breach existing for the last four years between the two ecclesias in Adelaide has been healed, and we are now meeting as one body under the previous constitution.—H. MANSFIELD, jun.

(February 1897) LEEDS. — *Wellington Road.* — Brother Suggitt reports: “Our special efforts have commenced with the first Sunday of the new year, when we had the company and assistance of brother R. Roberts, of Birmingham, who gave us a substantial exhortation in the morning at the breaking of bread. In the evening, he delivered a lecture on ‘The Troubled World.’ We had a good company of thoughtful people. On Monday night we had a joint meeting of the Great George Street and Wellington Road ecclesias in the Great George Street room, when the following definition was unanimously adopted (with two exceptions only), as expressing the intended and Scriptural sense of the clauses in the basis of faith which had for some time been the subject of controversy. Brother Pickles (Wellington Road), moved, and brother Gamble (Great George Street), seconded, ‘That Christ at this present time, is High Priest over his own house only, in this sense: that he does not intercede for the world in any cases, and that no man or woman is in a position to obtain the forgiveness of sins or to offer acceptable worship to God until they have believed and obeyed the gospel in baptism; also, that the statements contained in the printed slips, pasted on the hymn-books, express the truth as taught by the Apostles of Christ.’ On Tuesday night brother Roberts lectured on the subject of ‘Turkish Horrors.’ On Wednesday night we had a grand time of it, when our brother gave us a lecture on ‘Christ in the Earth again.’ Thus has been sown the good seed of the Kingdom, which, we trust, will bring forth by our Heavenly Father’s will, fruit a hundredfold to His glory, and our eternal welfare. On January 10th, brother Pickles lectured in the same place (Gladstone Hall), on ‘The Great Salvation.’”

(April 1897)BELFAST. — Brother Logan writes: “The brethren who met with us here when we only numbered three or four will be pleased to hear that we have now an ecclesia of sixteen members, and expect to have more very soon (this does not include brother Bell, who is here during temporary employment). Nine of them were meeting with the other side here, being ignorant (with one exception) of the fact that the other side were composed of ‘partial - inspirationists, free - life theory,’ &c. This, however, was kept in the background, One of them sent to brother Roberts, asking his mind on the nature of Christ, who very kindly sent him the January number of the *Christadelphian* and the *Slain Lamb*. After reading them, with our Bibles on the subject, and having personal conversations together, they saw their position and came out: namely, James Anderson, John Gordon and his wife, Jane Gordon; Thos. Taggart and his wife, Matilda Taggart; Wm. Fullerton, Wm. McKillen and his wife, Mary McKillen; and Thos. Jas. Milligen. We have also had the pleasure of putting under water for the remission of her sins, SARAH CAMPBELL (14), daughter of brother and sister Campbell, late of Irvine, who gave ample proof under examination that she understood the things concerning the Kingdom and the Name of Jesus Christ. We now meet at 5.30 for the breaking of bread, and have a public lecture at 7.0.”

(April 1897) LEEDS.—(*Great George Street.*)—Brother Throp reports the death of brother Harry Turner, at the age of 21—a brother devoted to the work of the Sunday School, and to the work of the ecclesia in general. Brethren Gamble and Dudding conducted the service at the grave, and brother Gamble (in the absence of brother Mitchell, who was prevented by sickness) spoke some words of comfort and hope. Brother and sister Murray have removed from Bradford. On the question of amalgamation of the two meetings in Leeds, it has been decided that it should stand over for future consideration, and that in the meantime each meeting, as heretofore, work together harmoniously, but separately.

(April 1897) MUMBLES.—The brethren in Wales and many in the south-west of England will be glad to hear that the dispute about the Kingdom of God has ended, and that unity once more exists between Swansea and Mumbles, as the result of a long correspondence and a meeting of the arranging brethren of both ecclesias (so brother Edwards reports).

(April 1897) SWANSEA.—“In the matter of the late Kingdom of God controversy, we are pleased to report that the Mumbles ecclesia, having withdrawn their rejoinders to our affirmations and accepted



brother Roberts' proposition on the Kingdom of God, which agrees with our affirmations, are now in fellowship with us."—THOMAS RANGLES

(July 1897) JERSEY CITY (*Union Hall, corner Grove and Fourth Streets*)—We are glad to report the obedience of Mr. WILLIAM BROWN (21). of Elizabeth, N.J., formerly a Presbyterian. Brother Brown became acquainted with the truth through the instruction of brethren who were his fellow-workers at the bench.—On April 8th, brother James Walker, aged eighteen-and-a-half years, fell asleep. He had been connected with the "one faith" for about eighteen months, but was well-advanced in understanding. His last hours were gladdened by the ardent prospect of the Master's speedy return. His mother and brother being sharers of the same joy, though cast down, do not sorrow as those who have no hope.—Brother Harry McCann and sister Anna M. Scott were united in marriage on Dec. 8th, 1896.—Concerning the unfortunate division that occurred here last autumn, we regret to say that no settlement has yet been reached. A conference of the arranging brethren of the two meetings was held a short time ago, and a proposition made by one of those separated from us we accepted as a basis of reunion; but when the proposition was referred to the other meeting for approval, it was rejected. We have since written a letter to the individuals composing the other meeting, urging them to unite with us upon terms named by one of their leading members, but the response has not been very encouraging. All that we require is that they drop their harmful contention to the effect that marriage with the alien is not unscriptural. At the same time we advocate no rigorous measures toward those erring in this respect. Perhaps time will be effective where other means fail.—Our roll is 56, and we are therefore short of our former numby a little over one-third.—The public work of the truth has been somewhat neglected during the past winter, but we are labouring in a private way. Evening Bible-classes are held weekly in Brooklyn, Newark, and Elizabeth. We live far apart, and concentrated effort is difficult.—On May 23rd, we had the pleasure of a visit from brethren Mitchell and McKellar, jun., of the Boston ecclesia.—JAMES C. BRUCE.

(July 1897) HAMILTON.—An endeavour to bring about union here has not been successful, as the conditions offered did not practically differ from the resolution that caused the rupture.

(December 1897) MORRISTON.—We regret to announce that, arising out of our willingness to meet with the Swansea ecclesia with a view to re-uniting in fellowship, we have lost a number of brethren, members of our ecclesia. We did all we could, consistent with our obligations to the truth, to keep the meeting in harmony. But alas, our effort to effect unity with Swansea has resulted in diminishing our already small ecclesia. We trust yet, that the brethren referred to will re-consider their position and retrace their steps, that we may be of further mutual assistance to one another in our efforts in God's service. We were encouraged by a visit on November 7th, paid us by brother and sister Jackett, of Swansea, and should be pleased to see any other brother or sister from Swansea or elsewhere, at any of our meetings.—T. G. WILLIAMS.

## INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS EXTENDING FELLOWSHIP TO OTHER INDEPENDENT ECCLESIAS

(July 1884) ST. KILDA.—Bro. Gordon reports the following additions:—Sister Harrison and bro. Hodges by union in fellowship; also the wife of bro. Stephens by immersion on Jan. 23, and also J. Hewitt, formerly Primitive Methodist, who was immersed March 6. We are glad to state that an understanding has been arrived at with the Melbourne Ecclesia, and that, although we are still two separate Ecclesias, we are one as regards fellowship. Last Sunday (April 13) the two ecclesias broke bread together, on the occasion of the Melbourne Ecclesia taking a new hall. A fraternal gathering was

held on the following day (Easter Monday), at the Oddfellows' Hall, Windsor, at which a goodly number of brethren and sisters were present. Exhortations were given by various brethren, and a very pleasant and profitable day was spent. We are still holding forth "the word of life" to our fellow mortals, though attendance at the lectures has been small of late.

(March 1886) Leamington.—Brother Peters reports that there have been added to the brethren, by immersion, THOS. GROOM (65), gardener, and GEORGE GROOM (63), labourer, both formerly neutral. They put on the sin-covering name in the appointed way on January 9th, 1886. Also, sister Brown, of Manchester, is meeting with us. This ecclesia wish it to be known that they are in fellowship with the Temperance Hall, Birmingham.

(May 1886) Keighley.—Brother Sutcliffe reports the restoration of fellowship between the ecclesia and those eight members who withdrew some time ago, and formed themselves into an ecclesia at Haworth. Not satisfied with the separation without an effort for re-union, both parties agreed for Brother Roberts to come, as he was visiting Yorkshire. So Brother Roberts was asked to do so, and consented to have an interview with both parties on Friday, March 26th. After interview the following resolution was adopted:—"That the brethren constituting the Keighley Ecclesia, having no objections of a spiritual nature to the statement of faith adopted by the Haworth Ecclesia; but on the contrary agreeing to it as an exposition of the true Apostolic faith, in all points and particulars, positive and negative, this joint meeting is of opinion that the two ecclesias, while remaining distinct as ecclesial organisations in different localities, four miles apart, should re-unite in fellowship one with another, as the law of Christ requires."

(August 1886) Derby.—(*Athenoem, Victoria Street, Sundays, 10–30 and 6–30.*) Brother E. Grimes has removed to Swansea, and sister A. Smith to Chesterfield. On June 22nd, JOHN HEAP, formerly neutral, put on the name of Christ and is now rejoicing with us in the hope of the gospel. This is the first addition since the division, and has encouraged us very much. We held our tea meeting on July 5th, and were cheered and comforted by the presence of brethren from Burton, Birmingham, Lichfield, Nottingham, and Peterboro'.

(August 1886) Swansea.—Brother T. Randles report that it was decided at the quarterly meeting to publish a correct list of the brethren and workers now in fellowship at Swansea, to prevent all misunderstanding arising from the departure of several from the Minos Albert Hall. The list is as follows: Brother Allen, brother Chidzoy, sister Chidzoy, Jas. Evans, sister E. S. Evans. Martin Evans, Daisy Evans, brother Grimes, sister Harding, sister Johnson, sister Langrave, sister Lifton, brother Lifton, D. J. Luce, H. Luce, Edwin Landor, Henry Morse, Elizabeth Owen, John Palmer, Geo. Palmer, Emily Palmer, Susan Peters, Thos. Randles, Mary Randles, John Rees, Mary Rees, Maretta Rees, David Slocombe, Esther Slocombe. Sarah Slocombe, Wm. Slocombe, Wm. Stock, brother Wheel, sister Wheel.

(May 1887) Huddersfield.—Brother Heywood writes:—"The ecclesia here held their usual tea and social gathering on Good Friday, in the Lodge Room of the Victoria Temperance Hall, Buxton Road. We had brethren and sisters from Liverpool, Stockport, Oldham, Sowerby Bridge, Halifax, Elland, Leeds, Heckmondwike, Bradford, &c., to the number of about 100. The meeting was addressed by brother Wilde, of Slaithwaite; Clarke, of Stockport; Smith, of Halifax; Z. Drake, of Elland; Bamford, of Oldham, who gave earnest and instructive words of encouragement to hold fast the Word of Life, and walk worthily unto the end. It was one of the most successful meetings we have had, and cheered us in the difficulties we had lately passed through. As the mills and business places here work on Good Friday now, the meeting was asked to decide if Easter Monday (Bank Holiday) would be more convenient for future meetings (if the Lord delay). It was decided by the majority present that our annual gathering should take place in future on Easter Monday."

(Excerpt from August 1887) Aberdare. — Sister Randles also refers to the declaration of the Cwmaman brethren appearing last month in favour of a wholly-inspired infallible Bible, and their determination to make that truth a basis of fellowship. She says those with whom she is identified in Swansea were very glad to see such a declaration, but are perplexed with its concluding statement that the Cwmaman brethren have never acted contrary to that declaration. On Jubilee day, they took part at a tea meeting at Aberdare, at which were present members of meetings from Rhondda, Cardiff, Swansea, and Mumbles which are all in fellowship with the “Exchange brethren” mentioned in the Cwmaman declaration. Sister Randles says that the brethren at Cwmaman may be personally on the right side of the contention with regard to the Scriptures, but by fellowshipping those who receive the Exchange brethren into their midst whenever they come, they make themselves a link in the wrong chain, and cause difficulty with those who would like to be at one with all who take the position defined in their declaration. “We cannot,” she says, “fellowship at Aberdare those whom we refuse to fellowship in Swansea.”

(August 1887) Sowerby Bridge.—Bro. Briggs reports there is no increased attention on the part of the alien here, but the brethren continue to sow the seed in patience. On June 20th they held their first tea meeting when about 80 brethren, sisters, and friends were present from Keighley, Bradford, Elland, Heckmondwike, Huddersfield, Oldham, and Halifax. After tea, various hymns and anthems were sung and short addresses given by brethren G. Drake and J. Heywood, of Huddersfield; brethren Bamford and Cockroft, of Oldham. Lectures have been given during the past month as follow:—June 19th, “Signs of the approaching end” (brother J. Briggs); 26th, “The devil and his works” (brother Z. Drake, of Elland); July 3rd, “Divine Jubilees” (brother Darlow, of Halifax); 10th, “The rest promised” (brother Drake Huddersfield).

(September 1887) Melbourne.—Brother R. Robertson reports various items concerning the Balaclava ecclesia, amongst others the obedience in November, 1886, of ALFRED RILEY (26), State School teacher, Caramut, Victoria, who, as previously reported, had found the truth through an advertisement in *The Age*, leading to his perusal of most of the truth’s publications. About the end of December brother C. C. Walker left, going to Daylesford (some 70 miles from here), where he stays until his prospected departure for England, on which he purposes to start about six weeks hence, if the divine will so permit. During his stay in Daylesford he has succeeded in rousing the people through lectures and newspaper correspondence, which is bearing some visible fruit. This is also the first known breaking of the ground for the truth in that town. On 1st January, 1887. ARTHUR RATTEN (27), school teacher, Kew, put on the name of Christ in the appointed way after due proof of his understanding. About this time several meetings were held to attempt a reconciliation between the three ecclesias in Melbourne and suburbs, which resulted in unanimity on all doctrinal points, saving that of the temptation of Christ in the wilderness (as to whether it was external or internal). Several meetings were held without attaining unity, at that time, but at a later period, namely, in the month of May, brother E. Waite, from Brisbane (visiting Melbourne in search of employment, which he did not obtain), was asked to put the question again before the ecclesias in its true bearing. At this meeting, the opposition so strenuously maintained previously against any second person in the temptation incident had abated. As a result the way was paved for re-union, and we have deemed it wise to unite in order that all may be done for the furtherance of the truth, which we are highly favoured in this dark age to know. On February 12, 1887, WILLIAM WALLIS FARMER (25), of Caramut, having come to a knowledge of the truth, in conjunction with brother Riley (whose wife has also become obedient to the faith), and having given proof of his understanding of his position, was introduced into the name. “On April 5 sisters I. and A. Magellan were withdrawn from for continued abstention from the assemblies of the brethren; also brother Lovell, 10 months previously for another cause.”

(January 1888) DOON.—“An Ecclesia was organised here in 1863, when Dr. Thomas visited us, and we have continued to hold forth the truth to those around us since that time. We have had our difficulties

respecting doctrines; but I am happy to say that we are all in harmony now. We have a statement of faith which forms the basis of our fellowship. It is in a condensed form for the purpose of registration as there is no law here that recognises Christadelphians as a body. We therefore registered our faith and gave a lease of our meeting house to those holding that faith for 99 years I enclose copy of statement. We also believe in a wholly inspired Bible which is a question that had not arisen when the lease was given. We hold our meetings every Sunday at 11 a.m., Doon and Blair alternately. They are two small villages two miles apart. We have helped 14 to put on the saving name this current year—10 of whom are constant attendants at the Lord's table, and two reside in Galt, sisters Robb and Wilkins, and two in Stratford, sisters Trow and Adams. I have been a reader of your writings for 25 years and am happy to say I have always found them in accord with the Scriptures. I have also noted your course of action through the many trials you have had to pass through for the truth's sake, and I feel assured that you have done your duty as a faithful servant of Christ."—JOSHUA PEDDER.

(May 1889) SYDNEY.—Brother Bennett reports that on the 31st October, 1888, the meetings in the Temperance Hall and New Masonic Hall were united, but that it has been found advisable to continue the New Masonic Hall meeting, which had been abandoned. This is now done; the two meetings being in fellowship with each other.

(November 1891) LEEDS—*Wellington Road, Sundays, 2.30 and 6.30 p.m., Wednesdays, 7.30, Bible Class.*—I have to report additions to our number of brother and sister John Murray (late of Bradford), brother Steele, of Middlesbrough, and sister Child, of Great George Street meeting, all of whom reside in the New Wortley district, and therefore will meet with us in future. On the other hand, brother Encell with in future meet with the brethren at George Street, on Sunday mornings, they being more convenient for him.—On Sunday afternoon, October 11th, the two ecclesias of this town met together for "breaking of bread" at Wellington Road, it being the time appointed for united fellowship. We had a very pleasant time together, and experienced the fact that "'Tis pleasant for brethren to dwell together in unity and peace." The speakers were brethren Mitchell, Pickles, and J. W. Edwards, all speaking to the edification and upbuilding of the body of Christ in this day of probation, and walk of faith. There were 37 brethren and sisters from George Street, making in all 70.—Tea was provided after the meeting, giving opportunity for conversation on the things of the truth, &c. The discourses for October were by brethren G. B. Suggitt, W. Turner, B. Johnson, and Geo. Pickles.—GEO. B. SUGGITT.

(May 1893) LEEDS *Wellington Road.*—According to announcement last month, the lectures to be given by brother R. Roberts came off in due course, and were quite a success throughout. The two ecclesias met together at the Great George Street Meeting Room on Sunday morning, April 9th, for united fellowship (as is their custom so to do every second Sunday in the quarter, first at one room then at the other), when a good company of brethren and sisters assembled to remember the sufferings and death of our Master in his absence, and to encourage each other on the way to "the Kingdom of God," and to wait with patience for the Lord's return to "build up Zion." Brother Roberts gave us the word of exhortation. 'Tis good to see so many of Christ's friends meet together in unity to bear testimony to the fact of Christ's death and resurrection. In the evening the first of the three lectures was given on "The first appearing of Christ." We had a full house to hear the truth concerning the first advent. The second lecture was delivered in the Co-operative Hall, Albion Street, to an audience of about 500, on Tuesday evening, the 11th. Subject: "The second appearing of Christ a certainty." The third and last lecture was given on Wednesday evening in the Holbech Mechanics' Institute, where about 400 people had assembled to hear "The signs of Christ's near approach." Pamphlets and leaflets were distributed at the close of each lecture, and it is our hope to see fruits of our labours in this way. May we have our Heavenly Father's blessing through His Son our Saviour. Brother Roberts was accompanied by his daughter, Sarah Jane. On April 16th, brother Pickles gave a lecture on "The refuge from the storm: or what must we do to escape the coming judgments, and

participate in the blessings of the coming age.” Brother W. H. Iredale and sister Emma Kinghorn were united in marriage on March 25th. They have our best wishes. — G. B. SUGGIT.

(June 1893) FAIRFIELD.—I write to inform you that as there are several brethren and sisters living in this neighbourhood, being from 18 to 20 miles from Sydney, we have formed an ecclesia at Fairfield some few months ago. We meet on the basis of the Birmingham Statement of Faith. We believe in a wholly inspired Bible, and have no sympathy with the age restrictions that some would impose on candidates for baptism, nor with the idea of excluding strangers from our meetings. We are in fellowship with and visit the Leichardt ecclesia. The names of the brethren and sisters forming our little ecclesia are:—Brother and sister Barton, now on a visit to England, sister Louie Barton, brother and sister Killip, sister Maberley, of Fairfield, sister Brinkman, of Guildford, sisters Lane, and brother and sister Wood (late of Birmingham), Canbez Vale. On 26th of January we spent a profitable time with the Leichardt ecclesia at the house of brother Killip, Fairfield, as a farewell gathering to brother and sister Barton. We had Bible readings, earnest exhortations, singing and prayer.—F. R. WOOD.

(April 1895) CARDIFF—It is with grief I report the death of my dear grandfather, brother Morgan Rees, of Llandaff. He died February 19th, after a short illness, aged 78 years. Although he had been failing of late, and we had anticipated the worst, we did not think the end so near. He was a willing counsellor and friend to us in our labour in the Lord’s vineyard, always ready and prepared to expound and defend the truth. He fondly hoped to witness the Lord’s appearing in his lifetime. But God has ruled otherwise, and has laid him to rest. He had read last month’s *Christadelphian* himself, while in bed, and I broke bread with him on Sunday afternoon, and he was much comforted. I am in fellowship with the Albert Minor Hall brethren of Swansea, as was grandfather with me, and add this information in case of any misapprehension.—ARCHIBALD WM. WINSTON.

(April 1895) LONDON (SOUTH) *Gresham Hall, Gresham Road, Brixton Road (near Brixton Station). Sundays, 9.45, 11 a.m., and 7 p.m.; Thursdays, 8 p.m.*—We are pleased to announce that the brethren of the Islington ecclesia will join us in a tea and fraternal meeting, to be held at our hall (the Gresham Hall), on Easter Monday. Brethren and interested friends from all parts will be most welcome—tea at 5 o’clock. Good Friday is to be wholly given up to the children of our Sunday school and to those who like to see the children enjoy themselves. The children are to assemble at 3 o’clock—various and instructive entertainments, distribution of prizes, tea, and magic lantern is the bill of fare for the dear young ones whom we love and whose welfare we seek. Brother and sister C. F. Clements and sister Cordon, having moved from North London, will in future meet with us at Gresham Hall, and we are glad with their company. Lectures for March have been as follows:—March 3rd, “The Holy City.—The advent of the Great King” (Mr. F. G. Jannaway); March 10th, “Russia and the Czar—Divine Predictions concerning coming events in the East” (Mr. F. W. Porter); March 17th, “Problems of Human Life” (Mr. A. T. Jannaway). The back of our lecture card reads as follows:—

#### THE WORLD IN DISTRESS. RELIEF AT HAND.

The earth presents many sad sights to those who have eyes to see. Where truth should be exalted for the hope and salvation of perishing man, we see contradictory creeds and bitter conflict. Instead of a generous distribution of the earth’s bounties amongst her children, we see millions toiling in hunger; instead of peace and prosperity, we see war preparations and oppressive taxation. We see also wealth concentrating itself into the hands of the few—the poor growing poorer; willing workers unemployed and starving; despairing men rising in rebellion. Alas! alas! Is there no prospect of relief? There is. From these sad sights turn we to a picture, bright and beautiful, drawn by God in His infallible but neglected Word. In this we see Christ once more among us, ruling as King over all the earth (Zec. 14:9; Rev. 11:15)—one law (Is. 2:3)—one religion (Zec. 14:16, 17)—no war (Ps. 46:8–10)—no miscarriage of justice (Jer. 23:5)—no mismanagement (Is. 11:1–5)—no tyranny (Is. 29:20)—no complaining in the streets (Ps.

144:14)—the poor and helpless cared for (Ps. 72:4)—the earth yielding her increase (Ps. 67:6)—grateful hearts every where (Ps. 113:2, 3). To share in this future blessedness is the hope of the only true gospel—the gospel of the Scriptures. All who come within its sound receive a message and an invitation from God. Let us not shut the door against Him.—JOSEPH BELLAMY.

(Notes December 1895) KILMARNOCK.—The brethren have decided to have a fraternal gathering on New Year's Day if God will. They cordially invite all brethren and sisters of neighbouring ecclesias to attend. Tea on the table at 3–30.

## EXAMPLES OF THE LIKES OF THE APOSTASY – EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL

### EXTERNAL

(Excerpt from August 1865) GOOD NEWS FROM NEW ZEALAND.—The ecclesia here numbers six in all, but owing to the great distances between us, we have not got organised yet, but I think shortly, we will be able to make a muster. There are a good many struck with the truth who have not been immersed yet. We stand badly in want of books. A great many are anxious to buy the *Twelve Lectures* of Roberts, and would be willing to pay any money for them; but I stand in the unfortunate position of not having copies to sell them. I have only got two copies in my possession at present which I keep lent out as best I can; but if I had plenty of books, I believe a great work could be done here before the coming of Christ. A man of the name of James Stevenson, who has delivered tracts in Dunedin, at his own expense these four years every Lord's day, and to whom I lent one of the books in my possession, has come to a knowledge of the truth and he has burnt the remainder of his tracts and is determined to undo all that he has done. I meet with great opposition from the professing community. The clergy in this place have denounced me out of their pulpits as a false prophet. However the time is not far distant when it will be made manifest who are the false and who are the true. From the appearance of things at present I think there will be a break up among the Campbellites of this place, as I have been spreading a knowledge of the kingdom among them.

(Excerpt from Answers to Correspondents March 1865) G. E. O.—Your remark though penned ironically is strictly true. There are things a non-belief of which is essential to fraternal recognition; and provided they were correctly defined, there would be no great harm in making out “a list” of them. We suggest the following contributions: the god Vishnu, Mahomet, Joe Smith, Emmanuel Swedenborg, the Pope, the deity of the Virgin Mary, the immaculate conception, the worship of saints and images, transmigration of souls, and if there be anything else which is contrary to the sound doctrine of “the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ,” it must be included in the category, such as the immortality of the soul, eternal torments, seducing spirits, doctrines of devils and many other well known forms of theological malaria which infect the air.

(Excerpt from Answers to Correspondents Cont. March 1865) W. D.—The “table of the Lord” is not a piece of furniture, nor the material emblems employed in the celebration of the Lord's death. It is a mystical name (derived from the literal table in the first instance) representative of a memorial act enjoined upon the brethren of Christ who while remembering their absent master in the form appointed, set forth their unity by partaking of one bread and one cup. This unity in the present state, is doctrinal and arises from unanimity in their perceptions of the things imported by the ceremony — which things of course have reference to a higher future unity, when they shall be in nature “one.” You ask who is to decide upon the admissability, or non-admissability of persons to this. The answer is, Christ has constituted his brethren, the natural guardians of that table by making it symbolical of unity. This compels them to see to it that unity exists where they are invited to sit down to it. They may differ as widely as possible on general topics, but there must be unanimity in their views of the matters involved in the

ceremonial act, in which they are called upon to engage. Hence they instinctively refuse to “fellowship” those who have another hope and believe another gospel than themselves. They would not hesitate to refuse fellowship to members of the common sects of professing Protestantism; so that although “the Lord’s table,” they are compelled in the Lord’s absence to act with the discretionary power of the Lord’s stewards, in drawing the line which divides the mystic table of the Lord from the wide spread table of the devil, This leads to the specific questions you ask. A person holding the common doctrine of the devil is not in unity with the doctrine which constitutes the basis of “the table.” The event memorialized by the table is the destruction of the devil through the death of Christ, (1 John 3:8. Heb. 2:14.) Hence, unity of doctrine on the subject of the devil is absolutely necessary as a condition of the memorial act of the table. The devil Christ destroyed, was sin in the flesh. This is the fact perceived by all who scripturally partake of the table, but if there come one among you, saying that sin in the flesh was not the devil that Christ destroyed, but that it was a supernatural antagonist, dealing death and affliction among the human race, then he is clearly unsuited by his condition of mind to sit down with you. There is no unity between you in those doctrinal perceptions which constitute the very basis of “the table of the Lord.” If he insist on a fellowship which cannot exist, all you have to do is to follow the apostolic injunction where spiritual incompatibility arises,—“withdraw thyself” which is more in harmony with the general passive policy inculcated by Christ, than the arrogant attitude of excommunication.[ Compiler’s Note: Dark gray is effect of light gray if not upheld]

(May 1865) DR. THOMAS AND THE PROFESSED FRIENDS OF THE TRUTH.—In a letter to the Editor, dated March 25, Dr. Thomas makes use of the following remarks, which we presume will be interesting to our readers in general:—“I see that one W. P. has been rating me in M. S. to you. Is it not *penance* for one who loves and honors the truth, who has 407arasse for thirty years to I it as a *distinct entity* undefiled by Ecclesiastical “harlots and abominations;” who has endeavoured to bring men to an enlightened, and affectionate appreciation of the truth, and of all who love her—is it not *doing penance*, for such an one to be located for ten days, more or less, in a city where there are three hostile and rival parties all professing to believe the truth with him; one party rejoicing in the presidency of one, who, he was told, says, “he loves power and will have it”: another party, fellowshipping *ci-divant* Campbellites and Bowsites, who were immersed first, and professed to believe the gospel of the kingdom afterwards, thus imagining to patch up their old ragged garments with new cloth; and a third party of whose merits, as a stranger, compared with the others, he had no means of judging. Was not this doing penance; so that instead of being able genially to take all by the hand, to be under the necessity for conscience sake, to decline breaking bread with either party? I have not been “contending earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints,” by mouth and pen, for so many years, the life-time of a generation, for such results as exist in Glasgow, and other places. The Lord will adjudicate all things rightly when he comes. But in the meantime, I am at peace and in fellowship only with those who believe the Gospel of the kingdom and Name *first*; obey it *afterwards* in immersion into the Christ, as exhibited in the formula “The Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit—or the Father *manifested* in the Son by Holy Spirit, which is “the Christ;” and thenceforth “patiently continue in well-doing, thereby seeking for glory, honour, incorruptibility and life.” These are Christadelphians or Christ’s Brethren; all others are illegitimate or counterfeit. This is my position in Britain and America, though I may have to stand alone: and from it, at this late day, I am not likely to swerve.

(September 1865) IS IT LAWFUL FOR UNBELIEVERS TO BE PRESENT AT THE BREAKING OF BREAD?—In a letter to bro. S. G. Hayes, dated July 10, 1865, Dr. Thomas has the following in answer to the question propounded above, which it appears is a practical difficulty with some who are anxious to walk in the perfect way:—“You know what our practice is in New York City. We assemble every first day of the week to break bread. Very few, if any, of the outside barbarians attend the meetings. Not because we should not be glad to see them on the occasion, but because they do not take sufficient interest in the memorialization of a redemption they fail to appreciate. When any strangers drop in we take it as an indication that an interest is arising in their minds which we are glad to see, and would be careful to do

nothing in word or deed to discourage. At the close of a discourse to an audience of many or few, we sometimes say, "The assembly is dismissed and the brethren will proceed to break bread; but if any not of the body please to remain, their presence will be no burden nor embarrassment." A few sometimes remain, while the multitude walk away according to their will. And this custom we approve as reasonable, and not opposed to sound doctrine. In the apostolic ecclesias, "prophecying" occupied the place of "speaking to men (*who believe* 1 Cor.14:22.) to edification, exhortation and comfort," when, as an ecclesia, they were assembled together for worship, of which breaking bread was an important part (ver. 23). Into these meetings idolators called "unbelievers," and others called "unlearned" came. They witnessed their proceedings, and were liable to come to conclusions according to what, as spectators, they observed. If all the divinely gifted spoke with tongues, that the unbelievers and unlearned did not understand, although the things spoken might be "the deep things of the spirit," they would conclude that the spiritually gifted were mad; but if all the prophets of the ecclesia spoke to edification, exhortation and comfort, in a language understood by unbelieving visitors or by members unlearned in tongues beside their own, they would be convinced, searched out, and thus are the secrets of their hearts made manifest, and thus falling upon the face, they will do homage to the Deity, reporting that the Deity is among you. 1 Cor.11:26, was not a secret meeting performance. The word *wat angelete* shows this. This signifies to announce, make proclamation, to set forth, teach, inculcate, preach. "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye openly publish, (or make proclamation of) the Lord's death until he come." To whom is the proclamation made? To the unbelievers, to the unlearned who may be present, and to the faithful by way of remembrance; inculcating in this way the redemption purchased for sinners by death and resurrection of the Lord. The ecclesia is the pillar and support of the truth, whose mission is in divers ways to "make known the manifold wisdom of the Deity" to all to whom it can find access, "being instant in season and out of season" which implies, that instruction to unbelievers by *precept* or example is at all times in place. "In understanding be men." "What concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath a believer with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of the Deity with idols?" Manifestly none, "therefore come out from among them," Belial, infidels, and idolators; and be ye separate and touch not the unclean." And this we do, when in obeying the truth, we purify our souls, or "cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord." We begin to do this when we become sons and daughters of the Father by adoption through Jesus. As the adopted in hope of the redemption of the body, we *come out from among* the Gentiles and constitute a *separate* people for his name. We decline to touch the unclean, as do the fornicators and adulterers of the world; nor in any of our enterprises will we be "unequally yoked with unbelievers." When we break bread in the presence of these, we are in no spiritual sense touching the unclean, or yoked with them. If we join in their superstitions, we yoke ourselves to them and become defiled by them; but if they appear in our presence to observe our proceedings, this is their act not ours; and we incur no responsibility on their account."

(Excerpt from April 1866) NEW SOUTH WALES.—W. Rooke, of Sydney, New South Wales, now a brother in Christ, communicates some interesting particulars as to his case. He states that he and his wife have been religious professors for nearly twenty years—first among the congregationalists, then among the Baptists, and finally among the Campbellites, who accepted him on the basis of his Baptist immersion. While among the last, he met in with *Elpis Israel* and *Twelve Lectures, &c*, by means of which he was induced to abandon his previous convictions and accept the truth as elaborated in 'the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.' On attaining to his change of mind, he was reimmersed, but continued among the Campbellites, doing all he could to communicate his newly-acquired convictions to them. This labour of love he persevered in until his former co-religionists would no longer endure it. They passed a resolution forbidding any one to preach any other gospel than that which Campbell had preached unto them, upon which bro: Rooke left them.

(Excerpt from August 1866) HALIFAX. THE TRUTH PROCLAIMED FROM THE PULPIT.—Brother F. R. Shuttleworth, of this place, writing on the 2<sup>nd</sup> ult., gives an account of a somewhat unusual incident in relation to the proclamation of the truth. He received an invitation from the minister of a Unitarian



chapel, in Rawtenstall, Lancashire, to deliver two discourses to the people there assembling, and thinking it an opportunity not to be despised, though a trifle marred by its connection with Unitarianism (a thing as much to be detested, from a scriptural point of view, as any form of popular superstition,) he accepted the invitation, and arranged for Sunday, the 24<sup>th</sup> of June, fixing for his subject “The Gospel as comprehensively unfolded in the writings of Moses, the prophets, and the apostles.” The congregation in the morning numbered about 100, and in the afternoon 140. When Brother Shuttleworth was about to ascend the pulpit in the morning, the minister observed he was taking his own Bible in his hand. To this he put in a mild objection, reminding him of the big and more professional-looking volume on the pulpit cushion. Brother Shuttleworth said he should prefer his own Bible, as he could refer to it more conveniently in the citation of testimony. The minister hoped he was not going to quote passages. Brother Shuttleworth said he intended to do so. Upon this, the minister adjured him to content himself with “the text,” assuring him that if he began referring to different parts of the Bible, the congregation would be “as 409arasse as owt.” Brother Shuttleworth took no notice of this eminently characteristic piece of clerical advice, but went upstairs and imitated the apostolic practice of “persuading the people out of the Law of Moses, and out of the prophets”

(November 1867) GALASHIELS AND INNERLEITHEN (Scotland).—Brother Dew, writing Sep. 22, says: “Things are very dull with us here now, in this cloudy and dark day; none of the world will come near us. The Galashiels brethren have given up their place of meeting; they think they are justified in doing so because none of the world ever came near them; and for my own part I do not see the utility of spending money in keeping up a place where nobody will come. The money thus spent might be put to more advantage. There are more ways than one of letting our light shine and bearing our testimony to the truth. We profess to be soldiers of Jesus Christ, but we only prove ourselves to be sinecures if we do not find employment in some share of the work. None of us here I believe are qualified to stand up in public to proclaim the truth. But then an army is not all composed of captains and generals; if we as *privates* endure hardness as good soldiers of King Jesus, nothing more is required of us; for he is not an austere, hard task-master, commanding us to make bricks without straw. He that is faithful in little will be promoted to higher honours, when the Captain of our army comes to inspect his troops. Ah, I fear it will fare ill with the fearful, the timid, the faint-hearted, who did not add to their faith courage to face the enemy.”

(Excerpt from March 1868) WISHAW (Scotland).—Bro. R. Hodgson, writing Feb. 12, says:—I write to inform you that the Methodist clergyman of Wishaw is engaged in delivering a course of lectures against us. At the close of his second lecture, he intimated that he would answer any questions the following Sunday that might be sent to him in writing by Wednesday. We took advantage of this and sent him upwards of twenty, and these have occupied him for two nights. In all his lectures he has made very free use of your name and your writings, of course doing his best to make both very contemptible. I think he has fairly laid himself open to a challenge to the platform, and I have been revolving the matter in my mind for a week or ten days, as to the best method of coming at him to take the wind out of his sails. At first I thought of writing to him as a friend of yours, to say I had no doubt you would be willing to meet him in public, in defence of what you had written and to show cause why it should not be condemned. Fearing that my interference might afford a pretext for declining to meet you, I have concluded at last to inform you of the matter, and ask you either to send him direct a formal challenge for discussion or authorise me to do so should you think that preferable.

(Excerpt from April 1868) GRANTOWN (Scotland).—Bro. Robertson writing from Turriff on the 19<sup>th</sup> ultimo, reports a lecturing visit to Grantown. He says free use of the Town Hall was granted by the factor’s clerk. Bills were issued, announcing a course of lectures on the revealed purposes of God in relation to the earth; but on the very day the lectures ought to have commenced, the factor himself

withdrew the liberty granted by his clerk; and there being no other public place available, the brethren were obliged to make the best shift they could.

(April 1868) WISHAW.—Brother Hodgson has received no answer to his letter, in which he conveyed to the “rev.” Mr. Harrison the Editor’s challenge to debate. He heard the letter was ignored on the score of its impertinence. To take away all such plea for refusal, the Editor transmitted a direct communication, couched in the language of perfect courtesy and respect, but this has been equally unsuccessful in evoking a response. The brethren have published the following paragraph in the local paper: “The Rev. Mr. Harrison, P.M. minister of Wishaw, has delivered a course of lectures in his own chapel, on the separate state and immortality of the soul. He has come forward as the champion of orthodoxy, to expose and refute ‘certain errors and errorists’ in Britain and America, who maintain that the revealed purposes of God have been obliterated by the philosophy and deceit incorporated in said orthodoxy. In his lectures, Mr. Harrison principally directed his attacks against ‘a writer of the name of Roberts of Birmingham,’ and ‘a Dr. Thomas of America.’ The former gentleman has since challenged him to a public discussion in defence of what he has written, but Mr. Harrison declines to meet him. Thus, like the cowardly guerilla in his attacks, he seeks the security of the bush, rather than a fair encounter in the open field. How are the mighty fallen!”

(May 1868) OLDBURY (near BIRMINGHAM.)—A Methodist local preacher, by name T. Watton, having become convinced of the truth, writes to ask what course he ought to take. He has been preaching the truth instead of Methodism, and was, in a few days from writing, to be brought before the district authorities to answer for it. He says there are others in the congregation besides himself who have embraced the truth, and are determined not to flinch from it. The question was, should they come out at once or stay to be excommunicated. The latter course was recommended, as likely to afford them the best opportunity of raising an agitation in the congregation in favour of the truth, and giving them an opportunity of defending it before the Sanhedrim.

(June 1868) OLDBURY (near Birmingham). — Mr. Watton, the local preacher referred to last month, has sent in his resignation, and the consequence has been the division of the small Methodist body with whom he was connected into two bodies, the Methodist section withdrawing and those who sympathize with Mr. Watton, remaining in possession of the preaching room, which will henceforth be a Christadelphian synagogue. Our readers will probably hear more of them anon.

(Excerpt from August 1869) BISHOP’S CASTLE.—The truth is bearing fruit in this place. The Methodists have disgraced themselves. Mr. George Owen, the Methodist local preacher, who wrote a month or two ago, concerning his growing convictions in the truth, at last reached the point of deciding to send in his resignation to the quarterly meeting of his co-religionists. He accordingly wrote it out in proper form, but the quarterly meeting refused to receive it. Why? Because they wished to retain Mr. Owen in spite of his heresies? No; but because as they could not keep him, they would not submit to be in the position of being deserted by him on a charge that they belonged to the apostasy—which was the actual situation—but preferred the mean retaliation of expulsion, by which, of course, they were placed on the high stool of ecclesiastical dignity, and Mr. Owen degraded to the level of a worthless fellow, whom they were presumably glad to get rid of. This proceeding may gratify the vindictiveness of the little lords of Methodism in the district, but it stamps them with contempt in the estimation of all honourable minds. Honesty demanded their recognition of the resignation and the reasons; but this was not convenient, so the demands of honesty were ignored, and a bull of excommunication “piously” fulminated against the devoted head of the apostate. They advised him to “read the Bible only.” Why this new zeal for the law and testimony? Would they prohibit Watts’s Institutes and John Wesley’s Sermons? If so, they are unlike all other Wesleyans, and destroy their own traditions and practices. If not, why not admit the reading of Christadelphian writings, against which their advice is a blow askance? Are we not

to “prove all things, and hold fast that which is good?” This is what Mr. Owen has done, and they don’t like the result. Therefore, although Mr. Owen had severed his connection with them, they could not bear the sight of him disappearing through the door of his own free will, so they sent the secretary of their little Sanhedrim to kick him into the street. And they did this with canting piety too—just like almost all Methodists. They instructed the secretary to say, hypocritically, that “they felt it to be a most painful act,” and that “they would not cease to pray for him, and should most gladly receive him back when he should give up those false doctrines, which were doctrines of men—yea, worse.”

(August 1869) SAFFRON WALDEN.—Bro. King reports as follows, on the incident mentioned last month:—“Some few weeks since, the Superintendent of the Primitives in the Saffron Walden circuit, called on me with a deed for me to sign, dissolving my connection with them as trustee. While I was with them some years ago, I was elected with others as trustee of their place of worship in the town, but having left them, or rather being expelled from them for embracing what they considered erroneous views, I have taken no interest in their place; and it seems they thought it would be better to get rid of me altogether, so the deed referred to was for me to sign myself out of office. They have been building a new chapel on the site of the old building, and requiring additional trustees, they took this opportunity to deal with me. It was just what I had wished could be done. After I had signed the deed, he asked what I would give them for letting me off from all responsibility in the matter, as there was a debt upon it. I said, that question was too late, for I had signed the deed and the thing was done. He admitted I had the advantage of him. I remarked that perhaps it was the best course that could be adopted. He said it was so, in view of our difference of belief. I said ‘Perhaps you do not know what I do believe.’ ‘Well,’ said he, ‘you are a Christadelphian, are you not?’ ‘Yes.’ Then ensued a conversation upon some points of doctrine. My visitor concluded by saying that he thought any further arguments would be waste of time, as there was no chance of either of us converting the other. He said, ‘you have been two or three sorts before.’ ‘Yes,’ said I, ‘when I left the Church of England, some said ‘he’ll come back again before long,’ but they were extremely wide of the mark, for every subsequent step has taken me farther from it.’ In about three weeks after this conversation, I saw a bill announcing a Bazaar to be held in the Agricultural Hall, for the benefit of their new chapel, and that a lecture would be delivered in the evening on the ‘*Immortality of the Soul*.’ I cannot describe the sensation that came over me better than in the words of Elijah, when he said, ‘I have been very jealous for the Lord God of Hosts,’ &c. I at once wrote to brother Handley, and afterwards to brother Andrew, which resulted in the visit of brother Andrew and brother Boshier on the 3<sup>rd</sup>, to deliver a lecture in the same hall. As the people came out, I gave away a quantity of No. 3 *Tracts and Thoughts for Thinkers*, some of which were rent up before my face and scattered about the floor. One man said, ‘Well, Mr. King, you are a Briton, but you are in error.’”

(August 1869) TARBOLTON (Scotland).—The TRUTH TURNED OUT OF OFFICE.—Brother A. C. Gillespie, master of Annbank Colliery School, writes (June 26, ) as follows:—“I have been under the necessity of resigning my situation here, and leaving it in a few months. I had a message conveyed to me from my employers, spurred on by the clerical Satan here, to the following effect: ‘It being notorious in this parish, that you are and have been for a considerable time past, disseminating heretical opinions, teaching among other things, that man has no inherent immortality; and that you have been distributing certain obnoxious tracts (*Thoughts for Thinkers*, &c.)—none of which things can be tolerated any longer; we wish to know whether you will return to the bosom of the church, or—’ [ellipsis, which I am left to fill up]. The message was a verbal one, and a significant movement of the head filled up the ellipsis at the end, which being interpreted, was ‘resign.’ I fancied I heard a voice whispering in my ear, ‘Who is on the Lord’s side? Choose you this day whom ye will serve.’ My inward response was ‘The Lord our God will I serve, and His voice will I obey, and reject the strange gods.’ Take this as a *practical* proof of the *theoretical* ‘religious liberty of the nineteenth century.’”

(Excerpt from November 1869 in places) BIRMINGHAM.—A painful case of withdrawal has occurred during the month, viz., that of FRANCIS AUGUSTUS CHATWIN, a promising youth of 16 (of clerical family connection), who had made himself valuable in the Sunday School and Young Men’s Class, and whose future was regarded with expectation. The painfulness of the case is aggravated by the cause of it. If he had gone back to orthodox circles from a conviction that the Christadelphians were wrong, the admiration of his consistency would have mitigated the disappointment of losing him, but he has gone back without professing such a conviction. He is a prey to family pressure, clerical influence, and professional interest: the power of which on so young a man is not a surprise. “Learned” relations pressed him, and have muddled his mind; companions laughed at him, and have stung him; and professional prospects—he is following the law—frowned, and have frightened him. The combined effect has been to turn him upside down, and resolve him to risk all on a venture. He has gone without being able to say that he thinks the clergy right and Christadelphians wrong. He first alleged as a reason for resignation that he had found there were doctrines in the Bible that were rejected by the Christadelphians. Called upon in conversation to point them out, he cited the well-known “orthodox” passages in support of immortal-soulism and the Trinity. These were explained to his entire professed satisfaction, while testimonies were submitted to him on the other side which he could not explain in harmony with clerical doctrines. On this, he withdrew his resignation, and made a new start, promising that he would not come to an adverse conclusion without first giving the brethren an opportunity of removing difficulties. Five days after this, he again sent his resignation, insisting on its being received at once, and refusing to see anybody or to have any correspondence on the subject. Bent, then, upon protecting the truth, as a straying sheep could no longer be reclaimed, the Editor, by the exercise of some determination, obtained an interview. The foolish young man said he distrusted his own judgment in such matters, and that his not being able to answer the arguments for the truth, was no evidence that they were sound arguments, but a mere indication of his inexperience. He preferred relying on the experience of those who had studied such matters for a lifetime. The Editor here renewed a previous proposal to which brother Chatwin had assented, viz., to converse with any or all of his clerical relations in his presence, or with any person he might select as, presumably, capable of defending clerical orthodoxy. To this, he now gave a prompt refusal, adding that none of them would consent to meet the Editor. The Editor in vain pointed to the absurdity of being guided by them under such circumstances, and finally obtained his signature to a paper worded as follows, being compiled from brother Chatwin’s letters and statements: “In leaving the Christadelphians, I, Francis Augustus Chatwin, hereby acknowledge that I do not do so because of any conviction on my part that they are wrong. I am not prepared to allege that they teach error; still less am I able to prove it. I leave simply and purely because my nearest relations advise me to do so, and because I think it strange that God should have kept millions of honest people in the dark. If the Christadelphians are right, I cannot help it. If they are, I hope Christ will have mercy upon me. I refuse to have any conversation with any of them on the subject, and I decline any further correspondence.—F. AUGUSTUS CHATWIN.”

(follow up on Brother Chatwin from above) requests us to state, in reference to our remarks on his withdrawal in the November number, that though “companions laughed,” their laughing never “stung” him: and that though “professional prospects frowned,” the “frowning had no effect in “frightening him.” His withdrawal, he alleges, had nothing to do with the laughing of companions or the threatening aspect of professional prospects

(Below is an excerpt from April 1869)

#### THE DISCUSSION

This came off in due course. It was hard to bring on in the first instance. Mr. Campbell’s meeting with brother Andrew in London, cooled the “rev.” gentleman’s ardour, and a report from Birmingham, that a

discussion would be a costly affair; and that the Nightingale discussion only paid expenses, finally extinguished it. He wrote to the Editor in somewhat indefinite terms, to say that his Society, though zealous in the work of putting down error, could not afford to lose money, and that consequently he must relinquish a meeting that he had eagerly looked forward to. The Editor rejoined that there would be no loss; that Mr. Campbell had better speak definitely; that his “eagerness” seemed to have had reference to financial results, rather than the performance of a good work which was scarcely compatible with his profession. To this, Mr. Campbell made no response. A week passed, and the friends of the truth (professed and enquiring) manifesting anxiety for the discussion to take place, the Editor wrote again to say that if the fear of loss was the only obstacle the Christadelphians of Birmingham would remove it, by undertaking to bear any that might arise; and that if he failed to return an answer within a week, a statement would be published both in Birmingham and London, illustrative of his own courage and consistency, and the zeal of his society. This brought an instant rejoinder, reopening arrangements for the discussion. A tedious correspondence followed. Mr. Campbell placed every obstacle in the way, and the Editor had to concede every point—to the very wording of the subjects—on pain of Mr. Campbell throwing up his challenge.

(Excerpt from January 1870) MUMBLES. — “During the last month, we have been made the subjects of imposture. A man giving the name of Adams, professing to hail from Perth, Scotland, visited us and received our hospitality for three days and two nights, on the representation that he was a brother. The ecclesia decided to give him £1, but it was arranged that the money should be paid through brother Randles, of Swansea, on whom he was to call on his way to Glasgow as he represented. Meanwhile, bro. Randles wrote to London, where Adams said he had been, and found he was a downright impostor, and of course retained the money. The affair has caused a great deal of uneasiness. We wish now publicly to state that for the future, we shall not receive any stranger as a brother unless he is able to produce satisfactory credentials.”

(March 1870) LICHFIELD.—Sister Fraser has not had long to wait the issue of the doubtful experiment she entered upon some months ago. She has been informed that her Christadelphian views are incompatible with the position she holds as the head of St. Chad’s School, and that she must give way to a successor at the end of the quarter. The Rector says: “She does her work thoroughly and most effectually, and it is with very great regret that I part with her. Her character and conduct are irreproachable, and it is only on grounds, involving what appears to me, important religious differences between us, that the separation has taken place.”

Her difficulty is illustrated in the following specimen of replies to applications for other situations:—“I am sorry to inform you that you have failed to get the school at —. The committee read and admired your testimonials; but the fact of your not being a member of the Church of England caused you to be refused.”

(January 1870) FAZELEY.—The truth is here attracting more and more attention, through the arrangements of sister Wood. On Wednesday, Dec. 15<sup>th</sup>, the Editor at her request, lectured on “the doctrine of immortality taught by Christ.” The room occupied was the same as on the former occasion, viz., a large room behind a public-house. The audience was again a large one, and would have been peaceable and attentive, but for the interruptions of a certain Methodist parson, who was overflowing with “the zeal of God—not according to knowledge” characteristic of that class of religionists. This gentleman was bursting with hostility: he was irrepressible to a ludicrous degree. He declared he could not stand it, and bobbed up at every second sentence or so, with either a query or a small speech to the people, or a solemn anathema delivered at the lecturer with studied attitude and intonation intended to be very tragic and killing. It was repeatedly pointed out to him that there was no need for him to subject himself to the cruel infliction of listening to the lecture; he had an effectual remedy in the door, which, having relieved his conscience, he could with all the more satisfaction avail himself of. The appeal was of no avail. He

kept his place, though urged by many of the audience to leave; and the Editor had to persevere through a storm of interruptions, hoping in the intervals of calm to lodge something in good and honest hearts, that would make an impression. The meeting was more or less in an uproar from the commencement to the close. Several times the Editor had to desist, and allow the storm to exhaust itself before attempting to proceed further. After keeping up the battle for two hours, the Editor took informal leave of the meeting, and the orthodox party were proceeding to arrange a meeting of their own, when sister Wood gave them notice that in five minutes the gas would be turned off. The result was a speedy clearance, to the great chagrin of the adversary, who had hoped to turn the occasion into a victory of clamour over argument. The result of the meeting as a whole was to create sympathy for the truth. The audience saw that it had not had a fair hearing, and inferred that the promoters of the disturbance were afraid of the consequences of letting it have one. When the audience had turned into the street, the parson harangued such of them as remained for a few minutes; and then indulged in long prayer, after the manner of the Methodized heathen. The Editor's company happening to pass the crowd on their way to the train, the benighted creature directed the shafts of his devotion at the Editor's head. On the following Sunday, brother Hipwell (who in the days of his ignorance often "preached" in Fazeley), obtained a good hearing on the subject of "Life and Death." Several intelligent persons are interested. Sister Wood is likely to see the result of her efforts.

(Excerpt from March 1870) MANCHESTER.—On the following Wednesday evening, we met at the room for the purpose of answering questions and objections. The room was filled, all seats being occupied. Our meeting was rather noisy. We had difficulty in keeping some restless spirits under control. Much confusion arose from several attempting to speak at once, which showed us the necessity of establishing rules for the guidance of the meeting. On the following Sunday evening, I spoke on the "Unknown God." The room was full; the number probably 120. The people were attentive all the time; and were quiet and orderly. The next Wednesday evening the room was crowded, a number having to stand. We had drawn up a few rules and read them before permitting any question; and appointed a chairman to see them adhered to. By this means, we were able to keep better order, and the questions were asked and answered much more satisfactorily than before. We had one or two turbulent spirits in the meeting who kept the chairman busy towards the close. On the whole, the meeting was satisfactory. On Sunday evening, the 30<sup>th</sup> January, the audience was not so large, numbering from 40 to 50. They listened very attentively to an address from brother John Birkenhead on the kingdom. On Wednesday evening, February 2<sup>nd</sup>, the room was again filled. We got rid of some unreasoning fellows by confining them to the rules. After going out, a number of them did what they could to annoy us from the outside, by knocking at the windows and throwing mud at them, and making other loud noises. As we paid no heed to these manifestations, the rabble outside dispersed, and the meeting proceeded without further interruption of any moment, finishing about ten o'clock. The Christadelphians seem to be the subject of talk for the whole neighbourhood."

(April 1870) MANCHESTER.—(Sale.) The truth encounters opposition at the hands of a fiery gentleman of religious propensities, resident at Sale, who having much temper and nothing to do, lets off his surplus energy in attacks on the truth as venomous as human malignity could well make them. His name is Wood. We have before exhibited him as an illustration of the devil belligerent. As a specimen of the squibs with which he amuses the public, we append the following:

#### POISON FOR NOTHING.

#### WHAT IS CHRISTADELPHIANISM

*Ans.*—It is an American compound originally prepared by Jno. Thomas, M.D., of New York.

*What are its peculiar properties?*

*Ans.*—They are numerous, but I can only mention the following: It is very efficacious in transforming man into a beast.

*Have you any idea of what the compound consists?*

Mr. W. Wood, of Sale, who have analyzed it carefully, gives us the following result of his experiments: take twenty-five parts of consummate ignorance, fifteen parts of mutilated texts of Scripture, fifteen parts of the most contemptible sophistry, ten parts of the purest infidelity, ten parts of downright Atheism, twenty-five parts of distilled impudence.

*Stire them well together and make the mixture.*

Dose for an adult,—one large spoonful every Wednesday and Sunday evening, to be taken with the eyes closed and the mouth wide open.

Sold wholesale and retail by Messrs, W. and J. Birkenhead, Sale; and may be obtained at the Christadelphian Meeting Room for nothing.

*Price One Halfpenny; sold by Mr. Brookes, Northern Road; Mr. Walters, near the Bridge, and Mr. Wood, flour dealer, Ashton Road.*

Mr. Wood, it appears, had engaged the large room of the Sale Institute for “a religious meeting;” but on the placard appearing, the object was set forth as the delivery of a lecture by “W. Wood, Esq., of Sale,” “On the unscriptural, Atheistical, and absurd theory of the Christadelphians.” Admission twopence! Upon this, for some reason or other, the proprietors of the place withdrew their permission to use the hall, and Mr. Wood had to take refuge under the wing of “the Rev. J. J. Cort,” who gave him the use of “St. Ann’s schoolroom.” Here, he also charged twopence, but offered the inducement of a copy of his lecture, to be presented at the close of the meeting. He says of the *Lectures*, “A more worthless, more senseless, more wicked, more unscriptural, and more abominable book was never printed in the English language! The sooner it is burnt the better.” Mr. Wood reports (for he favors us with voluminous and highly-spiced attentions through the post) that “the audience was respectable and attentive.” He says nothing about the size of it. We thank him for his untiring and hotspur antagonism. He will help to bring the truth into notoriety. The best thing a man can do if he won’t accept the truth, is to oppose it with all his heart.

(April 1870) SPRINGFIELD, Ohio.—Brother W. H. Reeve, under date Feb. 1, says: “I have just read letters from Jeffersonville from sister Sallie Bottorffe and brother Nicholson, in which they say that the ecclesia in Jeffersonville are not implicated in the letter from Osh Kosh, published in the *Marturion* from R. D. Logan, and that that brother sent the letter as a private letter with the request that it should not be published, and that since receiving the January number, he regrets that he ever wrote the said letter. I have no fear but they will escape the net of the adversary. The *Marturion* needs the strictures of an able pen. It is evident that some of its correspondents are not, and never were Christadelphians, but are the enemies of Dr. Thomas and his brethren. Note the Scottish correspondent querying as to the nature of the elements of resurrection and aionian judgment and drawing comfort from the pages of the *Marturion* while ignoring the lucid writings of brother Thomas. Oh, shame! Every babe in these days of increased knowledge of the principles of the Deity, knows the doctrine of resurrection and judgment.”

(May 1870) SWANSEA.—The challenge sent to the Rev. J. Kenner has resulted according to anticipation. He declines to vindicate in public controversy the position he took in his recent pulpit assault

on the truth, and his refusal is accompanied by the variety and lameness of excuse which indicates conscious difficulty in the work of extricating himself from an awkward position. By way of making the most of the incident for the truth's sake, the brethren issued placards announcing a meeting for Wednesday, April 6, in their own meeting room, at which one of themselves would review the Rev. gentleman's sermon, and show that the eternal torment of clerical preaching was not the eternal punishment of the Scriptures, but the mere offspring of the Pagan-Christian notion of native immortality. The result was a crowded audience, many being unable to obtain admission. Bro. Bennett did duty on the occasion, and is reported to have done it very effectively. At the close of the meeting, the correspondence which passed between the brethren and the "Rev." assailant, was read and commented upon. On the following Thursday a meeting was held, to allow of questions being put by opponents. There was a fair attendance, and a successful meeting. As we go to press, the work is being followed up by a course of lectures by the Editor. So far, the attendance has been good. The meetings are being held in the brethren's meeting house, which is capable of seating 120 persons, and as there is none of the disturbance which is liable to beset more public meeting, the object of the lectures is doubtless more effectually attained.

(July 1870) BEITH.—Brother J. O'Neil, of Glasgow, forwards some clippings from *The Ayrshire Weekly News*, having relation to Doctor Thomas's recent visit to Beith. The Beith correspondent of the paper alluded to, it appears, had stated in his notice of the Dr.'s lectures, that the Dr. had "advised his audience to go on in their sins, with the assurance that they would not surely die." Brother O'Neil wrote the Editor, in contradiction of this slander, and demanded a retraction on the part of the correspondent. The Editor published the letter in condensed form, but the correspondent took no notice. Brother O'Neil again wrote, quoting from the *Christadelphian*, in illustration of the character of the Dr.'s Beith lectures, as opposed to the character imputed to them by the correspondent. The correspondent then rejoined in a strain of satirical banter, carefully evading the point at issue, and riding off with flying colours on collateral matters, which were not in question. Brother O'Neil replied in a lengthy letter, which the Editor was fair enough to insert. There the matter has ended. Brother O'Neil would have been pleased no doubt, if the glib newspaper scornor had recalled his libellous words; but this is expecting too much. The devil does not own his faults. It is a great deal when an Editor allows an opportunity of exposing them. With this the brother in question ought to rest content, remembering that in this he has fared better than most.

(Excerpt from August 1870) DEVONPORT.— CAUTION!— Writing July 16<sup>th</sup>, brother Moore wishes the brethren to know that a certain person, short and slender, about 40, calling himself Webster, now on a begging excursion, representing himself as a Christadelphian known to the Devonport brethren, is not known there, and is, in their judgment, an impostor.

(Below is from October 1870)

"SOMETHING BETTER TO DO"

*To the Editor of the "Christadelphian."*

DEAR SIR.—In the July number of a periodical called "*The Earthen Vessel*," there was a criticism by the editor on certain "destructive errors." To this I replied, and said that Mr. James Wells, of the Surrey Tabernacle, had been challenged (by me) to meet you in a discussion on "The Kingdom of God;" and that what he (Mr. Banks) called heresy, I, for one, believed to be a glorious truth. I asked for my letter to be made public, instead of which, the following paragraph was inserted on the wrapper.—

"*Challenge.*"—Mr. Thomas Creswick Nichols cannot expect our bro. W—to hold public discussions: Mr. Nichols must know, a minister of Christ's gospel has something better to do than to stoop down, in order that some "New Faith" might ride into notoriety. Neither



can Mr. Nichols seriously wish us to open our pages for a controversy upon what he calls the "Pagan Myth." Sincerely we entreat Mr. Nichols not to Lend himself to any visionary or deluded speculation.

This is different to Mr. Banks' review of your pamphlet on "The Kingdom of God," which said, "Mr. Roberts must 'really be a clever man,'" and, "We should like to see his other works." It is also very unfair; as I challenged Mr. Wells to meet you on a subject deemed important to the whole world. *If* Mr. Wells is a preacher of *Christ's* gospel, what fear should be felt of a "New Faith" riding into obscurity? None at all. I did not ask the *Vessel* editor to open his pages for a discussion at all; but simply to insert my letter as a reply to his beating up volunteers to dispel "clouds of profession, *as empty as chaff.*" He further said, "Who will help us 'to cry aloud, and spare not, in these days of delusion?'" If such his desire, surely a "minister of Christ's gospel" *has* something else to do—when his courage does not fail him; or his "ministerial dignity" does not prevent him.—Faithfully yours,—THOMAS C. NICHOLS, August, 1870.

P.S.—The following is an extract from a letter received from Mr. Banks, April 6<sup>th</sup>, 1870:—"I thank you for Mr. Roberts' book. I heartily believe in much he has said in that lecture. *I shall be glad to hear Mr. Wells would meet him;* but that will never be. I could not answer Mr. Roberts." This is quite different to his *present* statement.

(Below is from October 1870)

"THE CHRISTIANITY TAUGHT BY THE APOSTLES.

*Washington, July 10, 1870.*

Rev. Dr. John Thomas, of England, to-day delivered at Odeon Hall a rather novel sermon (!) on the subject of the Christianity taught by the apostles. He took as the groundwork of his remarks the 7<sup>th</sup> chapter of Daniel, which gives the dream of the prophet in the first year of Belshazzar, King of Babylon. The speaker set out by stating that there was nothing in the Old Testament that had not the endorsement of the New, and nothing in the New that was not consistent with the Old; that the inspiration of the Scriptures could not be disputed when the wonderful prophecies of 2,500 years ago were so faithfully worked out. He spoke particularly of the figure of the ten horns. He said that they had reference to the ten kingdoms of Europe, and the plucking of them out had reference to the downfall of these ten kingdoms. He said that it was customary for politicians to teach that

#### REPUBLICAN INSTITUTIONS

would in the end prevail throughout the world, but that no American should humour himself with any such false belief; that republicanism, too, would fall, and there would be an universal theocratic form established for all the peoples of the earth; that there would then be no political lines, but that the whole world would be one people under one authority, and everything would be very peaceful and happy. The saints of the Most High would also come in for a share in the new government. The speaker put in a very apt side observation that it was very sure that Washington was not governed by the saints. The sermon was certainly interesting, and was very ingeniously put together. *The Christianity taught by the apostles was the ultimate ascendancy of religion and the direct government of God and Christ.*"

After the lecture, the Dr. accompanied brother Boggs to his home, where he dined; after which he retired for a while to rest. At half-past three, the Dr. met with us at the Lord's supper (our usual morning service having been postponed on account of the lecture). Brother E. J. Ward presided. He read Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. After the emblems had been partaken of, the Dr. commented in a very interesting and

edifying manner on the portion of Scriptures read. The Dr. remained in Washington until five o'clock, Thursday morning, July 14<sup>th</sup>, when he started for Richmond, Virginia. We trust that he may return by way of this city, that we may be able to see and hear him once more, before he takes his farewell tour of the United States. With love from all to all who walk according to the truth, I remain, yours, in the hope of the gospel,

JOSEPH SEACH, jun.”

(December 1870) INNERKIP: (THE ADVERSARY BELLIGERENT.)—Brother F. Malcolm writes Sep. 30<sup>th</sup>, as follows: “Since I last wrote, there has been another addition to the ecclesia here: MARTIN BISHOP, a young man, something over a year from the State of Illinois, the greater portion of which time he has been a student of the word. He has never belonged to any of the apostate sects. It is now three-and-a-half years since the truth found a foothold here, and its power has been such, that the orthodox party has become either alarmed or annoyed, and have made an effort to check the spreading heresy. To this end, two Irishmen—the one a Professor in the Literary Institute, Woodstock, the other a Presbyterian minister, of the same place—have visited the place: the Professor to speak, and the other to fill the chair.

Previous to the assault being made, there was considerable boasting by the enemy, that we were not only going to get the chance to defend ourselves, but that we were going to be whipped. The first subject was the immortality of the soul, on which the professor spoke about four hours, to a crowd of people, who had come a distance, many of them 5 or 6, and some of them 10 miles. About half-past nine, the lecture was over, and the people tired. The chairman then gave the privilege referred to above, viz., twenty minutes' defence. We did the best we could, but you will know how impossible it would be to do anything with a four hours' lecture, in twenty minutes. We stated, before sitting down, that we thought it was unfair to expect such a thing, that we would not hear or attempt to answer any more of Mr. C.'s lectures on the terms offered. Mr. C. made another short speech, and the chairman closed the meeting. But the Antichrist element was so strong that order could not be obtained to hear the blessing.

Some of the ideas advanced by Mr. C. may be gathered from the following: No such thing as annihilation. Proof: the bottles *perished*, still the skins remained. The world *perished* by the flood: it still exists. The ointment, though waste, was still upon the person of Jesus. *Hades*, not the grave, but the place of departed spirits, where both good and bad receive their reward to a certain extent. Death, not the extinction of being. If it could be proved that the death that befel Adam put him out of existence, all . But how to make it plainer than Moses and Paul had made it was the difficulty. Anyone making anything else out of these testimonies, than that man is a mortal going back to his earth, must either be dishonest or blind. Next we showed that the passages he brought up to prove eternal existence proved the contrary. The bottles were no longer bottles when reduced to skins. The ointment when put on the feet of Jesus was not available for further use. That the constitution of this wicked world, which perished at the flood, no longer existed. His explanation of *hades* was an attempt to get over difficulties, but it was like jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire. It destroyed the grand popular idea of going to Jesus at death, for Jesus was not in *hades* or hell after his resurrection. There was, therefore, no such thing as being present with the Lord when *absent from the body*. There would be no use of desiring to *depart* and be with Christ at death. Again the Bible testifies that the saints *sleep* in *hades*. That Jesus slept when there. That there is no wisdom, knowledge or device in *hades*. The testimony is that without a resurrection man is like the beasts that perish. The affair is now over, and the only effect we see is that the faith is better known, and those that hold it more notorious. Our enemies truly say we have made a laughing stock of ourselves. But we can wait the time when they who laugh shall weep, and they who mourn shall be comforted.—F. MALCOLM.

(March 1871) MELBOURNE.—Sister Eliza Ann Hare, writing on 4<sup>th</sup> of December, reports there is an extensive agitation in Melbourne in consequence of a Dr. Bromley, head of Melbourne Grammar School,

and a man of much influence, having lectured against immortal soulism. The Bishop and all the clergy opened fire upon the Dr., and the Dr. gave a second lecture in reply to them. About three thousand persons were present at the Dr's reply. He argued from the original Greek and Hebrew terms, that the doctrine of natural immortality was not taught in the Bible. A copy of *Twelve Lectures* has been sent to the learned lecturer

(June 1871) EAST ZORRA.—Three lectures were delivered here last September by Professor Crawford, of the Canadian Literary Institute, on the following subjects: "The Immortality of the Soul," "The Kingdom of Heaven," and "The Doctrine of the Trinity and the existence of Angels and Devils." They were directed against the "Soul-destroying dogmas" and "pernicious doctrine held by the Christadelphians" and were listened to by crowded audiences, who testified their approval by presenting "the talented lecturer with a purse of money," accompanied with a vote of thanks, and a request that the lectures be printed for general circulation. The newspaper from which the above facts are taken highly eulogises both the manner and matter of the lectures, which are described as completely establishing the propositions advanced, and destroying the "sophistries" of the Christadelphians. But as the notice is contained in a Baptist newspaper, and is written by a deacon, impartial and independent minds will know how to estimate it at its true value. The Brethren of Christ have nothing to fear from opposition and publicity. The truth always flourishes best when attacked. And if the brethren at East Zorra are alive to their opportunity, they will doubtless glean some fruit from this onslaught of the enemy.

(Excerpt from March 1871) NOTTINGHAM. — The following is the letter referred to in the foregoing. It is the production of a stranger:—

#### "RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN NOTTINGHAM.

TO THE EDITORS.—I have been informed of an act of persecution which, I think, reflects upon us as a community; and, therefore, I have decided to make it public through the medium of the *Express*. A young woman who served five years as pupil teacher in a suburban National School, with great credit to herself, and satisfaction to the trustees, was appointed teacher in a National School in Nottingham, where her attendance was punctual and her services devoted and faithful. She generally attended church, either in the neighbourhood of Nottingham or at the church with which the school is connected. One or two Sunday evenings, however, she went to hear a preacher in the People's Hall. I do not know to what denomination of Christians the preacher belongs, but I understand that the body of believers with which he is identified accept the Bible as an inspired volume, and receive its precepts as the rule of their lives. The circumstance that the young woman had been present at the People's Hall on more than one Sunday evening reached the ears of the clergyman, and she was forthwith requested to wait upon him, which she accordingly did. During the interview she was asked whether she had not attended service at the People's Hall, and she replied that she had. She was next asked whether she would make an apology for having attended such a place, to which she replied that she could not conscientiously make an apology, because she was not aware that she had done anything that was wrong. Will it be believed that she was there and then dismissed from the school, without even her salary being paid. These are the facts of the case, which are not in the least exaggerated. I wish to impress them upon the public mind. Here is a young woman who is a teacher in a school supported mainly out of the national taxes, turned adrift at a moment's notice, not for any inattention or misconduct on her part, but because she had attended the worship of another Christian denomination. Is England a land of religious freedom, or is the sentiment a meaningless phrase? Who would have believed that such an act of religious persecution as this would have taken place in Nottingham? I think the facts ought to be laid before Mr. Forster and his colleagues, to show them what is going on in schools partially supported by national funds.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

(May 1872) KETTERING.—The expected answer has arrived from the “Rev.” T. Rodgers, to whom it will be recollected the Editor applied for a read of his sermon, or offered three nights’ debate. The “rev.” gentleman declines to comply with either. Accordingly, the following announcement has been issued.

*To the people of Kettering.*

#### CHRIST’S DOCTRINE OF ETERNAL LIFE

On Sunday, March 10<sup>th</sup>, the “Rev.” Mr. Rodgers, of Kettering, preached a sermon in Fuller’s Baptist Chapel, in reference to Mr. Roberts’s recent Lectures. It was reported that Mr. Rodgers completely demolished Mr. Roberts’s arguments, in the presence of a crowded congregation. Mr. Roberts hearing this, wrote to Mr. Rodgers, requesting the favour of a perusal of his sermon, that he (Mr. Roberts) might either be convinced by it, or reply to it. Failing this, Mr. Roberts offered to meet Mr. Rodgers in three nights’ debate. Mr. Rodgers declined to do either; upon which Mr. Roberts takes the only course open to him, in asking those who heard Mr. Rodgers, to meet him in the Corn Exchange, Kettering, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, April 24<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, and 26<sup>th</sup>, and report to him in short speeches, the arguments made use of by Mr. Rodgers: He undertakes to answer them all, and to prove that the doctrine of eternal life in Christ alone, is the doctrine of Scripture, and that the doctrine of natural immortality is a mere and mistaken induction of Pagan philosophy which subverts the doctrine of Christ.

(May 1872) LIVERPOOL.—Brother Atkinson, writing March 20<sup>th</sup>, giving account of recent proceedings, says, “A certain Dr. Christie, who thinks all are wrong but himself, although he is doctrinally agreed with the orthodox teachers, gave several lectures in Hope Hall, upon the ‘Signs of Christ’s Coming, and the end of the World,’ ‘The two Covenants,’ ‘The Twelfth of Daniel,’ and a ‘Sketch of the Book of Revelations.’ Several of the brethren attended, and brother Millman tried to get the lecturer to answer some questions, but without much success. Dr. Christie tried to avoid the questions; but on the second evening, the audience called upon him to answer. Brother Ellis has taken up the matter, and given three lectures in reply to the Dr. The first one was announced by handbills, and also advertised in the *Liverpool Mercury*, as were the others, which has had the effect of drawing some strangers to the meeting. We wait the result, trusting that some good may arise from the seed sown. Brother Ellis’s lectures were on ‘The Signs of Christ’s Coming and the end of the World,’ ‘The Two Covenants,’ and ‘The Earth not to be Burned up.’ We have commenced a Sunday school, last Sunday being the first day.

(Excerpt from May 1872) YATTON (Iowa).—At this point, we were informed of a determination on the part of the trustees to shut up their house. They were seriously offended at the denial of the existence of their Pagan monster, who is the life of their theology. However, they allowed the next lecture—‘Hell: Is it a place of Torment?’ to proceed; attending, however, with the intention at the close of preventing us having their chapel again. Knowing this, I gave notice to the audience that the other lectures would be given in the school house. Attendance next evening was unexpectedly large. The concluding lectures were on ‘The Covenant of David,’ and ‘The (scriptural) dissolving of the Heavens and Earth.’

If the seed falls on good ground, it will germinate; but how often ‘the adversary cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts!’ The Lord will give the increase if it is His purpose. The brethren number thirteen, faithful and zealous. They are occasionally refreshed by the presence of brother George Moyer, whom I met there. He is actively engaged in breaking up new ground in that state during this winter.”

(July 1872) KIRKOSWALD. (Ayr.)—A correspondent forwards a printed circular of some interest to those who rejoice in the progress of the truth. It was issued by Mr. William Richardson, for 29 years past a class leader and local preacher among the Wesleyan Methodists in Kirkoswald circuit, but now standing disqualified and put under the ban by a vote of the quarterly meeting held at Gamblesley, on Wednesday, the 27<sup>th</sup> of December last. The circular sets forth the reason of Mr. Richardson's exclusion from Methodistic fellowship, which seems to have taken him by surprise. He says he has been excluded "for teaching what I believe to be the gospel of Christ in our Wesleyan Methodist chapels, in Kirkoswald circuit, . . . the only hope of true church of Christ, viz. the Resurrection of the dead at the return of our Lord Jesus Christ, and his personal reign on earth with all his saints.

He publishes the letter in which he is informed of the decision of the quarterly meeting. The following is the principal part of it:—"We have heard with much sorrow that you have for some time past, both privately and publicly, agitated the doctrine of Christ's personal reign on the earth, which in our opinion is not only *false*, but *injurious* to the *spiritual interests* of our members, and detrimental to our congregations; which is abundantly testified by constant complaints. Hence we find it necessary to take immediate action in the matter, and to request that for the future you will desist from preaching the same; and any refusal to do so will incapacitate you from occupying our pulpits."

After contending for the scripturalness of the doctrines condemned, and that they were believed by the founders of Methodism, Mr. Richardson concludes his paper thus: "But though the pulpits are closed against my advocating the precious truths, together with much else I hold dear, I still hope to be able to give a *scriptural*, if not a Methodistical, reason of the hopes I cherish, with meekness and fear, through the medium of the press, and in such other ways as I may have an opportunity afforded me by God's grace." We are informed that Mr. Richardson has not accepted the truth in its entirety; but the foregoing gives good ground for hope. His expulsion from Methodist pulpits will do him no harm but otherwise. Scriptural enlightenment will enable a man to see that there is no possibility of serving Christ in the communion of the orthodox denominations. His true servants have to act on the exhortation which speaketh thus: "Come out from among them and be separate."

(February 1873) CAUTION TO THE BRETHREN.—Bro. Elijah Ward, by direction of the Washington ecclesia, warns the brethren against "elder," N. T. Morgan, hailing from Winchester, Va., and claiming to be a brother. He is travelling about soliciting funds to enable him to publish a monthly periodical. He came to Washington, and the brethren questioned him with altogether unfavourable results—finding him to be a man of very limited intelligence, totally uneducated, possessing too little knowledge of the truth to entitle him even to recognition as a brother. "He showed us his prospectus," says brother Ward, "a pamphlet larger than the *Christadelphian*, and you may imagine our surprise on finding that with the exception of the cover and the title page, it was a *verbatim* copy of a part of *Elpis Israel*, commencing with the first chapter, and without a *single paragraph* of original matter from beginning to *finis*. We looked through the book for some mention of the much loved author of *Elpis Israel*, but we looked in vain; there was not even so much as a quotation mark; but we did find the name of N. J. Morgan, Winchester, Va., on the last page as the author, an outrage which can only be attributed to ignorance or rascality; or, what is more probable, a mixture of both."

(April 1873) TWICKENHAM (Middlesex).—Brother Johnstone distributed copies of the *Biblical Newspaper* (back numbers) among the clergy of this neighbourhood. The "rev." vicar, in his subsequent sermon, made the following allusion to the matter: "Within the last few days, I have received some infidel newspapers. They are craftily written to deceive the elect, and draw others from the truth. If any here have received them, I would advise them to read and *burn them*, and by no means allow them to pass into the hands of the young." Poor man! He speaks evil of the things he understands not.

(April 1873) BUCYRUS (O.)—Brother and sister Howell have removed from this place to Springfield. Writing a “farewell letter,” sister Howell says:—“The truth was carried to BUCYRUS many years ago by our brother Shanks, of Springfield, but did not find a response to the call until quite lately. Brother and sister Jordan were the first to come out of the gloom of Gentile darkness, and light is steadily but slowly shining into the hearts of a few. They at present number three brethren and five sisters, who are anxious to show to their fellow-men their dying position, and, at the same time, striving to keep “the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” I enclose a letter from one of the sisters, she being called upon to give an account of herself. It speaks for itself.”

[The “letter” referred to in sister Howell’s communication is subjoined; but first we give the ecclesiastical summons which called it forth, as follows:—

“Bucyrus, O., Nov. 8<sup>th</sup>, 1872.

Mrs. Margaret Messner,—You are hereby cited to appear before the Council of St. Paul’s Lutheran Church of Bucyrus, O., on next Monday (Nov. 11<sup>th</sup>, 1872), at seven o’clock, in the pastor’s study, to give a reason for your neglect of your obligations to this Church, and the promises you made in the presence of God and men, as well as for rejecting the doctrines of this Church, which you professed before many witnesses.—Yours respectfully, CHURCH COUNCIL.”

[REPLY.]

“Bucyrus, Nov. 11<sup>th</sup>, 1872.

TO THE COUNCIL OF THE BUCYRUS ST.

PAUL LUTHERAN CHURCH, GENTLEMEN, I decline to meet you at the Church on Monday evening, but I will give you my reason for not attending that Church—not because I feel myself under any obligation to do so after having requested the pastor to remove my name from the Church Book, but merely because of the opportunity your note affords me of condemning error and defending the truth. When I began to study the Word of God, I found the gospel was not preached in that pulpit as it was by Christ and the apostles. Paul teaches (Gal.1:8), that though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than the true one, he is accursed. John says (chap. 2:10), “If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.” As to the promises I made when I united with your Church, I was in ignorance of the truth; but when my eyes were opened, I found the blind leading the blind, and I thought I must avoid the ditch before we all fell in. I rejected the doctrine because it is unscriptural. Isaiah says (chap. 8:20): “To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” As regards my answering men for my conduct, I have thrown aside all connection with the daughter of that Great Mother spoken of in Rev. 17:5. To my own Master I stand or fall. Now that the apostacy is unveiled to me by Holy Writ, I stand entirely aloof from all their traditions. Although I have refused to meet you at your Church, if you desire to speak with me on this subject, my doors are open to you. Finally, while I may hold the gentlemen of the council in the highest respect, I have none whatever for the doctrine of their church.—MARGARET MESSNER.”

(Excerpt from February 1875) NOTTINGHAM. — The Milbourn-Sulley incident, reported two months ago, has worked to the advantage of the truth in a way not expected. The “Rev.” Mr. Clemance, (who some time ago, published a pamphlet entitled *Christadelphianism Exposed*) apparently stimulated by that

incident sought to help the enemies of the truth by getting out a fifth edition of his pamphlet, and announcing the same by placards extensively posted on the walls of Nottingham. This led to deliberation among the friends of the truth how this could best be turned to its advantage. As the result, the Editor of the *Christadelphian* wrote to Mr. Clemance offering to debate the matter with him in Nottingham for six nights. Mr. Clemance, after taking three days to think about it, sent a refusal. The way was thus open for the next stage. But, meanwhile, the Editor got ready for publication a reply to Mr. Clemance's pamphlet, which, though answered in a certain way in Nottingham some years ago, had never been met in the satisfactory manner called for.

(Excerpt from February 1875) STOCKPORT. — Up to the present time, says brother Birkenhead, the result has been most gratifying to the brethren and sisters, who notice with pleasure the earnest attention paid by a number of constant attendants. With one exception there have been present at each lecture from 30 to 80 strangers; and marked interest has been observed on each occasion. One or two have expressed themselves so much interested that they will not miss any of the lectures yet to be delivered if they can possibly be there. Another has expressed a wish to be united with the brethren, and appearances indicate that several others will enquire more deeply into the grand teaching of the Bible.

These successes have stirred up an old fire-spirit of an adversary upon whom the truth seems to produce an almost explosive effect. He has been long dormant at Sale, but the spectacle of the truth receiving attention at Stourport, has roused the old effervescence. He cannot speak of it without foaming at the mouth, so to speak. [Compiler's Note: The result is referring to the lectures previously given.]

(Excerpt from August 1875) BIRMINGHAM. — The report circulated by those who would destroy us, that people are received into fellowship without regard to their doctrines, is absolutely without foundation. The very reverse is scrupulously the fact, as anyone may ascertain by consulting any of the brethren, whether those who remained faithful at the time of the Renunciationist treachery or those who have recovered from the snare.

(October 1875) ADELINE, OGLE CO. (Ill.)—There has been transmitted to us with a request for publication, a long report of a meeting held here of friends from different parts of the States, convened for the purpose, as stated in the introduction, of harmonizing misunderstanding on the subject of the nature of Christ. We are sorry to be compelled to decline the request to publish, yet clear, and unhesitating, and final as to our decision. One or two of the lesser speeches are reasonable and scriptural; but as a whole, the addresses delivered on the occasion are such as would only tend to increase disputation and bewilderment, and such as every enlightened and competent judge of the matter must repudiate and oppose. We all believe Jesus to have been "the only begotten Son of God," and the manifestation of the Father's wisdom and power; and, therefore, no "mere man." But when we are asked to sanction the proposition that in the days of his flesh, he was "one in substance" with the incorruptible and deathless Being who has created the universe, we are asked to go against the most obvious facts of the case, and the express testimony of the word. This we cannot do or consent to. On the contrary, we must dissent emphatically, and oppose decidedly a new doctrine which leads in the direction of the "immaculate" heresies of the early centuries, whether those who promote it are capable of discerning the fact or not. Their argument is illogical. God has created all things by His Spirit; that is, He has formed them out of it, and they are in the Spirit, and have the Spirit as their substratum; but all things are not in their proximate nature spiritual on that account. Their nature depends upon the will of the Creator absolutely. Therefore the participation of the Spirit in the begetting of Christ does not prove him of "divine substance," but only a divine work for a divine end—a spirit form, pattern, or character in the flesh, yet the flesh, not spirit flesh, but the flesh common to the Adamic stock. It was afterwards (at the anointing) enswathed with the Spirit, and at the resurrection changed to "divine substance." Our friends seem to think the substitution of "begetting" for "creation" makes a difference to the argument. If it does, it makes a difference quite in the

contrary direction to their ideas; for to create is to form (not “out of nothing,” as the orthodox have it, but out of the spirit direct); whereas to “beget” is, in this case, to operate through a corruptible flesh medium. Surely, if “divine substance” is necessarily the result in either case, it would be in the former not in the latter. Finally, it is a bootless controversy altogether. No man can comprehend abstractions and essences. It was jangling on such points that ate out the soul and marrow of the gospel after Paul’s decease. Councils met to discuss and settle things then, at Nice, Ephesus and other places, as a few brethren have now met at Adeline, but they did not help the truth but contrariwise. Having imperial power on their side, they were able to make their decisions effective for the establishment of barren theories, and the suppression of the word in its simplicity. But the times are changed. We want the glorious facts of the gospel preached by the apostles. The apostles discoursed not on “begettal” and “creation” or of the precise proportion of divinity in the bones and flesh that were entombed in Joseph’s grave. They presented facts concerning Christ such as the simplest mind can receive, and invited men to rejoice in the great prospects opened before them through this man. Those who speak otherwise speak not as the oracles of God. They darken counsel by words without knowledge. They practically hide the glorious gospel of the blessed God; and “the time” that has “come,” of which they speak, is a time to oppose barren definitions; and to insist on the practical work of the gospel as carried on in the apostolic age, and illustrated in the epistles, which in the wisdom of God, they left behind, for the continuance of their sanctifying work when they themselves should be in their graves.—EDITOR. [Compiler’s Note: This really applies to both external and internal.]

(November 1875) FROME. — Brother Clarke mentions the following incident. Sister Chitty requiring the signature of a clergyman or magistrate in the town to a document connected with some government business she had in hand, determined to apply to the “Rev.” W. J. E. Bennett, the great ritualist, having a desire to see him. After admission and statement of the object, the august personage asked sister Chitty whether she attended “the church.” Reply: “No.” He then asked, “Where she went to get religious instruction?” Sister Chitty replied, that she did not attend any of the popular places, as she was a “Christadelphian.” The gentleman asked, “Who are the Christadelphians?” Answer: “Brethren of Christ.” Sister C. at the same time remarking that a Greek scholar should readily see the import of the word. This Mr. Bennett admitted by defining the word, upon which he asked, “Do you acknowledge me as God’s minister over Christ’s flock?” Sister Chitty had but one reply to this, which was far from palatable to the “Rev.” gentleman. Of course Mr. Bennett little knew how impossible it is for an intelligent believer of God’s word to acknowledge him in the character he claimed, knowing that he is of the apostacy and minister of only an *anti-Christian* flock, and who does not attest his professed apostleship as our brother Paul did in 2 Cor. 12:12. To cut the matter short the “Rev.” gentleman refused to sign the paper, and expressed surprise at her “dishonesty” in asking him to sign, not believing him to be minister over the true flock, and finally dismissed her. Brother Clarke remarks: “It is a consoling thought that soon these ‘teachers of lies’ (Jer. 16:19) ‘who wear peculiar garments to deceive’ (Zec. 13:4,) will be no more. The testimony being that in the glorious time to come ‘speakers of lies in the name of the Lord’ will be so in abomination that even their nearest relations will not hesitate to destroy them.”[Compiler’s Note: Example of what the world will do out of spite.]

(March 1877) SHERBROOKE (Que.)—The following letter appears in the *Sherbrooke Gazette*: SIR,—In your issue of last week, you have a paragraph referring to an “English sect calling themselves Christadelphians,” the orthography of which should be Christadelphians. As a member of the sect, I beg to offer a remark on that paragraph. I have not seen the challenge you refer to, but I think instead of its issuing from the sect as a body, it must have come from an individual member only. Christadelphians, however zealous, do not generally approve of staking money, or appealing to the avarice of man in throwing out a challenge after the manner of betting, which too much pervades society, but are taught to avoid all appearance of evil, even though there may be no wrong in the act itself. In regard to their being “An English sect of moralists,” I would say that this might mislead the public mind into the belief of their being authors of a code of morals distinct from the divine word. This is not the case, but, as the



etymology of the name “Christadelphian” implies, they profess to be Brethren of Christ, and as Jesus endorsed “Moses and the prophets,” so they believe all Scripture given by inspiration of God, beginning with Moses and ending with John in Revelations. As a further evidence of their not being simple moralists, but earnest believers in the Bible, there has just issued from the English press a “Report of a six nights’ debate on the authenticity of the Bible,” held in Leicester and Birmingham, between Mr. Roberts, editor of the *Christadelphian*, in the affirmative, and Mr. Bradlaugh, the leader of English atheists and editor of the *National Reformer*, in the negative. With regard to their non-belief in the dogma of the immortality of the soul, it is one of their first principles that life here, in all orders of creation, is wholly dependent on the all-pervading breath or free Spirit of Deity; and that life hereafter, usually termed “eternal life,” can only be obtained by the resurrection of man through Christ Jesus, who is the “First Begotten from the Dead.”—CHRISTADELPHIAN.

*Sherbrooke, Dec. 25<sup>th</sup>, 1876.*

(Excerpt from May 1877) RIDDINGS.—Bro. King writes of another addition to the little ecclesia, meeting at Ridings, viz., JAMES ALLEN (26), miner, formerly belonging to the United Methodist Free Church. He put on the saving name March 24<sup>th</sup>. He has had a knowledge of the truth for some time, but has been kept back from obeying it, by his parents and supposed friends, who have done all they could to try and dissuade him from the step he has taken. The matter has cost him no little anxiety of mind. His father, a good father, has been a Methodist class leader for a number of years, and it was a great trial to brother Allen to go against his wishes, the more so as his act has virtually concluded him under sin, being out of Christ. But having received the truth he could not do otherwise than obey it, which has made him free, and he can rejoice in the liberty of the children of God by faith in the anointed Jesus.

(Excerpt from May 1877) DUNEDIN.—Brother W. W. Holmes explains that the Christadelphian books admitted to the Dunedin Library, obtained access there through his unaided exertions. He mentions the immersion of a Mrs. Smith, of whom he reports interesting particulars. He says, “She was on her way six years ago to be immersed in Dunedin, when she happened to meet her husband, who is a dissipated character, and vowed he would murder her if she carried out her intention. On that occasion she went home in a fright. At last she resolved, and privately became obedient. She has been studying the truth for ten years, but her husband took a delight in marching her off to the Church in his pompous way. Mrs. Smith was travelling companion with the Empress of Russia—Nicholas’s wife. When she told her husband plainly she had become a Christadelphian, and had just met with us twice, he told her it she left her house on the Sunday, it would be the last time she would get the chance. Since then we have been deprived of her company.”

(Excerpt from November 1877) ROCHESTER (N.Y.)—The had intelligence is as follows:—“A young man called upon me where I do business, on Sep. 14<sup>th</sup>, and gave his name as James Wiley, of Troy, N.Y., U.S.A. He stated that he had been a Christadelphian for six years; that he had been a member of the ecclesia in Glasgow, Scotland, three years, and a member of the ecclesia in Troy, N.Y., U.S.A., for three years. He spoke of brother Nisbet, of Glasgow, and of hearing brother Thomas Boshier, brother J. J. Andrew, brother Shuttleworth and brother Roberts, having heard them all lecture. Judging from his language, he is evidently a Scotchman. He is tall, rather slender, with a good honest-looking countenance and an intelligent-looking head. He said he was in straitened circumstances, and wanted to borrow some money to carry him home, and that he would send it back to me on Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>. I asked him to send it by Post Office Order, which he agreed to do. Not hearing from him I sent a letter to brother G. H. Ennis, of Troy, N.Y., U.S.A. His reply was: ‘No man with such a name, or answering your description belongs or ever has belonged to our ecclesia.’ The object of my writing is to protect the brethren and sisters, through the *Christadelphian*, from being swindled, as I have been.”

(Excerpt from January 1878) BIRMINGHAM.—

One of the local dignitaries of the Church of England—“Canon” Bowlby, Rector of St. Philip’s—has thought well to notice and assail the truth, in the shape of a lecture on “Christadelphianism” to the Church of England Young Men’s Improvement Society. The lecture was thrown open to the public, and nearly the whole of the brethren attended, to the manifest surprise of the promoters of the meeting. The place was crammed. The Canon said “Christadelphianism” was exciting some interest in the town, and, therefore, he thought to fill up a gap in the programme of the Society by a lecture on the subject. It was a system, he said, which opens up some of the most important questions which a man could be called upon to consider. He proceeded to give a history of its uprise and an account of its nature, so far as he had been able to apprehend them from the books placed in his hand. His description was fairly accurate, but contained some misrepresentations which brother Roberts desired permission, at the close, to correct. The Canon did not accord the permission, but said if Mr. Roberts would write him a letter pointing out the mistakes he had made, he (the Canon) should make the correction public on the next occasion he should address the Society. This led to the following correspondence:

*Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row,*

*Birmingham, Dec. 14<sup>th</sup>, 1877.*

Respected Canon Bowlby,—In accordance with your suggestion, I write to correct the misrepresentations (unwittingly, I thoroughly believe) which occurred in your lecture, last night, on ‘Christadelphianism.’

You said the Christadelphians ‘repudiated baptism.’ I cannot imagine how you could take this impression, on the supposition that you read the book which you had on the table as your authority. On pages 354–55 you will find that so far from repudiating baptism, the Christadelphians believe that no unbaptised man is in the position expressed by the apostolic phrase, ‘in Christ,’ and that even baptism itself is of no validity in the absence of scriptural faith.

You next alleged that the author of *Twelve Lectures*, in contrast to Dr. Thomas, contended that Christ was a ‘mere man.’ Again, I am at a loss to understand the reason for this statement, unless I assume that you have only skimmed—not read—the book in question. That book declares Christ to have been a man, but only in the sense in which Paul makes the same statement when he says, ‘There is one mediator between God and man, *the man Christ Jesus*.’— (1 Tim. 2:5.) His relation to God as the manifestation of the one Father is recognised throughout lecture V., and expressly affirmed on page 136, line 28; on page 138, line 19; also from line 24 to line 29 on the same page. I will grant that in the effort to exhibit the unscripturalness of Trinitarian views, there may be a leaning in the direction indicated by your statement. Perhaps the best disproof of your statement lies in the fact that it is an express understanding among Christadelphians that no one shall be received among them who holds that Christ was a mere man.

Next, it was incorrect to allege that we say there is no soul. Had you qualified this by prefixing the word “immortal” to soul, there would have been nothing to object to.

Then you will find on examination that the re-creation of the whole human race at the coming of Christ, forms no part of the faith of the Christadelphians. Item 7 of the summary of ‘the truth,’ on page 364 of the book in question expressly defines a contrary conviction.

Your statement that we hold there is no other life than the present is in contradiction to even the lecture headings of the *Twelve Lectures*. You cannot seriously have meant this, except in the sense in which we deny that a man is alive when he is dead.

In conclusion let me propose to you the public canvass of the topic in friendly platform discussion. You rightly said, last night, that our system 'opens up some of the most important questions which a person can be called upon to consider.' I think this is a reason why you should make the endeavor to place these questions in what you conceive to be a scriptural light before the many people in this town who are convinced that the Christadelphians have the truth. Disputation, which was not beneath the dignity of the apostle Paul (Acts 17:17; 19:9; 1 Thes. 2:2) ought not to be beneath the dignity of a canon of the Church of England, or out of the line of what he considers expedient.—Very respectfully yours.

ROBERT ROBERTS.

*St. Philip's Rectory, Dec. 14<sup>th</sup>, 1877.*

My dear sir,—I am very much obliged to you for correcting those misrepresentations of Christadelphian doctrine which you mention as having occurred in my lecture last night, and which, as you rightly say, were, on my part, unwittingly committed. I felt all through that in trying to understand a system with which I was not familiar, I might have failed, however much I tried, to catch the real meaning of those who believe and teach it. I shall take every opportunity of giving to your corrections, if possible, as wide a circulation as my lecture. I am anxious to represent your views accurately, and, as you yourself express them, and your letter of to-day will help me to do so. I am sorry if in any respect I have not stated them accurately. I hope you will consider it no discourtesy on my part if I respectfully decline to accept your proposal of a public discussion on these topics. I have long been convinced that religious controversy is one of the greatest evils to which people can be exposed, and I have no wish either to provoke or to carry on controversy. I do not arrive at this conclusion because I think it 'beneath my dignity,' as you seem to think possible. I possess no dignity whatever, nor any sense of dignity, but I object to religious disputation on very different grounds.—I am, my dear sir, yours truly,

Mr. R. Roberts.

H. B. BOWLBY.

A brother having liberally offered to pay for the Masonic Hall if a reply should be given to Canon Bowlby's lecture, arrangements were made for the delivery of two lectures, by brother Roberts, on Tuesday and Wednesday, Dec. 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>. Three hundred large posters and 3,000 handbills, besides newspaper advertisements, brought together large audiences on both occasions. The opportunity was good for a renewed exhibition of the truth, and for the wholesome entertainment, strengthening, and comfort of the brethren.

The Sunday evening meetings have been crowded during the month. Lectures as follow: Dec. 2<sup>nd</sup>, The Signs of the Times from a Religious Point of View.—(Brother Shuttleworth.) 9<sup>th</sup>, The Progress of the War.—(Bro. Roberts.) 16<sup>th</sup>, The Approaching Revolution.—(Bro. Roberts.) 23<sup>rd</sup>, The Past and Future Exodus of Israel.—(Bro. Roberts.)

(February 1878) GLASGOW.—Brother O'Neil reports that on the 23<sup>rd</sup> December, ROBERT WALLACE, shoemaker, was immersed into the saving name. His attention was first attracted to the truth by a conversation he heard in a railway carriage on the immortality of the soul. He was connected with the Free Church of Scotland, and held the office of deacon till the truth led him to give it up. The elder of

his church visited him before “the sacrament” with his “token,” as usual, but brother Wallace told him he could not accept of it as he had embraced the teachings of the Scriptures on the subject of immortality. He told him he did not believe that man had an immortal soul, or that there was an immortal devil, &c. The elder said he did not see how these things should keep him back from the table; this only shows how indifferent to truth the various denominations of the apostacy are in their desire to retain hold of the people. On the same day there was another addition in brother James McPherson, who was formerly in connection with the brethren in Aberdeen, from whom he separated without sufficient reason. He made application for a return to fellowship, which after an interview and an expression of regret on his part, was granted, the Aberdeen brethren being consulted previously, and their consent given joyfully. On the 13<sup>th</sup> inst. THOMAS BELL, watchmaker, husband of sister Bell, was inducted into the all-saving name, in the usual manner. He was formerly Baptist. This addition has caused the brethren much encouragement. The lectures for the month have been as under:—Dec. 16<sup>th</sup>, The Bible Hell not the Hell of Orthodox Belief.—(Brother T. Nisbet.) Dec. 23<sup>rd</sup>, The Refuge from the Storm or what we must do to be saved.—(Brother Wm. Robertson.) Dec. 30<sup>th</sup>, The Nature of Man; views popular and false, *versus* unpopular but true.—(Brother James M’Climont.) Jan. 6<sup>th</sup>, Immortality: Resurrection, not Death the gateway to it.—(Brother James Nisbet.) January 13<sup>th</sup>, Our Dear Friends: where are they?—(Brother Thomas Nisbet.) The last three lectures are the first of a course of eight lectures, which we have had largely placarded, also setting forth that brother C. Smith, from Edinburgh, will answer any questions on the preceding lectures sent in by the preceding Sunday. (*Erratum*.—In last month’s intelligence, John Brown ought to have been Thomas C. Brown.)

(Excerpt from March 1878) LEICESTER. — The proceedings of the month have been enlivened by a somewhat unusual incident, viz.: a public lecture against the truth by a clergyman of the Church of England, and a reply by brother Roberts, of Birmingham. The clergyman in question is a Jew, the “Rev.” A. A. Isaacs, vicar of Christ’s Church. His lecture came about in this way. Some time ago, in lecturing on the errors of the day, he classed Christadelphianism with Secularism. The fact being reported in the papers, brother Collyer wrote the “Rev.” gentleman, repudiating the association, and expressing surprise that the lecturer should have fallen into such a mistake. Mr. Isaacs replied that he had gained his impression from information, but he should be glad to see some Christadelphian publications, and would lecture on the subject, to which a reply might be given. Brother Collyer, therefore, sent him several publications, and, in due time, Mr. Isaacs issued announcements of a lecture on Christadelphianism. The lecture came off on Monday, Feb. 18<sup>th</sup>, in the lecture theatre of the Temperance Hall. There was large audience, filling the place. Mr. Isaac’s lecture was more an endeavour to exhibit than an attempt to confute the subject of his assault; and consisted largely of reading quotations from Christadelphian works. He had promised to answer questions at the close, and, of these, quite a large number were put by various brethren and some not brethren. It was amusing to see the helplessness of the “rev.” gentleman in the hands of his piquant questioners. He was evidently unaware of the nature of the task he had undertaken. A good-natured indifference to logical exigency, however, helped him through where other men would have been overwhelmed with confusion. The only proof he could give of the immortality of the soul was the opinion of “philologers and learned men” that *nephesh chayiah* involved “the immortal principle.” The questioning lasted to a late hour. Meanwhile, the brethren had issued announcements of a reply on the following night in the large room of the Temperance Hall, by brother Roberts, who had been filling his usual quarterly lecturing appointment at Leicester on the previous Sunday. There was a large audience and a patient hearing, which was followed by a number of questions.

(April 1878) LEAMINGTON.—By request of the brethren at this place, brother Shuttleworth went over from Birmingham on Monday evening, March 11<sup>th</sup>, for the purpose of being present at a lecture to be delivered by Edward Hines, Esq., on “The identity of the British nation with lost Israel,” with a view to putting questions at the close, in accordance with the advertised invitation of the lecturer. The lecture was delivered under the presidency of the Mayor, and was attended by a very large and respectable audience, who filled the building in every part, notwithstanding a charge of admission. When the lecture was

concluded, there was no time for questions, and bro. Shuttleworth, instead of attempting to put any, invited Mr. Hines, in the presence of the audience, to publicly discuss the question with brother Roberts. Mr. Hines at first said it depended upon whether the gentleman proposed was competent, and what his surroundings were. He then excused himself, on the ground of his numerous lecturing engagements reaching some weeks ahead, amongst which he mentioned an appointment for Birmingham. He was then asked if he would debate the question at all when he came to Birmingham, or at any other convenient time. Mr. Hines replied again in an evasive manner, whereupon a gentleman in the audience, who had heard him in the afternoon challenging anyone in Leamington to impeach his position, and, not being satisfied with his non-acquiescence in the proposal to hold a public debate, offered to accompany bro. Shuttleworth to the vestry, and to see Mr. Hines privately. The two went, and succeeded in getting an interview. They did not succeed, however, in inducing Mr. Hines to consent. Mr. Hines said he was "not qualified" for debating; that it was not his *forte*; that God had not blessed him with gifts in that direction. So the matter ended. The brethren then considered how the opportunity could best be turned to account, so they made immediate arrangements for a reply to be given by brother Roberts on the following Monday, March 18<sup>th</sup>. The Mayor being previously engaged, the consent of the deputy-Mayor was obtained to take the chair, and a charge was fixed for admission, under an offer to give the entire proceeds, with expenses undeducted, to a local charity. Advertisements and posters were issued, and a large and highly respectable audience were thus brought together in the Public Hall, Leamington. The deputy-Mayor, Mr. Middleman, J.P., briefly introduced brother Roberts, who proceeded to discourse on the subject of the Ten Tribes. He spoke for nearly two hours, and obtained a very attentive hearing. He traced the history of Israel from the beginning, and quoted prophecies bearing on the question of the dispersion and history of the Ten Tribes to the present time. He showed the unscriptural character of the distinctions insisted upon by Mr. Hine, and then took up Mr. Hine's "proofs" and "identifications" *seriatim*, so far as the time would admit, showing that they were no proofs or identifications at all, but the contrary, when understood with reference to the context in each case. He made use of a variety of arguments to show that Britain had no connection with Israel. He showed the true future in store for the Ten Tribes, according to the prophets, and pointed out the pernicious character of Mr. Hine's doctrine in obscuring the true doctrine of the kingdom of God. The deputy-Mayor, in awarding a vote of thanks, said he would have been much better pleased to have seen Mr. Hine on one side of the platform and Mr. Roberts on the other. Mr. Roberts replied that it was not his blame that it was not so, and explained the circumstances.

(June 1878) MONTGOMERY.—Brother Richards speaks of a preacher who is reading *Eureka*, *Twelve Lectures*, *The Christadelphian* and other publications. The preacher says he would embrace the views presented if he could see them to be right, but so far from seeing them to be right, he pronounces them to be "bubbles." He has not ceased to oppose the truth since the Editor's lecture in Montgomery. He says: "In ten years time Christadelphianism will be a thing of the past. I told him," says brother Richards, "If he would continue reading, the scales would much more likely fall from his eyes, and then he would see the Bible as a new book, full of harmony and beauty, and the kingdom which he now called earthy, he would call heavenly and divine. He spent about three hours here with us on Thursday last. On the Sunday evening he preached from the words "Until the Ancient of Days came and judgment was given to the saints of the most high and the time came that the saints possessed the Kingdom." This, no doubt, was intended as a great gun fired at the Christadelphian doctrine; but what blindness and confusion in the teeth of the beautiful truths of the Scriptures. "The Bible knows nothing," says he, about Jesus Christ reigning in Jerusalem. This is only the product of the carnal mind. He says: 'Mr. Roberts is not consistent, for he lays down a programme of events which must necessarily take many years to accomplish before the kingdom is set up;' and then in reference to the *Hymn Book* and other things, says: 'If the kingdom do not supersede.' Perhaps brother Roberts will explain this." [There is nothing to explain except the preacher's mistake. The qualification to the *Hymn Book* and other enterprises is not "if the kingdom does not supersede," but "if the Lord delay His coming." The Lord will come a considerable time before the setting-up of the Kingdom. The setting-up of the kingdom is the work to be done after He comes, and in

this work His brethren shall participate; but before they are invited to do so, they must appear before Him for judgment. For this work of individual judgment, to be exercised on a vast multitude (mostly composed of those now in their graves), He comes before the kingdom is established; and because it is not revealed how long the one event precedes the other, the coming of Christ may be an eventuality of any day, even if the rest of the programme “take many years to accomplish.”—EDITOR.]

(October 1878) MONTREAL.—Brother Charles Robertson writes: “I moved to this city from Toronto in January last. I soon became acquainted with the members of the Advent Christian Church, the leader of whom is the Mr. W. W. Robertson who appeared as a correspondent in the *Christadelphian* in the number for November or December, of last year. They claim sympathy with Christadelphians, but the claim is not well founded. They have read much of our literature, and scripturally understand and teach the nature of man, the kingdom of God, the unity of the One God, the origin and nature of Jesus the Christ; but on the other points they are not so clear, such as the necessity for immersion, the doctrine of resurrection, and subsequent account-giving. On immersion, they do not believe that the Scriptures insist on a birth out of water as necessary to salvation, but consider it optional with any one, whether he be or not. This point I have discussed with them several times in their meeting house, but to no purpose. When brought face to face with the testimony, they stolidly denied the teaching and practice of Jesus and his apostles. In private life they are very estimable men, and this, with the fact that they have disengaged themselves from the traditions that abound, makes their case a peculiarly sad one. One cannot but deeply regret that such men should stop short of embracing the whole truth on such seemingly plain and simple matters. But perhaps the truth may even yet gain the ascendancy. I duly became acquainted also with the Mr. Alex. Kerr brother Paton, of Sherbrooke wrote you concerning. I found him to be a most intelligent man, and to have made surprising progress in the truth. His request for immersion was responded to at a quiet spot on the river side. Brother Kerr, like all others, has had to encounter those petty annoyances which a belief and obedience of the truth so surely entail upon us. Occupying a prominent position in the choir of a Presbyterian church, of which he was a member, his abjuration of Presbyterianism was rendered the more conspicuous, and of course former friends were friends no longer. Brother Kerr bears all cheerfully, being persuaded the truth he has found will compensate for ‘the loss of all things.’ Another case of obedience to the truth, which I have to communicate, is that of Mr. HUGH ARMSTRONG, schoolmaster, of Dunrobin. He is brother in the flesh to brother R. Armstrong, of East Lothian, Scotland. Correspondence with his brother, on the matters of the faith, led him in due time to a complete emancipation from the thralldom of the orthodox creed. His request for immersion was first made, I believe, to brother Gunn, of Walkerton, who, learning of Mr. Armstrong’s case on his last visit to Scotland, has since taken a deep interest therein. This request it was somewhat difficult to comply with, on account of Mr. Armstrong’s residence, Dunrobin, being in a part of the country inaccessible to the ordinary modes of travel—boat, rail, or stage. He was very desirous of being immersed by one in the faith. Brother Gunn accordingly detailed brother W. Farrar, of Hamilton, to meet Mr. Armstrong at Ottawa (from which Dunrobin is distant some twenty miles), and have the matter attended to. Brother Farrar arrived in Ottawa, but from the uncertain nature of communication with Dunrobin, he found he was a day ahead of Mr. Armstrong, and being pressed for time, could not wait till he should arrive. Both had therefore to return with the sense of having failed to accomplish the object in view. It was a bitter disappointment to both. Brethren Farrar and Gunn next put me in communication with Mr. Armstrong with a request that I should arrange a meeting in Ottawa for the same object. This I was unable to undertake at the time, and finally it was arranged that Mr. Armstrong should, during his school vacation, come to Montreal and be immersed by me here. He accordingly arrived here July 20<sup>th</sup>, and stayed with us three days. Brother Gunn was also in the city at the time, on his way through to Halifax, N.S., and all were mutually glad to become acquainted with each other. Mr. Armstrong had never seen any of the brethren face to face, although many hearing of his interest in the truth had been in correspondence with him. Brother Gunn would liked to have been present at the immersion, but the hour at which the steamboat he had to travel by was to leave did not permit of it. I found Mr. Armstrong a well informed man, and to have thoroughly apprehended the things which are the cause of our joy. Accordingly we repaired to a secluded part of the St. Lawrence, a little above the

city, and there Mr. Armstrong was invested with the sincovering name. On the morrow we took our farewell of each other, and brother Armstrong went on his homeward journey rejoicing. He is likely to have his share of the believers' troubles. His sojourn being an isolated one, will, if anything, enhance these. He desires the prayers of the brethren that he may be kept steadfast in the faith."

(November 1878) GLASGOW.—Brother Leask reports the removal of brother and sister Lang, to Newcastle. The gap has partly been filled by the immersion of ISABELLA FERNESTER, fellow servant of sister Hobart, of Renfrew, who came in contact with the truth through her means. As mentioned last month, the other two nights of the discussion between brother Charles Smith, of Edinburgh, and Mr. Mitchell duly came off on the subject named, *Is the Gospel a Call to an Inheritance upon the Earth?* On the whole four nights Mr. Mitchell brought forward nothing new, his arguments being of the usual flimsy and weak nature, when put side by side with the truth, which is truly impregnable. On the Sunday following the discussion, Mr. Mitchell delivered a lecture on the Christadelphian Resurrection, his idea being, as he stated, to represent or make known what the views of the Christadelphians were regarding resurrection, and to show the unscripturalness of the same, but had he said he was to *misrepresent* those views, he would have been nearer the mark. Brother Robertson replied to the lecture the next Sunday, and made known the true facts of the case, but Mr. Mitchell was not present to hear it. The other lectures since last communication have been as follow:—Sep. 22<sup>nd</sup>, *Another Gospel which is not another: the Gospel of Jesus Christ in contrast therewith.* Oct. 6<sup>th</sup>, *The Second Coming of Christ.* Oct. 13<sup>th</sup>, *Is the Soul dormant after death?* The latter was a reply to a sermon delivered by a clergyman here the previous Sunday on the same subject.

(November 1878) HUDDERSFIELD.—Brother Heywood reports a visit and lectures by brother Dixon, of Manchester. On Sunday, September 29<sup>th</sup>, he lectured on "Palestine and the Eastern Question;" on the Monday following the subject was "Are Englishmen Israelites?" There was a good attendance at both lectures, particularly the latter. It so happened that Mr. Hine was advertised to lecture in the town the same week. Brother Dixon inserted a challenge to Mr. Hine on the bills announcing the foregoing lectures, and also attended Mr. Hine's lecture to deliver the challenge personally. The chairman, however, though inviting questions, refused to hear brother Dixon on account of the published challenge on the bills. Mr. Hine made frequent and scurrilous reference to the Christadelphians, remarking that he would neither discuss with Mr. Bradlaugh nor Mr. Roberts, as they were both children of the devil. The Huddersfield brethren propose to help brother Dixon to get up a tract in confutation of Mr. Hine's theory, and invite others to help in the work.

(June 1879) RIDDINGS.—Bro. Wragg writes: "The lectures at Swanwick, which are being delivered in the house of an alien friend, has called forth the opposition of the 'vicar,' who intimated from all the pulpits in the village his purpose of holding meetings to denounce the 'damnable doctrines' introduced into Swanwick. We have had the pleasure of attending three of these meetings, which were held in the school room—the first on the immortality of the soul; second, on the future of the righteous; and the third on the destiny of the wicked. The room was full every night, the last night many had to go away, being unable to get in. He gave a good definition of who the Christadelphians were, and of the faith, as he read from a *Declaration*, which he told the people was poison. The 'vicar' did his best to answer all the questions put to him the first two nights—even admitting that man was mortal, yet declaring he would not pin his faith to the collect for the first Sunday in Advent. He also said Christ would reign on earth a thousand years; but on the third night he would not attempt to give a direct answer at all; contradicted himself over and over again; declared the teaching of the Scriptures on the future of the wicked was eternal torments, and even pretended that 'everlasting chains,' in Jude, was eternal torments, and that everlasting punishment was the same. At last he called in the aid of a brother Independent parson, who began to question instead of answering, and then the 'vicar,' seeing things not going right, gave an exhortation to the people to beware of this eternal fire. He then closed the meeting—no doubt glad for the

relief. The people all seemed anxious to obtain the tracts which we had for distribution, and we expect good results in Swanwick, two having already separated themselves and begun the searching of Divine truth.”

(Excerpt from December 1879) KIDDERMINSTER.—Brother Bland writes, Oct. 21 (too late for last month’s *Christadelphian*: intelligence communications should be not later than the 15<sup>th</sup> of the month): “We are thankful to state that we have something worth recording on the present occasion. Our efforts during the past five months have yielded a little fruit, which we sincerely trust is of that nature that shall endure to life eternal. If the harvest corresponds with the first-fruits we shall have cause to be abundantly grateful to him who—after faithful labour—generally giveth the increase. We have to record the addition of four members to our little ecclesia, two of whom were immersed into the name of the Holy One of Israel, on Saturday, Oct. 11<sup>th</sup>; one on Thursday, Oct. 16<sup>th</sup>; and one on Saturday, Oct. 18<sup>th</sup>. The names of the new brothers and sisters are as follow:—JOHN COOPER (39), foreman; and his wife SARAH GOWEN COOPER (37); JOHN THATCHER (29), carpet designer; and ALICE MILLWARD BLAND, the beloved wife of him who now writes to you. The whole of these have carefully looked into the truth and witnessed a good confession. They were all previously connected with the Wesleyan denomination, and took some active part in some department of labour connected with that organization. Of course results of this kind bring heavy condemnation upon our heads, from those who will not, and in some instances dare not. Look to see whether the things we teach are true, and all sorts of bitter, biting things are unhesitatingly—and equally as untruthfully—said about us by the so-called Christians around. This we must endure, knowing that ‘our Vindicator liveth,’ to whose eye our motives are not hidden, and who will one day ‘judge his people with a righteous judgment.’ We understand that Mr. Fisk, the Baptist minister, has been attacking us from the pulpit. The difficulty is to get to know what has been said on occasions of this kind, when no public notice has been given of the intended attack. We were informed on pretty good authority that he declared that ‘no one could be a Christian who did not believe the doctrine of the Trinity,’ that we ‘did not take the whole of the Bible, but built our doctrines upon isolated passages,’ a statement that is absolutely untrue, and far more applicable to the sect with which he is connected, and the other sects with which he fraternizes. He stated, too, that ‘he would not discuss with us,’ which is no doubt a very wise decision—at his standpoint—at which to arrive, though at the same time not at all one that would be endorsed by Paul, who constantly ‘reasoned’ with the people wherever he went. He has also stated that (so we are informed) ‘he has several friends who are Christadelphians, that they send him lots of tracts and pamphlets, which he never reads but always puts upon the fire.’ We can only say that if Mr. Fisk heard of a Churchman putting some of his Baptist tracts upon the fire unread, he would be one of the first to condemn him as a very bigoted person. Such conduct, if true, is by no means commendable. Some other person, or persons, have been endeavouring to bring contempt upon the truth, in a paper emanating from Wolverhampton, called ‘*The Lantern*.’ We fear it is a lantern that gives little light, and though a Bible is printed upon the front page, it is a closed one, as that book probably is to most of its readers. It is a paper that affords an opportunity to men without manliness, to do an injury to any one anonymously, and men who have little or no honesty of purpose, who dare not meet us openly, and who ‘love darkness rather than light, have in this publication an opportunity to vent their spleen, or to show forth their satirical powers at the expense of truth. The Christadelphians, however, are (or should be) impervious to the shafts of witticism, satire, or falsehood that malignant neighbours may use against them, and so far as those at Kidderminster are concerned they have more reason for rejoicing than anything else, for their meetings have thus, through their enemies, been advertised for to no other cause can they ascribe the increasing number that have attended their meetings.”

(April 1880) BIRMINGHAM.—During the month obedience has been rendered to the truth by the following: JOSEPH THOMAS, boot maker, formerly Campbellite; and JANE SEAMARK (46), formerly Church of Christ, so-called.



The lectures on the Apocalypse continue to be attended without visible diminution of numbers or interest. The question of publication is not yet decided. We hear of many who intend to have them, but have not yet signified their mind.

Campbellism in Birmingham is being severely exercised by the truth. It will be recollected that some time ago Mr. Andrews, a principal man in their meetings, obeyed the truth. He was immersed at his own request by the brethren in Birmingham, but did not at that time identify himself with them. The result was a division in the Campbellite meeting, and the secession of a large number with Mr. Andrews. Many of these—to the number of 26—have been baptised by Mr. Andrews, and meet together in the Alexandra Hall, Bloomsbury, separately from the Campbellites, who meet in a chapel of their own in Great Francis Street. The fear of being compromised in an uncertain profession of the faith (a fear entertained on various reasonable grounds), has hitherto prevented the Birmingham brethren from according that cordial recognition to the new community which is desirable: but there is a likelihood now that all difficulties will disappear. The new community has formally applied for recognition and co-operation. This has been followed by an interview at which the various elements of the truth were defined, by a deputation from the Birmingham brethren, and endorsed by Mr. Andrews in the presence and on behalf of those in fellowship with him. It had also been signified that the new meeting were not unwilling to be known as Christadelphians. A formal compliance with their request for fellowship will probably have taken place before this meets the eye of the reader.

Meanwhile, the incident has stirred up Mr. David King to make strenuous exertions to avert further disaster to Campbellism in Birmingham. He has been lecturing specifically against the Christadelphians. Brother Andrews invited him to debate the subject with the Editor of the *Christadelphian*, but Mr. King took refuge in a proposal to have a committee to investigate the nature of an incident that transpired between himself and the Editor of the *Christadelphian* sixteen years ago, the particulars of which are in the possession of the early readers of the *Christadelphian*. The Editor of the *Christadelphian* declined to waste time in such obstructive trifling, remarking that having the answer of a good conscience towards God, in the matter that seems to have inflicted such a deep and lasting wound on Mr. King's feelings, he was willing to bear any amount of odium Mr. King might please to cast upon him, caring more for the unspeakably more important question "What is the Truth?" He was ready to discuss this without condition or preliminary; but Mr. King could not be brought from the miserable corner in which he prefers to stand. However a sort of discussion has been proceeding notwithstanding. By arrangement of brother Andrews the Editor delivered two lectures in Duddeston Ward Hall, in exhibition of the true nature of the kingdom of God. After this Mr. King lectured, with the view of showing that the kingdom of God was set up on Pentecost. This lecture was answered in a counter lecture in the Ward Hall, by the Editor of the *Christadelphian*. Then at another meeting in Great Francis Street Chapel, Mr. King answered written questions submitted by those who sympathised with the truth. His answers were at another meeting reviewed by the Editor of the *Christadelphian*. No definite result can be reported; but any agitation on the subject of the truth is better than stagnation, and may be the means of doing good all round. The lectures during the month have been as follow: Feb. 29<sup>th</sup>, Hope as an element of the human constitution.—(Brother Roberts). March 7<sup>th</sup>, Infant baptism a human invention.—(Brother Hodgkinson.) 14<sup>th</sup>, The predicted falling-away from the truth.—(Brother Bishop). 21<sup>st</sup>, Charity, false and true.—(Brother Roberts).

(Excerpt from June 1880) LONDON.— Brother McKillop, who it will be remembered emigrated from London last November, with sister McKillop and family, to Christ-church, New Zealand, for the benefit of his health, in writing to a brother, states they have arrived safely and in excellent health, and that he has derived great benefit from the voyage. Referring to the opportunities of making the truth known amongst

the passengers on board, he says, “The passengers and sailors invited me to speak to them at a proposed meeting on the ‘forecastle.’ I promised to be there at the appointed time, viz., Sunday afternoon, but this coming to the ears of those in authority, the chief officer quietly told me it would not be allowed; however, his consent was obtained for holding a meeting in ‘tween decks.’ One gentleman drew up several large notices, which he posted about; the result was a ‘monster’ meeting of all classes of passengers. The sailors asked permission of the captain to hear me speak but they were met with a very emphatic ‘no,’ as no good (so the captain said) was to be learned. Several of them, however, got to the hatchway, but were ordered away. The subject on which I spoke was, The kingdom of God. I was somewhat surprised at the attention paid, and the rustling of the leaves while finding the various passages alluded to. At the close of the address, I invited questions, but none of any account were put. During the whole of that evening the deck was dotted over with groups of people talking away as eagerly as if some great event had happened. Not one of the 150 on board ever heard the ‘strange things’ before. . . . I found one or two stoutly defending me against the adversary, one young man especially, with whom I took the first opportunity of getting into conversation. I lent him the *Twelve Lectures*, which he read, and also the greater part of *Elpis Israel*. As he expressed a desire for a copy of the *Twelve Lectures*, I gave him mine, of which he said he would make good use. In his diary of the voyage, he says that his candid opinion is that the Christadelphians are the only people who teach the truth. An attempt was made by the passengers to get up a debate between a young minister and myself, but he declined. . . . I afterwards had some warm discussion with some hot Ulster ‘Orangemen’ — Presbyterians, who all had Bibles, and flourished them pretty openly. They warned me that if I dared to say such things in New Zealand I would lose my life.”

(Excerpt from October 1880) LEICESTER.— Brother Collyer writes, September 14<sup>th</sup>: “In addition to the intelligence you have from here, I have to advise a special lecture by brother Dixon, in the Central Hall, on Monday night, the 13<sup>th</sup> inst., on the following subject, ‘Jesus Christ and Secularism.’ This has been the outcome of correspondence in the local newspapers on the question of putting a bust of Jesus in the Secular Hall along with Thomas Paine and others. This seems to be the intention of the parties building the new hall. Indeed the name of Jesus already appears under the place for his bust. Many protests have been made by different parties, but we thought a more practical method of dealing with the matter would be to give a public lecture on the subject. The result was a good meeting. The lecture was all that could be desired and was listened to throughout with marked attention. An opportunity was given for replies; this was taken advantage of by the leading spirit of Secularism—a Mr. Gimson—but he was very unfair to Jesus, for he wanted to take just such passages as suited his purpose, and apply them to matters pertaining merely to this life. Brother Dixon pointed out quite conclusively that the main object Jesus had in recommending and enforcing good deeds was for the ulterior advantages it would bring, because of their bearing upon the faith which is well pleasing to God; this, of course, the Secularists will not have. I think the effort will do good. I have suggested to-night the desirability of a week-night lecture through the winter. If this can be arranged, we shall be glad to put you under contribution.”

(March 1881) BILSTON.— Brother Parkes writes that here Wesleyanism and Romanism prevail, consequently, the spreading of the truth is uphill work. Only a few avail themselves of the Sunday afternoon class, and the attendance at the Sunday evening lectures has considerably fallen off.” We have been incidentally informed that the ministers of the various denominations have advised their people not to attend. It will only be by persistent effort, and varied tactics, with the blessing and aid of God, that we expect to succeed in storming their citadel of prejudice and Priestcraft, and of establishing in their midst the standard of truth and righteousness.”

(Excerpts from April 1881) BIRMINGHAM. — On the same occasion the Campbellites tried to neutralise any favourable impression made by the lectures, by advertising copies of the tract published by David King, twelve years ago, entitled *The History and Mystery of Thomasism*—the last word of the title being

now changed to *Christadelphianism*, The brethren had heard of the purpose to do this, and a circular was got ready and distributed to the audience in advance, of which the following is the principal portion:—

“It is probable that as you disperse at the last Lecture, a Tract will be placed in your hands, the object of which will be to neutralize, if possible, any favourable impression the Lectures may have made. The Tract is entitled “The History and Mystery of Christadelphianism.” The title is a misnomer. It is not a history of the truth, but an unfriendly representation of certain incidents, over 30 years old, of no manner of moment to those who desire only to know what the Bible teaches. They are incidents connected with the visit of Dr. Thomas to Britain in 1848–9, incidents which were naturally galling to those whose fellowship he was leaving, but which in no way affect the question of Christ’s coming and Kingdom. They are incidents of which those who cherish Dr. Thomas’ memory need in no wise be ashamed. The Tract has been answered and the incidents explained long ago. The explanation will be found in *Dr. Thomas’s Life and Work*, which may be had where the other works are procurable.

“As for ‘mystery,’ there is none in Christadelphianism. It is the outcome of a reasonable and frank acceptance of the Bible as the word of God. Studying this for himself, Dr. Thomas discovered that its teaching was at total variance with recognised theology in all points and particulars. He set himself to work by voice and pen to make this manifest. Others examined to see if it was so. They found it was so, and they in turn have done the same towards others. In this there is no “mystery,” but a very straightforward and obvious operation of reason and truth. The writer of the Tract in question, probably inserted the word ‘mystery,’ to jingle with “history,” and make a telling title. But there is nothing in it. It is neither history nor mystery, but an attempt to hurt by prejudice that which cannot be touched by Scripture or true reason. It indicates the Scriptural impotency of the Campbellites, who make this effort, that their only answer to a Scriptural demonstration is an attempt to create personal prejudice.

“But it will be represented to you that it is not their only answer; that they have tried to bring about a debate and cannot. The facts of the case do not justify this representation. They are these:

“Seventeen years ago, Mr. Roberts proposed debate with Mr. King. Mr. King declined, saying it was unnecessary to kill that which was everywhere dying out; but that if the Christadelphians, in Birmingham became as numerous as the Campbellites, he would think about it. In six years Mr. King having issued his *History and Mystery*, as an attempt to neutralise Dr. Thomas’s visit to Britain, and the Christadelphians having increased six-fold since 1864, Mr. Roberts against proposed debate. Mr. King again declined, on the score of the estimate which Mr. Roberts had formed of Mr. King. Ten years having again elapsed, and the Christadelphians having increased twenty-fold (some of the increase having come from Mr. King’s own body), Mr. King’s friends urged him to accept the proposal for debate that had been made years before. Mr. Roberts expressed his readiness to hold it, and he is now ready. But Mr. King proposes that there should first be an investigation as to the character of a certain letter, written by himself, and the time it was received by Mr. Roberts, seventeen years ago, which Mr. Roberts declared was unpublishable, and which he still declares to have been so, as assailing the character of persons (now dead); which Mr. Roberts said he believed, as he still believes, Mr. King wrote with the express purpose of preventing the publication of the correspondence in which he declined debate, but which was published notwithstanding; and which Mr. Roberts declared, as he still declares, arrived after the other letters were all in type, and when the correspondence-pamphlet contained no space for it, even if it had been publishable. But all of which is of no consequence whatever to a living soul, except as furnishing Mr. King an excellent pretext for declining a controversy which he does not care to hold, but which, at the same time, he would not like his friends to think he has the least disinclination to.

“You will now understand and appreciate the pamphlet which it has been intimated to Mr. Roberts it is the purpose of the Campbellites to place in your hands. If the pamphlet is not placed in your hands, no

harm will have been done in giving you this explanation; and if it is, then it is as well you should know the right version of the matter, in case you might be biased against further investigation into a matter which is deserving of your very highest consideration, and which the Christadelphians have no object in inviting your attention to beyond placing within your reach the great boon conferred upon themselves in the understanding of the Scriptures. Their doing of this is a duty the truth itself has imposed upon them, which they cannot escape, and which they, with the help of God, will continue to discharge in spite of the intense and bitter odium it brings upon them at the hands of such (many of them pious people) as do not understand the Scriptures. If our neighbours accept the truth, the benefit will be all their own. If, unhappily, they reject it, nobody will be hurt but themselves.”

(April 1881) OUTRAM.—Brother R. Simons, who has been transferred to this place from Balclutha, where he was station master, writes as follows:

“My removal appears to have been brought about at the instigation of the so-called ministers of the gospel. I had only been here a short time when I learnt that a letter had been sent from the Rev. (so-called) Maurice, of Balclutha, to Rev. Kirkland of this place, cautioning him that a very dangerous and pestilent fellow had come into his district. And I have already suffered some persecution, as they have done their best to get rid of me. I am expecting in a few days either to be removed again or else appointed to the amalgamated duties of railway station master, post master and telegraphist. The revds. And their friends are against me, and they have some considerable influence, but the railway authorities and general public are for me. Our Almighty Father is over all, and our mediator and advocate knows well what persecution is, and we can well and safely commit all our affairs into His hands. The great thing for us to do is to submit patiently. It is truly a great honour to suffer for the truth’s sake. What surprises me is that the very little I can do troubles them so much, as it is so little I can do, except lending and distributing books, and that only on a very small scale now, as my means are a little more limited than they were, but if I get appointed here my means may improve. Do you think it possible or practicable for brother Ashcroft to pay a visit to New Zealand, provided the necessary funds could be raised? Most urgently do we need the assistance of an able brother amongst us now. Brothers Mosley unite with me in asking this question.”

(We are sorry to disappoint the expectations of the New Zealand brethren, but it would not, in present circumstances, be possible for brother Ashcroft to accept an invitation out of Britain. The piano-tuning business, by which he is seeking to provide a livelihood with his own hands, though not yet adequate to the supply of his wants and that of a numerous family, is slowly developing and requires his steady attention. The work he does for the truth is mostly on Sunday.—ED.)

Brother Simons adds the following P.S. to his letter before closing: “I am just appointed to railway, post, and telegraph. Blessed be Jehovah’s name. I may remain in Outram for some time if according to the Deity’s Will.” Brother Simons also encloses letters from the brothers Moseley, which space prevents appearing.

(October 1881) LONDON

The following additions to our number have taken place:—August 24<sup>th</sup>, JOHN W. F. SPELLER (25), letter carrier, neutral. September 4<sup>th</sup>, FREDERICK W. PORTER (23), clerk, Baptist; Sept. 7<sup>th</sup>, ALFRED E. BAUGHN (19), letter carrier, Church of England; Sept. 11<sup>th</sup>, ANNIE SULLIVAN (20), neutral. It is pleasant to see the truth in such a flourishing condition all over the country so far as figures go. At the same time, the danger connected with it which you pointed out in the *Christadelphian* for August, in saying “that people in coming from the world in considerable numbers, naturally brought the principles of the world with them.” Such being the case (as without the shadow of a doubt it is), it behoves us to be ever upon the alert to see that not only the truth is not compromised, but that we, individually and

collectively, are not influenced by those principles. When we speak of those principles being evil, we mean that such are considered so by those who are no longer babes in Christ, but are able to take strong meat and drink. There is much that when we were “of the world” that we thought quite harmless, but, upon hearing more thoroughly the Way of Life, we see are positive evils, such as theatre-going, smoking, &c., which fact should make us all the more careful as to what connexions we make. The words of Christ are as true now as ever they were “that a *little* leaven leaventh the whole lump,” and this is made more apparent when considered by the light of his other words, that although “the spirit is willing” yet “the flesh is weak” when called upon to do those things that are acceptable in the sight of Deity.

LECTURES.—September 4<sup>th</sup>, “Saints, How to Become” (Brother J. J. Andrew); Sept. 11<sup>th</sup>, “What is the World coming to?” (Brother Horsman); Sept. 18<sup>th</sup>, “Samuel and the Witch of Endor” (Brother Atkins); Sept. 25<sup>th</sup>, “The Promises made to the Hebrew Fathers” (Brother A. Andrew).—FRANK JANNAWAY.

(October 1881) MERCER.—“My previous letter will prove to you that there is no truth in the statement published in the *Bible Standard*, that the Christadelphians have joined the church of Mr. G. A. Brown. There are a few who have been spoiled with the ‘free life’ theory, the principal one of whom, I feel confident, cannot live much longer in so unhealthy an atmosphere. Our brethren at Taupiri and Huntley have had a brush with the alien through the medium of a local paper, cuttings of which I send you. On Sunday, July 26<sup>th</sup>, the wife of Brother Gibbons and the wife of Brother Fowler, after a satisfactory examination, put on Christ in the appointed way. This is a great blessing to our brethren there, and an encouragement to us. We find *Seasons of Comfort* a great help to us. We have no speaking brethren, except Brother McKillop, and he is 40 miles away.”—W. CLARKE.

(November 1881) CINDERFORD The lectures by Bro. Roberts, of Birmingham, referred to last month, duly came off on Tuesday, Sept. 20<sup>th</sup>, and Tuesday, September 27<sup>th</sup>. They were delivered in the Town Hall. The proceedings were diversified on both evenings by somewhat unusual proceedings. On the first of the evenings the hall was filled to the door; Bro. Wilson, of Gloucester, in the chair. Shortly after the meeting commenced, a phalanx of “the Salvation Army” (what a ghastly misnomer!) which had taken up in a position in the street outside the hall before the front door, and under the windows struck up one of their hymns in fine stentorian fashion. The liveliness and power of their performance were doubtless sweetly enhanced by a blending of the double satisfaction that they were, in the first place, doing something meritorious in singing a hymn, and, secondly, they were silencing the devil’s voice (as they possible imagined it) inside the hall. Those inside the hall could do nothing but wait until the zeal outside had expended itself. This occurred in due time, and the army departed and the lecture proceeded in peace. Great attention was paid by a crowded audience. At the close, one of the audience got up and said he had been pleasantly disappointed. He had heard dreadful things about the Christadelphians, and he had come to hear for himself, and he must say he had heard something that had given him great satisfaction as a believer in the Bible. A minister of some chapel near by then got up in a state of earnest excitement, and surprised the conductors of the meeting by declaring that they had listened for an hour and a half to something that nobody denied—about the coming of Christ and the setting up of the kingdom of David; but there were doctrines that had been held back, that were under the cover, which were damnable deadly poison, and these he would undertake to attack and confute in a lecture he would deliver on the following Friday evening. Bro. Taylor said the best plan would be for the “rev.” gentleman to debate matters properly. Confusion set in, and nothing definitely was arranged.

On the next Tuesday night, a larger audience came together than before, and many were unable to obtain admission. The “Salvation Army” was not outside this time, but inside, as we soon discovered. Before the lecture commenced, the “rev.” gentleman who interposed last time demanded that there should be there and then a proper discussion. Bro. Roberts pointed out that this was an unreasonable proposal: that the meeting had been convened by public advertisement to hear a lecture, and that faith must be kept with the

public. He had no objection to discussion at the proper time. The “rev.” gentleman insisted, and the audience shouted. Bro. Roberts said he would compromise the matter. He would cut his lecture short, and allow the “rev.” gentleman to speak for half-an-hour, after which he (Bro. Roberts) should answer him for half-an-hour. After some grumbling this was accepted, and the lecture proceeded. The lecture had not proceeded far when organised interruption took place. Bro. Roberts tried to reason it into silence, but in vain. At last, the disturbance broke into a “Salvation Army” song, which the audience performed with great gusto. When they had got through, Bro. Roberts, who remained on his feet, resumed his lecture, but immediately another hymn broke from the assembly. There was no help but wait. When the second hymn was ended, another attempt to resume the lecture was drowned in a third hymn. Bro. Roberts told them at the end of the third hymn that they were only wasting time and strength; that they had better hear him; that he should not be sung down; that he was there to deliver a lecture, and he should do his duty whatever they might do. Another hymn was the answer, whereupon Bro. Roberts told them they were imitating the people of Ephesus, who for “the space of two hours, tried to silence the truth by crying, ‘Great is Diana of the Ephesians.’” A little breathing space was obtained, after which another hymn amused the assembly. After this the lecture was allowed to proceed. At its close, the “rev.” gentleman came to the crowded platform to fill up his appointed half-hour. He spoke with great vehemence, striking the air with clenched fist, and stamping the platform with his right foot. Whether it was his vehemence that exhausted his strength, or his paucity of matter that failed to sustain him in a perfectly attentive hearing—broken only by the cheers of a sympathising audience—he broke suddenly short at the end of about a quarter of an hour or so. Thereupon Bro. Roberts rose and proceeded to reply to what had been said, but he had not got more than a sentence or two uttered when the excited audience gave vent to their aggrieved feelings by another hymn, sung with a gusto sufficient to blow the roof off if it had been frail enough. A number of hymns followed in succession, until the audience, shamed out of their obstructiveness, allowed Bro. Roberts to be heard. The hearing accorded was only a brief one, and the meeting broke up in confusion. Many were disgusted at the nature of the opposition, and even the local newspapers condemned it. No harm has been done to the truth, but contrariwise. Many are enquiring; books have been eagerly bought; and Bro. Wilson says the Bible is being read and debated all through the Forest of Dean as it never has been within human memory. Arrangements are in progress for regular meetings. Several are on the point of obeying the truth.

(November 1881) HUDDERSFIELD—The correspondence which has taken place in the public papers resulting in a proposal for platform debate, concludes with the following letter from Bro. Heywood:—Sir,—No doubt many of your readers will be wishful to know how the above matter is going on, and if it is likely to take place. I am sorry to say that for various reasons it is not at present.—Those correspondents who with myself affirm that the Scriptures do not teach that man has an immortal soul, are ready at any time to stand forth represented by a gentleman able to discuss the question, as we are confident that our position is right, and desire a full and free inquiry. As the ministers of the various denominations have not taken up the matter, and being very wishful that it should be tried up, I waited upon various prominent gentlemen engaged in public speaking, Sunday schools, &c., in the hope of forming an influential and strong Committee, having no doubt, in that case, that some of our local D.D.’s or M.A.’s, or some other able gentleman from a distance would come forward in the interest of the popular (though apparently very weak) side of this argument— Well, one local preacher promised assistance. One rev. gentleman said he would not oppose it. Two others, who had said before they would not object to discuss in a proper place, &c., now write important business prevents them. Some are afraid the result of the discussion may not be good for poor sinners if it was shown they had no immortal souls; therefore could not be doomed to hell torments, to fear. Dr. Bailey told me that the immortality of the soul was assumed, and he did not attempt to prove it from the Scriptures. This is the position of nearly all, some alleging that they did not wish to be upset in their minds by discussing the question. One gentleman, twenty-five years a Sunday-school teacher, &c., did not care anyway about it. A few are desirous the question may be well and ably discussed, and the truth thereby established. I find those who are most careless about this important subject have plenty of time to attend missionary meetings, and are very

pious in a certain way, seemingly thinking it is of more importance to convert the heathens abroad than to put themselves in harmony with God's Word, and so make themselves able to give a reason for their belief, instead of beginning to propagate error at home and abroad. The matter seems to stand thus with many—if the poor sinner has no immortal soul, then there can be no hell torments, or heaven for him at death; perhaps no personal devil to torment him either, and the hymns sung and doctrines taught in the places of worship and Sunday schools are all upset if it should be proved from the Scriptures that it is not taught there, but only the invention, of a false, corrupt system of theology handed down to us from the dark ages. A few able ministers are rising above these miserable doctrines, and no longer teach them, but it is a very slow process, and people are loth to give up the old ideas, and simply believe that it is possible for God's justice to be satisfied by His destroying or consigning the soul of the sinner to everlasting death as the wages of sin. Surely God's mercy, goodness, love, are abundantly set forth in the gift of His only begotten Son, that none need perish if they will only come to Him that they may have life, in the age to come which is promised to all who love His appearing and kingdom. Surely love is more calculated to draw men to God than teaching never ending torments in hell fire, even if that were true (which can't be proved). However, in any case, it is impossible that the subject can remain quiet in this age of inquiry and search after truth. The various systems of theology are now being tried by God's Word, and all truth seeking men will have the truth and that only. The new version of the New Testament is a help in the right direction. Respecting Hades (hell), the soul, the marginal readings are very useful. I hope those who have read the corres-pondence will not rest satisfied short of the whole truth on the subject, and I shall be always ready to help such in their search of the Scriptures, which are our only safe guide, and, like the Bereans of old, we should search them and see whether these things are so. In conclusion I should be glad to arrange for a discussion of this all important subject at any time. Thanking you for your insertion of this,—I am, yours respectfully, JOE HEYWOOD, Green street, Huddersfield, October 4<sup>th</sup>, 1881.

(November 1881) PONSONBY, AUCKLAND.—Bro. McKillop writes:—"Since I have been in this country my time has been a continual struggle against the "free life" theory. You may guess with what pleasure I read of the immersion of David Handley. Mr. Brown here confesses to having received the theory from him, and since I have been here he has delivered four lectures in favour of it. The Slain Lamb with Questions and Questions, however, have done good service. The truth in its purity has again got a footing in Auckland. Last Sunday nine of us met for the remembrance of the manifestation of the wisdom of God in the condemnation of our destroyer, ancestral sin, in the flesh of Jesus of the seed of David. Brother Binns, who was the first to discover the deception of Mr. G. Brown, has returned to his old standing, and is now meeting with us. We have also the addition of two more who, after a very intelligent confession of the truth, were immersed by Brother Wither, in the Waitemata. Their names are MARGARET OLIVER, daughter of Sister Oliver, whose immersion I notified to you last mail. The other, W. WHITEHEAD, formerly Campbellite, but was immersed into Mr. Brown's Church about seven months ago. He however has never been satisfied that those of Mr. Brown's Church were in the name that saves. His eyes were opened to this through Mr. Brown opposing his re-immersion, by contending that his immersion into Campbellism was as good as any other. These are all 'brands from the browning.' It is Brother A. Andrew, I think, in his articles on Bible marking, who says that browning and burning are both the same. There are one or two yet there—one claiming to be in the same position as Dr. Thomas, while fellowshiping Trinitarianism, immortal soulism, immortal personal devilism, sky-rocket resurrectionism, and any other ism that thinks proper to sit down with them; it is the most thorough Babel in the apostacy; any ism by itself is preferable to this. May they repent ere it be too late."

(December 1881) NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE—We have secured a room in what was formerly the British Workman, Gallowgate, Newcastle. So we shall be more easily reached by brethren coming northwards. I have also to record the obedience of JANE ORRICK (34), formerly neutral, wife of Bro. Geo. Orrick, Carville Gardens, Wallsend. Sister Orrick has had much opposition; her mother, a member of the Salvation Army, told her she would disown her if she should join the Christadelphians.—GEORGE HARKER.

(April 1882) BIRKENHEAD—In addition to these lectures a special effort has been made, owing to the fact that some among those sometimes called Campbellites have, for some time past, been in considerable doubt on doctrinal points; certain of them, in fact, have gone so far as to say that “half of their number were Christadelphians at heart.” The special effort consisted of two lectures by Brother J. Andrews, of Birmingham, on the reasons that had led to his leaving the Campbellites and uniting himself with the Christadelphians. A supplementary address was delivered a week afterwards by Brother Thomas, of Birmingham. I am rejoiced to add that the Liverpool brethren continue to render willing and efficient aid, and the interest awakened some nine months back is steadily on the increase. We continue to have full audiences, composed of most intelligent and attentive hearers, many of whom we hope, and believe, are “not far from the kingdom;” but amidst all this cause for thankfulness, there is one disturbing fact: our landlord (who belongs to the society called “Quakers”) has given us notice to quit. well, so be it, if it is our heavenly Father’s will, although it will cause us much sorrow; but who knows what good may come out of it?—T. N. PARKER.

(April 1882) TORONTO.—Brother Ross reports that the person about whom he wrote as a brother in distress, has turned out to be a swindler. He asks the insertion of the following notice:—“The brethren in Canada and the United States are cautioned against a man, about 30 years old, with a squint, and a slight defect on his nose; who has been imposing on the brethren in Toronto.

(August 1882) BIRKENHEAD AND TRANMERE- Brother Parkes reports that during the month obedience has been rendered by the following: WILLIAM EASTMAN (38), formerly Baptist, and Mrs. EASTMAN, his wife, formerly Baptist; also, EMILY ROBERTS, late Campbellite, the wife of our Brother Ezra Roberts. Miss KIRKPATRICK, who was immersed into the sin-covering name some 12 years ago, but who, for some time past, has been meeting separately from the brethren, has been received into fellowship, on satisfactory proof of her acceptance of the truth in its purity and fulness.

“Our landlord (a Quaker) objects to the doctrines taught by the brethren, and has, therefore, given us notice to quit, which expires at the end of August. We do not at present know of another suitable place of meeting. When first formed, in November, 1878, the numbers were 9. We did the best we could up to June, 1881, when our numbers amounted to 25. In that month the Liverpool and other brethren agreed to assist in the proclamation of the truth, and the gratifying result has been an addition during the twelve months of 23, bringing our total number up to 48. We mention these additions with grateful hearts, ascribing all the glory to God, yet sorrowing our efforts must now be discontinued.”

(October 1882) LEICESTER—The discussion referred to last month duly came off on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday evenings, Aug. 28<sup>th</sup>, 30<sup>th</sup>, and Sept. 1<sup>st</sup>, the subjects taken being “The Immortality of the Soul,” “Eternal Torments,” and “The Trinity,” so worded that Brother Dixon denied that the Bible taught either of the doctrines, while Mr. R. McKenny, a missionary of the Reformation Society, and connected with Christ Church in this town, affirmed that it did. The chair was taken each evening by Brother T. Weston. Our hall was full each night, and considerable attention was displayed to what was advanced by both disputants, although it was very soon evident that by far the greater portion of those present were on the popular side. Mr. McKenny is a very able and fluent speaker, and said what he had to say, although comparatively young, with force and power; but while being possessed of considerable skill as a debater, he lacked argumentative and reasoning power, for when driven to the logical issue of what he advanced, and sometimes quoted, he very cleverly evaded the point often to the amusement of his audience, who were tickled at his attempted witticisms. He very often courted applause, and appeared to be abundantly satisfied when he received it. Without entering into particulars of the lines taken by both speakers, some idea can be gathered of how this gentleman met what our brother advanced, when I say that he made a very special study of quoting passage after passage, that contained particular words, such as “spirit,” “perish,” “destroy,” “consume,” and the like, irrespective of qualification or degree, for the



purpose of reading them, as he said, “through Christadelphian spectacles,” with the sole object in view of holding them and us up to ridicule, and so turn what he considered the argument against his opponent. For example, the passage “The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death,” he read, “The last enemy that shall be annihilated is annihilation,” branding it at the same time as “unqualified nonsense,” and truly so, only in a very different sense to that meant by him, simply because he does not, or would not, understand in what sense we use the terms. During the progress of the first two debates, as a matter of course, the well-known and equally well thrashed out arguments and passages were brought under contribution; but explanation of them was simply out of the question, for he would not admit of anything that in any way conveyed a different idea to what he wanted conveyed, and when Bro. Dixon ventured to appeal to the Old Scriptures he was met with “Oh! That is a gloomy utterance of an old Testament Saint spoken in a moment of depression, which we must not accept as necessarily inspired, because we, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, have more light on these subjects than ever David, Job, and the rest of those old worthies had,” a statement which, it is needless to say, Brother Dixon combated in a most impassioned and eloquent manner. In the questions, which occupied 30 minutes each evening (15 minutes each), Mr. McKenny demonstrated considerable skill, not in answering them but in evading them, a procedure which met with many signs of disapprobation from the audience. On the last night, when the doctrine of the Trinity was under discussion, Brother Dixon severely catechised him on the nature and office of Christ as to his being very God of very God, etc., etc., and whether it was God Almighty that died upon the cross, which, after some hesitation, Mr. McKenny answered that it was the “man” that died, but did not attempt to explain how and why, so as to reconcile this statement with his former utterances on the point, beyond saying that the Lord had two distinct entities or natures—“one God and the other man,” and that he knew everything as “very God;” but at the same time, because he was the “Son of Man,” certain things were withheld from his knowledge. For instance, when Christ spake of certain things which only the Father knew, it was the “man” Jesus speaking, an assertion with which Brother Dixon dealt with considerable force. Again, we are to understand that when Jesus said, “My Father and I are one,” it was Jesus, the mighty God, speaking; but when he said, “My Father is greater than I,” it was the “man” who spoke, and not the second person in the ever blessed Trinity, etc., etc. This system of interpretation which Mr. McKenny very freely indulged in—in fact, as often as it suited his purpose did he thus distort the written word, a proceeding which was just as freely denounced by his opponent. The brethren generally are very well satisfied with the defence made, and rejoice that the truth has been so admirably set forth. The rest we are content to leave to God, who alone can give us the increase of our labours. But interest has certainly been aroused. The first two debates were briefly reported in the local papers, and a paragraph, containing less of truth than gabble, has also found its way into the *Rock*. Several letters have also appeared in the press, and are appearing, both upon the discussion and other matters, in which Mr. McKenny and some of the brethren are interested. Another debate is to take place on Wednesday evening, September 20, arising out of the one on August 30, between a Calvinistic Baptist and Brother Dixon, upon the question of “Eternal Torments,” this gentleman deeming this doctrine to be both in accordance with Scripture and Christian experience. We have ceased the open air meetings for this year. It was out of these that the late discussion arose.—F. S. HERNE.

(December 1882) FALMOUTH—The distribution of *Finger Posts* in this town has brought the truth more prominently before the public, and with it the denunciation of some unknown person; it will, however, I hope, be the means of doing good, as I have had several parties applying to me for a copy of the tract, This is what a local paper says:—“An infidel tract has been put into my hands which was given to a young woman by a man who was distributing them to the people at the door of a Falmouth preaching-place on Sunday evening last. The tract is called, ‘Future Life. What to be. When to be. Where to be,’ and it has no printer’s name affixed to it, or publisher’s either. Its false argument is that the spirits of the departed good do not ascend direct to heaven. Here is one of its paragraphs word by word:—‘David, then, ‘not having ascended into the heavens,’ but having ‘gone the way of all the earth,’ is wholly dead, *body and soul*, (the soul is nowhere affirmed in the scripture to be immortal, or to, have a separate existence from the body), and he remains in the dust until the day of resurrection.’ The italics are not mine; they are

in this foul publication. Now, is not this the work of the devil? I shall only quote another sentence, or so, which surely seals the fate of this wicked paper. 'It is manifest then, that the Gospel of the Bible and the Gospel of the pulpit are two different things. It is nowhere declared that Christ came to save immortal souls.' Shameful! And I roll my heaviest anathema upon it. My Mems cannot pass by such an abomination as this. Can nothing be done to hinder the distribution of such foul infidel literature at chapel doors? Should such a base sheet as this have fallen into the hands of any of my readers, my urgent advice is that without delay they imitate the example of a dear old heaven-going friend of mine—poke them in between the bars of the grate and burn them. Yes, burn them at once to ashes." Letters have been sent in answer to this, but the Editor refused to insert them. Some of the people suggest that I ought to be put over the quay. I have commenced to advertise our publications, and hope by this means to entice people to search for themselves.—WM. WARN, Junr.

(Excerpt from January 1883) (U.S.) Brother Gunn writes:—"I had hoped that some of the brethren in America would have cautioned you long ago against Dr. J. H. Thomas, who certainly is not sound in doctrine, and is striving to hold a position in which he can do great damage to the truth—passing as a Christadelphian, and fraternising with the vile 'Restitution,' and the viler 'Investigator' of Montreal."

[We are in a somewhat helpless position with regard to communications from the other side of the Atlantic. The "platform" of the *Christadelphian* (as the Americans phrase it) is well known: and when a man of education addresses himself to us fraternally, and encloses printed productions of his own apparently in entire harmony with the truth, we naturally assume his advances are on the basis of a mutual endorsement of the said "platform." It sometimes turns out that in this we are mistaken. The only remedy is for brethren on the American side (as everywhere else) to use their discrimination when any one approaches them in the name of the truth, and act on John's recommendation to "Try the spirits whether they are of God."—EDITOR.]

(June 1883) LEICESTER- Brother Gamble reports a series of open air meetings in a village called Syston, about five miles from Leicester. Handbills were distributed announcing that addresses would be delivered on Sunday, April 22<sup>nd</sup>, to "prove from the Scriptures that Christ would return to the earth to establish a never-ending kingdom, and rule all nations in righteousness and peace." Brother Jones (who resides in the village) read a chapter, and began to make a few remarks, but was immediately interrupted by a Plymouth Brother, who repeatedly characterised the speaker and his friends as "Deceivers," "Antichrists," and "Liars." The accuracy of these designations was disputed, and the gospel set forth for the space of two hours. The efforts of the brethren were hindered by the beating of old tin pans, and other demonstrations of disapproval and contempt on the part of "certain lewd fellows of the baser sort," and when the meeting was over, they were followed up the principal street by the rabble. During the ensuing week the Plymouth Brother, aforesaid, issued bills, announcing that on the Sunday following he would deliver two lectures against "Christadelphianism." The village was all aglow with excitement, and the occasion was seized upon by the brethren for a further exhibition of the truth, to which the audience seemed more inclined than towards Plymouthism. The tumult subsided, and it is thought there will be no further attempt at annoyance and abuse at other such open-air meetings as it is the intention of the brethren to hold.

(September 1883) MUMBLES-A few days' stay at the Mumbles of the "Rev." W. Briscoe (who has made himself notorious here by his continual attacks on the truth), was taken advantage of by the brethren here, and a lecture was announced on a week night in confutation of his unscriptural theories. A very good audience came together, and at the close a gentleman from Bristol put a string of questions bearing on the truth, with a result of showing, we hope, that the truth enables a man to meet difficulties which would be fatal to any of the orthodox systems around us. On Bank Holiday, Aug. 6, we held our annual summer outing at Langland Bay. The day being warm and fine, and a general holiday, we had one of the

largest gatherings of the kind ever held in the neighbourhood. Somewhere about 130 took tea on the rocks, and after tea we were able to hold a very profitable meeting. There were brethren from London, Birmingham, Swansea, Neath, Cardiff, Llanelly, and Bishop's Castle.—D. CLEMENT.

(October 1883) ELLAND-Brother Riley reports the immersion of MARY ALICE HOLROYD (18), daughter of sister Holroyd; also that of HARRIET STOTT (19), and MARTHA LYDIA SPENCER (32), daughter of brother Spencer. The brethren have taken a hall, capable of holding about 800 persons, and it is intended that a course of lectures be given. At a recent lecture by brother Handley, of Maldon, on "Jesus the Christ, was he God, Angel, or Man?" Daniel Bairstow, of Halifax, was present, and at the close asked a few questions, which were Scripturally answered. The questioner, however, was not satisfied. Some correspondence passed between the Elland brethren and him. It was proposed on their part that he meet brother Roberts for the thorough canvass of the whole question in the presence of both his party and the brethren. To this he declined to accede, but made a proposal of a different character, which would not have admitted of so thorough a canvass of the subject. One of his conditions was that "no report of the meeting or its results, nor any reference to the matter, direct or indirect, shall appear on the pages of the *Christadelphian*."

(January 1884) ELMSWELL (BURY ST. EDMOND'S)- We made the first public effort on behalf of the truth in the above village on Sunday last, the 9<sup>th</sup> of December, when brother J. H. Diboll lectured as follows:—Afternoon—"What is the Gospel? &c.;" evening, "The soul of man: what it is. What it is not;" and again on Monday evening, subject—"The second coming of Christ." Our hall, which is capable of seating nearly 100, was comfortably full, in spite of the inclemency of the weather. Throughout, the attention of the audience was good; indeed, quite exemplary. At the close of the lecture upon "the soul," a leading member of the Plymouth Brethren sect (who had closed their meeting room to come and hear us) rose, and in measured tones warned the audience against our teaching, saying he would take them to record this day, that he was pure from the blood of all men, and to beware of those who had changed the truth of God into a lie. A few questions followed, which were easily dealt with by brother Diboll. At the close of the Monday evening lecture, some questions were raised by others of the same sect (who are strong in this place), but apparently only with the result of needlessly exposing their gross ignorance of Biblical subjects.—While writing this, a poor woman who heard all the lectures, says great excitement still exists about the strange doctrines, and that many of our neighbours are indignant with us, and that such preaching ought to be put a stop to. She replied, what she heard was all out of the Bible, but if it had been Miss Watts (a female preacher here), it would have gone down quite easy. I question it, as her audiences are always prepared for smooth things, in which we may safely assume they are seldom if ever disappointed. We hope to follow up the effort, knowing the issue is with Him who will not allow *His* word to return unto Him void. May it be ours faithfully to discharge the duty which the truth enjoins on all who know and love it.—J. H. NEWSON.

(January 1884) STOURPORT-This, I think, is the first time the name of Stourport has appeared in the *Christadelphian*, at the head of any operations carried on in that town. It is—as many of your readers are aware—a small town about four miles from Kidderminster. One brother (brother Darkes) and his sister wife resides there, and break bread together, not being connected with any ecclesia. No public effort has—as far as we are aware—ever been put forth hitherto on behalf of the truth, but the Kidderminster ecclesia thought some good soil existed in which might be planted the good seed of the Kingdom of God, so they resolved to try a lecture in the place. This having been resolved upon, the Young Men's Association undertook to provide the means for a second lecture, and, to make the effort more successful still, a brother—well-known for his generosity—in our midst, offered to bear the expenses of a third. The services of brethren Ashcroft, Chamberlin, and Roberts were put into requisition, the place placarded, and hand bills and tracts well distributed. The meetings were to be held on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday evenings, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup>, and 21<sup>st</sup>. The first night we had a great disappointment, for a telegram

arrived, not long before the time stating that brother Ashcroft was unwell, and requesting the writer to take his place. There was no help for it, and though exceedingly unwell myself, I had to go. The first night the subject was "The immortality of the soul a myth;" second, "Who are the Christadelphians;" and third, "Why we expect Christ soon." There was an excellent attendance each evening, the audience increasing each night. The inhabitants were quite roused up from their theological slumbers. Each night brought on some discussion, and the third night—after listening most attentively to brother Roberts's lecture—the pentup passions of a considerable portion of the audience burst forth. One exceedingly ignorant old man made himself ridiculous in the eyes of the thoughtful portion of the audience. He was a Primitive Methodist, and dearly clung to the "fire and brimstone" belief. The "Rich man and Lazarus" was evidently a favourite portion of the word with him. He declared he would "preach hell and damnation to the lot of us," and he was well nigh irrepressible. There were evidently many of the "baser sort" present, who even resorted to threats towards some of the brethren. Well, we believe, notwithstanding all this, that good has been done, and the matter has not ended yet. The Baptist preacher attended the whole of the lectures, and has commenced a series of four sermons in reply. These are being duly reported. The first, on the Immortality of the Soul, is a most tame affair, containing a considerable amount of misrepresentation. We have resolved to give four lectures in reply, the first and second weeks in January. The man is evidently not so discreet as the occupants of the pulpit generally are. He thinks, perhaps, that he will snuff us out. He might as well try to mop up the ocean. The result, of course, must be left with God, but we are hopeful, very hopeful, that some good will result from our united efforts, for in the next effort, we shall have the financial support of the Bewdley brethren, and also the brother at Stourport.—J. BLAND.

(March 1884) CINDERFORD—A considerable stir has been caused in the neighbourhood of the Forest of Dean by a newspaper correspondence which has been carried on for eight months, and which arose from an outdoor lecture delivered at Cinderford last summer by bro. J. J. Bishop, of Birmingham. A discussion took place at the close of that lecture, and the meeting was reported in the *Ross Gazette*, with a brief review of the arguments advanced on both sides. Bro. Bishop was described as "a vagrant spouter," and "a wandering star" from the midland metropolis. The next week, a clergyman who was present sent a letter to the *Dean Forest Mercury*, to which bro. Bishop replied, and as also to other disputants, whose letters appeared in the columns of the paper. Finally, in the early part of November last, Mr. T. C. Nichols, of Nottingham, came upon the scene with a scurrilous letter throwing out an indiscriminate challenge to debate. The brethren advertised a pamphlet in answer to Nichols' "Words of warning," which brought a second letter from Mr. Nichols, in which he bid defiance to "the entire host of the Christadelphian camp." Brother Bishop had written accepting the challenge, and his letter of acceptance appeared in the same issue. Mr. Nichols was evidently taken by surprise at this acceptance. Feeling the awkwardness of championing orthodox teaching, of whose thorough unscripturalness he must be aware, he tried to retreat by proposing that brother Bishop should affirm to a proposition which he knew bro. Bishop could not accept. Several letters were published on both sides, brother Bishop trying to get him to stand his ground, but without success. Ultimately, Mr. Nichols retired, saying that whatever Mr. Bishop might say or think of him, he declined any further correspondence.—Arrangements were then made to give a public answer by lecture to the misleading statements that had appeared in the correspondence. The Town Hall was secured for February 4<sup>th</sup>, when brother Bishop lectured on "Christadelphianism—a review of the correspondence." An audience of between three and four hundred people attended, who enthusiastically received the avowal of our intention of contending earnestly for the faith. After the hall had been taken for the purpose stated above, Mr. Samuel Jackson, of Derby, a friend of Mr. Nichols, wrote endeavouring to justify the retreat of his friend, and expressed his readiness to meet brother Bishop if he would take the affirmative to a proposition he had formulated. This was accepted subject to a slight alteration, and the arrangements are now in progress between the brethren and Mr. Jackson's committee.—The debate will take place at Cinderford, and will probably last four nights. The first two dates suggested by the committee, are March the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>. The interest the public feel in the matter is indicated in a letter published in the *Dean Forest Mercury*, in which it is said that a public memorial is in

process of signature, requesting that the debate may come off in consequence of the high state of interest caused by the correspondence.

(April 1884) LLANELLY-Bro. Green reports that the proclamation of the truth in this place by brethren W. and D. Clement, assisted by brethren Tucker, Davies, and Jones, still continues. The attendance is not now so good. The curiosity which always accompanies its first proclamation having died away. Still we have a very good number of constant attendants, several of whom are interested. Our number has suffered by the removal of brother Wm. Phillips to America (LONG BRANCH, New Jersey), about 36 miles from New York. Brother Green says:—"If there are any brethren there, we hope they will kindly look out for him. God willing, he will be at his destination about the 1<sup>st</sup> April. Bro. Phillips is by trade a painter, &c., with a little business of his own. Since leaving a very rich Baptist Church (where he was a member), and joining us, he has lost all his good customers and trade, hence comes the necessity of removal to procure the bread of this life. If he stays there, sister Phillips will follow him before the end of the year."

(July 1884) GRAVESEND-A course of Lectures has been given on Sunday afternoons in the Bat and Ball Field. The first and second were by Brother G. F. Thirtle, and the third by Brother Dunn. All of them were attended by apparently appreciating audiences. Several of the "conditionalists" were present at the last. Brother Dunn met with a little opposition from a deacon of a strict Baptist community, who had come to "discharge his conscience" (as he termed it), by telling Brother Dunn "you don't know what you are talking about." The people were unanimous in their disapproval of his interruption; even a member of the white-neck cloth fraternity reproving him for his "unseemly behaviour." The weather being unfavourable just before Brother Dunn's lecture, I ran up to the house connected with the field, and took the liberty to ask the landlady if we might have the use of a large room that is in the field, and which is used for picnic parties. The lady consented at once, got a broom and ran down with me and helped to put it in as good order as we could in so short a time, saying, "If I had only known it yesterday I would have had it all straight for you." The lecture which had been advertised to be in the open-air, was held in a room comfortably seated. And as there is nothing lost by asking, I took the liberty (while thanking her for her kindness) to ask if I might expect the same favour in the future? To which she replied "O yes, and welcome." It seems almost too good to be true Other lectures are arranged for.—C. HOPPER.

(Excerpt from September 1884) CARDIFF-Bro. G. A. Birkenhead reports another addition to the number of the brethren in this place, by the immersion, on July 30<sup>th</sup>, of THOMAS GOODALL (31), formerly connected with the Plymouth Brethren. After bro. Goodall had become acquainted with some portion of the truth, he introduced the matter at the meetings of the Plymouth Brethren. The result of which was, that both he and his brother were excommunicated, and a resolution was passed at one of their meetings that they would not have anything more to do with the Christadelphians. There are hopes that other members of bro. Goodall's family will be associated with the truth before long.

(Excerpt from September 1884) CINDERFORD-Bro. Worgan states that a man calling himself "bro. Dyer" called upon the brethren here in May last, representing he had come from Frome, but wanted to get to Swansea, where he had a prospect of work, to which, however, he lacked means to pay his fare. The brethren ministered to his need in the matter: but on writing to Frome, ascertained there was no brother of that name there. It is, doubtless, our old friend, the impostor, who changes his name according to the exigencies of his need. The brethren suggest a travelling card, to be shown by brethren on the wing: but this would be no protection. It could be imitated. The only plan is, for travelling brethren to be armed with letters of introduction, failing the possession of which, the brethren visited should ask reference, and wait the result, in case of suspicion.

(September 1884) LEWISHAM-Brother Guest is making the most of an opportunity that has presented itself in connection with the commencement of a local monthly paper. To this paper, he sent a copy of a

letter he had addressed to 25 clergymen of Lewisham, asking them for **Scripture proof of the clerical doctrine** “that every man and woman has an immortal soul destined to live for ever, in happiness or torment.” The editor published and commented on this communication, and, pointing out that the question affected them all, advised everyone to put the same question to their “vicar, minister, curate, or priest.” He, at the same time, intimated his intention to address the same question to several well-known leading London clergymen, and publish the result. Of this, more is likely to be heard, as the Archbishop of Canterbury has responded—in a letter marked “private,” to be sure, but still intimating a disposition, in certain circumstances, to discuss the question in a written form.

(September 1884) NORMANTON—On Sunday afternoon, July 20, Mr. Leathley, the Local Board clerk referred to in my report of last month, gave an address in the Market-place, against the truth. Brother Chadwick, of Leeds, at the conclusion of the address, entered into a short discussion with Mr. Leathley, and proved conclusively, to all willing to accept the Scripture testimony, that souls can be destroyed, a principle of our belief which Mr. Leathley had been trying to show to be erroneous. In the evening brother Chadwick lectured on “Where are the dead, and what are they doing?” A few questions were asked and answered at the conclusion of the lecture. On Sunday afternoon, July 27, Mr. Leathley made another attempt to deal with what he calls “The fallacies of Christadelphianism.” *Twelve Lectures* was chiefly the object of Mr. Leathley’s sarcastic remarks. Brother Z. Drake, of Elland, made good use of three alternate periods of ten minutes each, to expose Mr. Leathley’s illogical treatment of the Scriptures. In the evening, brother Drake replied to Mr. Leathley’s address of the previous Sunday afternoon. Mr. Leathley got up at the close, and complained that brother Drake had occupied all the evening, and must now hurry away to catch his train, thus leaving him (Mr. Leathley) no chance of replying. He thus taunted brother Drake with wanting to run away. Brother Drake then proposed public discussion for as many nights as Mr. Leathley pleased. Mr. Leathley replied that he did not think it worth while to trouble himself about brother Drake, but would prefer dealing with the author of *Twelve Lectures*, whom he styled “The great apostle of Christadelphianism.” Brother Drake then proposed Mr. Leathley to discuss the merits of *Twelve Lectures* with brother Roberts himself. Mr. Leathley, however, said he should pursue his own course in dealing with Christadelphianism, and exhibited unmistakable evidences of his utter disrelish of the idea of a face to face conflict with the writer of *Twelve Lectures*. Bro. Drake did not fail to point out to the large number of people present, Mr. Leathley’s preference for fighting bro. Roberts behind his back. On Sunday, August 3<sup>rd</sup>, bro. Z. Drake occupied both afternoon and evening in criticising Mr. Leathley’s address of July 27<sup>th</sup>. In the afternoon the audience were somewhat impatient while Mr. Leathley’s strictures on *Twelve Lectures* were being dealt with, but in the evening quite a contrast to this obtained. Bro. Drake’s examination of the passages quoted by Mr. Leathley in support of his views kept the audience in a state of the greatest interest and attention. On Sunday afternoon, August 10<sup>th</sup>, Mr. Leathley again attended, and gave a further address on “Christadelphian Fallacies.” Bro. Drake was again present, and entered into a little discussion with Mr. L., when he had finished his pitiable effort to upset the truth. In the evening, bro. D. lectured on “The Kingdom of God not a kingdom in the skies, but a kingdom to be established on the earth, at the return of Christ.” Great interest was manifested throughout. Thus far large numbers have attended our out-door lectures, and several are looking into the things of the truth.—GEO. DOWKES.

(October 1884) LEWISHAM—Bro. Guest is following up the opportunity referred to last month. The local monthly, *Lewisham Opinion*, publishes a letter addressed by him to the Archbishop of Canterbury, furnishing the definition of terms asked for by the Archbishop, and imploring him in his “exalted position and learning,” to settle the subject of human immortality once for all by bringing to bear that scriptural knowledge which he is presumably able to afford, and consenting to the publication of his reply for the general benefit. The Archbishop’s reply is a refusal to discuss the question in a newspaper. Bro. Guest has meanwhile turned in other directions.

(September 1885) Newport (Mon.)—Brother Allen reports that obedience has been rendered by Mr. HOLDER, formerly neutral, also Mr. LANDER, brother in the flesh to bro. Lander, lately removed from Cinderford. The brethren are making a sturdy war against all false teachings and teachers, and in consequence, are meeting strong opposition. Not satisfied with getting from 20 to 30 strangers indoors, they made up their minds to go out of doors to the people; the result has been quite a stir. At the last open-air meeting (at a place about the centre of the town, where the Salvation Army have their open-air meetings), brother Thomas was the speaker, and he was handled somewhat roughly, not by roughs but by professed members of the different religious denominations. They tore *Finger-posts* out of his hand and tried to take his Bible from him. Next day brother Thomas was summoned to appear before the magistrates for obstructing the thoroughfare, but the case was dismissed.

(December 1885) Falmouth.—We have recently had three lectures delivered in the Town Hall, one by Brother A. Andrew and two by Brother A. T. Jannaway, both of whom have been here spending their holidays. Each lecture was well attended and listened to very attentively. We wait in hope and keep the Truth before the people by meeting together each first day of the week, for breaking of Bread, and reading, and studying the Scriptures. A short time ago, we were called upon to stand to our conviction of the Inspiration of the whole of the Scriptures by an alien, who tried several arguments for about two hours to make us shift our ground. Had he been able to do so, our positions would have been taken from us one by one, and we should ourselves have begun to doubt whether we had not put our faith in God in vain. We have also been visited during the summer by brothers Guest (London), Hosking (Devonport), Purser and H. Clements (London), W. Osborne (Tewkesbury), and J. M. Evans (Swansea). Sister Jannaway also accompanied Bro. Jannaway. We have been compelled to withdraw from Bros. Peters and Tonkin, for refusing compliance with the law of Christ respecting voting at elections and continued absence from the table of the Lord.—W. WARN.

(May 1886) Newport (Mon.)—Brother Thomas reports that the brethren have succeeded in getting another room to meet in, but with a renewal of opposition. A brother seeing premises to let with a large room to seat about 150 people, communicated with the brethren, and took the place for 15 months by stamped agreement. The landlord afterwards finding that it was the Christadelphians who were meeting in the room, sent his solicitor to request us to vacate the place. We told him we held the place for 15 months, but that we would talk the matter over with the landlord, and if he could show some reasonable ground why we should give it up, we might do so. But the only answer we could get was, “You shall not meet in the room.” This the brethren did not think a sufficient reason for surrendering, so we intend to hold on. Our prayer is that these evil times may soon be over.

(July 1886) High Wycombe.—Brother Money writes: “We are still striving to hold forth the word of life in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation. We have been holding open-air meetings during the month of May; and we intend, if strength permits, to continue (at intervals) through the summer. We had hoped to have arranged a debate, with a spiritualist upon the ‘Nature of Man,’ but he backed out of it, and has not ventured to put in an appearance since. We earnestly hope that some who have been interested for a long time, will shortly become united with us in fellowship, and that we with them may be found among the faithful at the appearing of the Lord Jesus.”

(November 1886) Longton.—Brother Morton reports a visit from brethren Taylor and Parkin, of Birmingham, a few weeks back, of the former of whom he made good use in the Market place, along with brother Bullock and himself. The subject of death was selected, in consequence of an unexpected encounter on that subject, a fortnight before, with a Mr. Leonard Weaver, an evangelist. This man had asked brother Morton to meet him at a stated hour, at the van, in the market place, from which he was preaching. The invitation was given in such a way as to make the impression that his object was private conversation, but when brother Morton got there, there was a numerous audience, and he was asked to the

platform. For this he was not prepared, yet had he refused, he would have been branded as a coward, so he went up and did the best he could. He stated his position, Bible in hand. Some of the audience yelled at them like wild beasts. He asked them for Bible proof for the doctrine of the immortality of *the soul*. In response, some with frantic shouts called out 'I believe in the immortality of the soul.' This was followed by torrents of abuse, bursting out so violently and sudden, that for the moment brother Morton could not proceed, and for a few days suffered severely from nervous prostration. Afterwards bro. Morton wrote one or two of those who were so loud in their denunciations calmly, putting the truth before them but except in one instance, he did not receive a word of reply. At the lectures given a fortnight afterwards, although permission was given for questions, not a question was asked and the meeting was most orderly. Two thoughtful men called the following day and asked brother Morton to write out a few main propositions for their consideration in contrast to the general teaching. Brother Morton placed some literature in their hands. Some are now willing to listen to the truth. Brother Morton adds: "We spent a Sunday at a farm-house some miles away where we met with two ladies deeply interested, who kept us with open Bible for four consecutive hours with an intelligence and an earnestness that is refreshing when we contrast it with previous experiences. They asked for some literature, which I have sent to them. I hear that my mother, who is now in her 76th year, has stated that she believes our view, as she terms it, is both reasonable and scriptural."

(Excerpt from April 1887) Boston (Mass).-- Brother Trussler encloses the following interesting clip:—"New York, February 14th.—The New York Presbytery at its meeting to-day adopted resolutions offered by Dr. Howard Crosby, as follow:—Whereas, loose views touching the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures have become current in certain parts of the Christian church; and Whereas, it becomes the Presbyterian church to give no uncertain sound on so vital a doctrine at any crisis when its teaching may be questioned; therefore Resolved, That the presbytery hereby emphasizes the declarations of the confession of faith that 'the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God,' that the Old Testament in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek are immediately inspired of God, and that there is a concert of all their parts."

(The tide of partial inspiration sweeping through the world is compelling even orthodox believers to "declare themselves." What has caught the brethren is merely a back eddy. If it be said, "You are on the side of the orthodox, then?" we reply, "Yes, where the orthodox are right." When the orthodox say, as against atheism, "There is a God," we don't go against them there, because they happen to be "astray" on other topics. So with inspiration.—EDITOR.)

(July 1887) Pemberton.—Brother Rylance writes:—"Will your insert in the *Christadelphian* that we are still doing our best for the spread of the truth, though with little success. We advertise our lectures in one of the principal local papers, with time of meeting, and post the subject with name of lecturer outside. But we are surrounded by bigotry and ignorance, and have little chance. There are hundreds of professing Christians pass the board on which our subject is posted, but they seem too religious to read it. How difficult it is to get the people to be like those noble Bereans who searched the Scriptures daily to see if those things are so. Things now are reversed. The ministers and clergy call their congregation noble if they do not search the Scriptures, but accept all that they say without examination at all."

(September 1887) Longton.—Brother Morton writes: "Since writing you on the last occasion an incident has occurred which is perhaps worthy of notice I told you then that brother Bullock had left this district to join brother Brookfield in business at Blackburn and that I was left alone and felt the isolation much. We have, however, been cheered this last week or two by the fact that we have been able to speak to a large gathering of people who have listened attentively to the truth. Some two or three weeks back, on a Sunday night, we came across a camp meeting being held on Caverswall Common outside Longton We listened to a number of speakers who seemed to revel in fire and brimstone. One more zealous than the rest gave



Psalms 9, 17 as being in Job 14. I said, 'would our friend kindly read the passage he said was in Job 14.' This was taken at once as an attack upon their position, and speaker after speaker poured forth anathema upon our devoted heads. At the close, having filled our pockets with leaflets, we took the liberty of giving some away. This was too much for our zealous Methodists, who took hold of us to put us off the ground. On this nearly the whole audience came to our side, and soon we had a body-guard of stalwart men who defied any man either to insult or put a finger on us. In addition to this, one man—a local preacher, who is a close neighbour, and who has read some of our literature, got up in our defence and said, 'You had better be careful what you do and what you say about this man. You will find he is not an infidel and that probably he knows more about Scripture than all of you put together. I tell you,' said he, 'you will get paid back in a manner you don't like if you are not careful what you are saying, for there is not a parson in Longton dare meet him, and you will find there is an open platform for any of you who will undertake to do so.' This at once drew upon us the attention of the whole audience, who demanded us to speak to them then and there, which we did for nearly an hour. After which they kept us for nearly another hour in questions. The speakers were left to finish what they termed their prayer unity nearly alone. I asked one of them if he would explain the meaning of a passage of Scripture he had made use of very freely. He replied he could not, but said he, 'It is there, ain't it?' 'Yes,' I said, 'it is there, but the meaning you attached to it when speaking is not there.' The result was we were requested to come again. I asked brother Brookfield, of Blackburn, to come and help us. He very kindly did so, when we had two large congregations who listened with much attention—especially at night, as we expounded the gospel of the Kingdom. Some hundreds were present, some of them having come miles to be present. A number offered us their fields or houses to speak in. One said he would pay Mr. Brookfield's expenses if he would come again. By request in the same plan next Sunday, we deal with the subject: 'Man; his nature and destiny.' We trust that some minds will be opened to learn the truth in the love of it. The zealous Methodist said he had been praying it might rain yesterday to prevent the people gathering to hear us. This prayer was not answered."

(September 1887) Sydney.—(*Temperance Hall*, Pitt Street.)—"Since writing last, we have pleasure in reporting obedience to the faith by ROBERT FRANCIS MONTGOMERY, aged 23, plasterer, formerly Church of England. He evinced much earnestness and knowledge in his examination, and now rejoices in the glorious hope of the Gospel, 'which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both *sure* and *steadfast*.' Also a considerable amount of attention has been drawn to the truth by a public debate we have just held between brother J. J. Hawkins and an Evangelist of the Campbellites. The propositions debated were as follows:—"That the Scriptures teach that no Kingdom of God, of Christ, or of Heaven is yet in existence, and that any Kingdom thus designated in the Old and New Testaments existed before Christ as the Kingdom of Israel, and will be restored by Christ at his second coming." "That the Scriptures teach that faith in the Restoration of the Kingdom to Israel, as above described, is necessary to either present or future salvation." "That the Scriptures teach that all the dead are unconscious till the resurrection." "That the Scriptures teach that all those amenable to Christ's judgment seat, who are excluded from eternal life, will be utterly and for ever annihilated by divinely-wielded agency, and that all those who have not heard the Gospel of Christ, and who cannot hear it, 'such as pagans of ancient times, idiots, and very young children,' will never be raised to life." The discussion extended over five nights, with an average attendance of about 500 persons each evening, and was held in the Campbellite meeting house (Christian Chapel, Elizabeth Street, Sydney), the result being that the great bulk of the audience was from among their own people, which was an advantage in some respects, for it was principally with the object of placing the truth before them that we consented to the debate taking place there. On Mr Floyd's part, the object was to convince some of his late members—who have become interested in the truth—of the unscripturalness as he thinks, of what they are interested in. It is, perhaps, needless to say that he failed in this mission, and sig-signally collapsed before the evidence adduced by Brother Hawkins, who at times came upon our friend the evangelist with crushing force. The real pith of the contention lay in the mode of interpretation of the Scriptures. Mr. Floyd adopts the mystical and obviously erroneous process known as the *spiritualistic*, and consequently is involved in a complete morass in his understanding of the *Old*

*Jewish Prophets*, as he so disdainfully styles them. He, however, in his mental conflict would have us understand the Apocalypse in an absolutely literal sense. “The beast, false prophet, &c., to be tormented for ever and ever”—(which we thought shocking for an animal to suffer eternal torments above all other things). Brother Hawkins contended the Bible afforded no evidence for such a process to be adopted, but pointed out that it should in a great measure be understood literally, giving illustrations of fulfilled prophecy from Moses and the prophets, which he said was as much the WORD OF GOD as any other part (Rom 15:4), and which prophecies were expressed in a literal manner; at the same time admitting the usage of symbolic language in the Scriptures, but the literal forms the basis. Brother Hawkins affirmed the several propositions in an able manner, and an excellent opportunity was afforded of laying before the audience a good deal of matter that might be thought over, besides exploding the popular ideas. We trust that the words spoken may some day bring forth fruit unto the praise and honour of our Father’s holy name.”—ARCH. O’TOOLE.

(Excerpt from March 1888) THRIFTY (Brown Co., Tex.).— Brother Wolfe also sends a copy of “charges” preferred against brother Hall by the Campbellite community. They charge him with teaching—1st, “That Christ has never set up a Kingdom;” 2nd, “That Christ is not reigning on David’s throne;” 3rd, “That the promise made to Abraham, ‘that all nations should be blessed in him’ has not been fulfilled;” 4th, “That the law has not yet gone forth from Zion, nor the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem.” The Campbellites say brother Hall puts in the bigger portion of his time in preaching and assisting others to preach in a disorderly way, boring everybody he sees with his heresy, and defying the Church to touch him. This grieves our hearts, he being an old and tried friend, a whole-souled man, and a true “soldier of the Cross.” This last is “a good report of them that are without.” The “Church” would not be enlightened, so brother Hall had to go on to “a more excellent way” alone. Brother Wolfe asks that the subjects of the charges may be treated of in *Finger-Post* form, and published. They are already so dealt with in the following *Finger-Posts*:—No. 51, “Do you understand the Kingdom?” No. 8, “Christ as Heir to David’s Throne;” No. 55, “The Promised Land;” No. 53, “Jerusalem.”

(December 1895) MUTUAL EXCOMMUNICANTS FOR A LIKE FOOLISH REASON.—The Romish Church proclaims itself to be the only true Church, and allows to no Church that remains outside its pale the right to an existence. The Eastern, or Greek Church, which was severed from the Western, or Roman Catholic Communion in the 5th century, in consequence of the Patriarch of Constantinople refusing to acknowledge the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, holds its priesthood to be in the line of true apostolical succession and maintains the perfect validity of its ground of separation from the headship of the Roman see. Then there is the Church of England, which has likewise disowned the Pope’s supreme authority in Christendom, but nevertheless grounds the validity of its “orders” on the assumption of its inheritance of apostolic virtue from its original connection with the Roman hierarchy. Though differing widely in their articles of faith and modes of worship, these three ecclesiastical communions are alike in this, that they regard the Apostolic succession of their priesthood as the criterion of their being the true Church.—J. P. R.

(April 1896) NEWPORT (MON.)—We are sorry to have to report the removal of our young sister Eley from this town to the vicinity of Bristol. We have recently had a couple of blind guides championing the cause of darkness and superstition. They declare we are growing in numbers, and must be stopped. We hope they will not let us rest. We have decided to give a course of four special lectures in the Co-operative Hall, to let the people see what God has spoken.—E. S. SCHOFIELD.

(May 1896) SKIPTON—I forward you a handbill for “Intelligence.” The lectures advertised thereon—(two lectures by brother Wadsworth, of Keighley—C. C. W.)—were got up in reply to two lectures given by the Spiritualists, subjects, “How I Became a Spiritualist,” and “Do Spirits Return to Earth after so-called Death?” The lecturer said in the course of his lecture that he had visited different places of worship,

including the Christadelphians, and put forth certain statements, which, if he had investigated, he would have found to be untrue. No doubt the brethren and sisters will be pleased to know that in Skipton there is one who is looking for the Lord from heaven.—C. IDESON.

## INTERNAL

(Excerpt from March 1866) WISHAW (SCOTLAND).—Bro. R. Hodgson, writing on the 16th of January from this place, says: “I would have settled this account ere now, but I have been greatly embarrassed by two persons who were in fellowship with us. They were in straightened circumstances and applied to the brethren for assistance, and five of us agreed to and did render the required aid, and after twelve months’ assistance they tried to swindle us and partly succeeded, although not to the extent they wished. They have left the place since, and we are happily relieved of their presence. I have several times thought it necessary to warn the brethren of their deceit, lest others should be made victims in a similar manner. What do you think of this? If you agree in this, I will furnish you with their names for the next *Ambassador*. Since I saw you, we have passed through a crisis in the history of the ecclesia here. The Fordycian crotchet was the cause, imported by one of our number. We have been considerably disturbed by it, although the importer of the new Gospel is the only one decidedly disaffected.

(June 1866) PAISLEY.—Brother J. B. NEWLANDS of this place, writing on April 21st says, “Ecclesiastically, we are not in a very good state. An attempt was made a short time ago to introduce an unbaptized person to our communion, which has resulted in dissatisfaction to a number, on account of his rejection. Those who would preserve the truth in its integrity are charged with being “uncharitable,” but these things do not trouble us much. We know that the way of life is not a smooth one, and with the help of our heavenly Father, we hope to fight the good fight of faith successfully.”

An ecclesia must be far gone in spiritual decay, or else has never attained to spiritual vigour at all, when the rejection of an unimmersed claimant to fellowship causes “dissatisfaction” in it. Such an ecclesia had well act on the exhortation of Paul: “Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith.”—EDITOR.

(Excerpt from April 1868) EDINBURGH.—Brother Ellis, writing March 17<sup>th</sup>, says—We have had two friendly discussions with our would-be brethren of Union Hall. The discussions originated by my asking what they meant by the phrase “The Signs of the Times” upon their bills—seeing they denied any times, and consequently could have no signs. The first meeting terminated with no result beyond a clearer definition of our respective positions—James Cameron maintaining that the resurrection of the dead and change of living, have neither time nor sign to indicate when they could be expected, since the days of the apostles. We maintaining on the other hand that these events immediately precede the day of Christ, and that they are connected with that epoch. J. C.’s argument is based upon the notion that the coming of Christ and the day of Christ being distinct matters, the former *may* take place any time, and take away his saints—as in the instances of Enoch and Elijah. The second evening drifted into the same position, which was not very well sustained by J. C., as he had to admit that the last trumpet of 1 Cor. 15:52, and the seventh trumpet of Rev. 11. Referred to the same time; and as a consequence, that a last necessitated others to have preceded; and also a seventh implied that six had gone before. This admission proved fatal to his notion being reasonably held; but whether he intends to hold it, remains to be seen.

(July 1868) ABERDEEN.—We must decline to publish intelligence from this place, so long as those in it professing the truth, identify themselves with the Dowieites by fellowship. When they have taken up a faithful position, news of their movements will be interesting and useful. Till then, we must forbear to

compromise ourselves by co-operation with those who hold the enemy by one hand, while stretching out the other in friendship.

(March 1871) MALDON.—Brother D. Handley, writing Jan. 30, announces, with thanksgiving to God, two further additions to the ecclesia, which now numbers 25. The new-borns in Christ are JAMES SEARLES (40), market-gardener, and JOSHUA DYKES (22). Concerning the first, brother Handley supplies some lengthy and interesting particulars. He was the leader of the Peculiar People in the district. To this post, he was appointed after brother Handley had withdrawn from them on the subject of mortality. Brother Handley frequently assailed him with the shafts of the truth. These, Mr. Searles did his best to ward off for a while, but was finally so far subdued as to confess man was mortal, and ask baptism which he also came to see. His wish was complied with some years ago before the faith was apprehended in its fulness either by himself or the friends who have since progressed to completeness in Christ. This baptism was the break up of the “Peculiar” cause in the neighbourhood. Mr. Searles, however, had a hankering after the old love. He thought the study of the scriptures which took place among those connected with brother Handley, something dry and spiritless, and along with his wife (who had been baptized at the same time) returned to his former friends, thinking to hold on to what new light he had obtained, at the same time rejoicing at what was considered the “outpourings of the Holy Ghost,” among the Peculiar People. He now confesses that he lost the light of the word in proportion as he entered into the feelings of the “Peculiar” meetings. He and his wife felt this at the time, and it caused them to think seriously. They saw that the word of God and the spirit of the Peculiar People did not agree, and that they must either shut the book, or lose the “spirit.” This conflict continued for a time. Finally, a society of “Peculiarists” was formed, about four miles from Maldon, of which Mr. Searles was desired to take the oversight. With this wish he complied, but he got into trouble for bringing out what the people called “Handley doctrine.” Things were in this way nine months ago, when brother Handley attacked him, since which time they have often met with the result of the truth gaining the ascendancy. While progressing in the truth, Mr. Searles brought it out before his people, which has led one to come to Maldon to be baptised, of which notice has appeared. About a month ago, Mr. Searles invited brother Handley to go and speak to his people. Brother Handley went three Sunday afternoons, and brother Lewin went the Sunday before brother Handley’s writing. This has led some of the flock to desire immersion, but at present their minds are not sufficiently in the light. “We hope,” says brother Handley, “that several of them will (if the Lord delay his coming) come on. Brother Searles’s wife sees the truth, and has tried to rest on her former immersion, but I believe she can now see that she was not in the one faith at that time, and will, no doubt, before long apply for immersion into the one and only name wherein is salvation.—Joshua Dykes was formerly a Primitive Methodist. He heard the truth in London, and has been feeling his way for months. He is a sailor, and coming within ten miles of Maldon, of which place he is a native, he applied with the humility of a child, and upon a clear confession of the faith, stepped out of the condemnation of the first man, into him in whom we stand complete, even Jesus Christ, who is made unto wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.”

(Excerpt from July 1870) NOTTINGHAM.—Brother E. Turney, writes May 30<sup>th</sup>, as follows: “You have been made aware of the existence of a ‘reverend’ person named Parry. He has been vaporizing here upon what he calls ‘the great controversy of the day,’ viz., the discussion in the *Christian Herald*, upon unending torments and the nature of the soul. In the course of his attempts to show the people of Nottingham and the correspondents of the *Christian Herald* were all wrong upon these subjects, he was pleased to advertise Christadelphianism as a damnable heresy, and made some attempt to review some of its publications. His own people affirmed that he proved nothing, and it was remarked that he talked a whole evening without quoting any text save one to begin with. His style was somewhat boisterous and even uncouth. While this was going on, I was absent through ill health, and being called to Grantham. Some thought it advisable to attack his reverence, but that did not square with my judgment. After twice challenging him, before a full house, on the occasion of the Dr.’s lectures, I felt it no part of my duty to pursue him to his own cynical habitation where he was enjoying the sound of his own voice,

uninterrupted by that of the enemy. I felt under a compliment to him for spending money in publishing the Christadelphian names, but had no intention of spending mine to give prominence to his, for which he appeared so desirous. At length he finished his "course," and informed his flock that it would not do to take up all his time in controversial preaching, but after welding a few connecting links, he should return to the encounter. In the interval afforded, we issued placards bearing the words "*A Defence*," and announcing subjects to be re-examined in the light of the testimony of God. No allusion was made to Mr. Parry, only to the things he had in hand.

(Excerpt from October 1873) BIRMINGHAM. — During the month, the brethren have been subject to considerable turmoil consequent on steps taken to agitate the Renunciationist heresy. Those steps were at first attended by an unexpected degree of success. In the Editor's absence for a week from ill health, a private meeting was convened, to hear Edward Turney, whose long lecture and diagram and prompt rejoinder to some questions put to him (coming from one of such long standing in the faith and in such good reputation for ability and trust-worthiness in the things of the Spirit,) naturally had a staggering effect on the bulk of those present, most of whom went away with an impression, for the time being, that the new theory was the truth, which they accordingly began to advocate. In the following week, the Editor having again to be absent—in Ireland in the service of the truth—they arranged for another and more public meeting, in the next week, in the Temperance Hall, at which Edward Turney was again to expound the Renunciationist heresy. Printed notices were distributed among the brethren, inviting them to be present. On the Tuesday previous to the meeting, which was held on Thursday, August 28<sup>th</sup>, the Editor submitted himself to public questioning by those inclined to believe Edward Turney's doctrine. At the close of the process, the brethren agreed to authorise him to question Edward Turney at the close of his coming lecture. On Thursday night a large meeting came together, many being present from other places, in the expectation that the Editor was to question Edward Turney. This expectation, however, was doomed to disappointment. Edward Turney spoke for nearly two hours and a half, filling up the whole of the time, and leaving no opportunity for questions. The Editor asked to speak, but was disallowed. He then asked Edward Turney, before the whole meeting, to meet him in debate, in Birmingham during the following week. This he declined to do. The Editor then announced that on the following night he would give a lecture in reply to the one which had been delivered. This lecture appears in the present number of the *Christadelphian*, under the title "The Slain Lamb." The effects of it were far beyond the Editor's expectations. Most of the brethren who had been disposed in favour of the new theory, gave way before the testimony adduced, and are now united in the maintenance of the faith. A few only, and these, in nearly every case, such as distinguished themselves in a previous faction, hold on to the new conceit with which, if they desist not in their opposition to the truth, they must be left to themselves by the brethren, who cannot, beyond a certain time of patience, allow their edification to be interfered with, and their position in the truth to be compromised by fellowship with corrupters.

(Excerpt from December 1873) RIVERSIDE (Iowa).—Brother R. J. Jones reports the declension of brother J. K. Speer, as set forth more particularly in editorial remarks in this number, on "Perilous Times." Brother Jones says brother Speer ran well for a time, and was dearly beloved by the brethren. He did not keep pace with the brethren generally, but when he began to teach (after his removal to Claremont) that the assembly of the brethren together, for the breaking of bread, was a delusion of the apostacy, and that baptism belonged to the same category, they could bear with him no longer, "so in sorrow we leave poor brother Speer in his own misguided way."

(The following is from January 1874)

#### DISCUSSION AT MALDON; AND OTHER THINGS

Brother J. J. Andrew, of London, reports thus: “On the 7<sup>th</sup> December I went to Maldon for the purpose of discussing the ‘free life’ heresy with David Handley. The circumstances under which this was brought about are as follow:—two or three brethren in London, who had embraced this heresy, announced their intention of bringing the supposed originator of it to London, for the purpose of propagating it amongst us. Thinking that it would be better to have the question openly discussed before the ecclesia than, to have it talked over in private meetings as in other places, I proposed to meet David Handley before the London and Maldon ecclesias. This was agreed to. The first discussion took place in the early part of November (see Dec. No.), and the second commenced on the above date. Two evenings were occupied in discussion and one in questioning. As the ‘fountain head’ of what is called this ‘glorious truth,’ has been alleged to exist at Maldon, it may be interesting to some to know a few of the principal arguments put forth in its support.

1.—It was admitted by my opponent that Jesus Christ was only partly in the position of Adam before the Fall, that part being in the possession of a free life. When asked for proof of this, John 1:4 was quoted: ‘In him was life; and the life was the light of men.’ The obvious reply that this referred to the Spirit-words spoken by Jesus Christ (John 6:63) was considered as foreign to the subject; nothing but natural life could be seen in it, a life which Jesus Christ had from his birth. So that according to this view, that which was ‘the light of men’ was a physical thing, the life of the flesh; and as this life was as perfect at the beginning of his career as at the end, there was as much life-giving power in Mary’s new-born babe, as in the Son of God at his baptism and anointing! Moreover, if this passage teaches that Jesus had a life free from condemnation, like Adam before the Fall, it follows that Adam had, at that time, as much life-giving power in him as had Jesus Christ!

2.—Of course the existence in the flesh of anything called ‘sin’ was denied; and the conclusion which logically flows from this position was admitted, viz., that Adam was in a condition before the Fall for sin to be condemned in his flesh, and to become thereby a Saviour for others, if such a thing had been needed.

3.—In the course of the discussion it was asserted that Mary was the ‘seed’ of David and the ‘fruit’ of his loins, not Jesus. This was based on the statements in Acts.—‘Of the fruit of his loins. . . he would raise up Christ’ (chap. 2:30); of this man’s seed hath God . . . raised unto Israel a Saviour’ (chap. 13:23). Jesus Christ, it was said, was made of David’s ‘seed’ and ‘fruit,’ but he himself was neither; he was the ‘of.’ Consequently, however, in the course of the questioning, it was admitted, on the basis of 2 Sam. 7:12-16, that Jesus was the ‘seed’ of David, but it was still contended that he was not the ‘fruit’ of David’s loins, and was never in the loins of David. Considering the relationship which fruit bears to seed, it is impossible to see how he could be the one without being the other. But such are the fine-drawn distinctions and quibbles which are made use of by those who have become infatuated with a lie.

4.—It was admitted that Jesus was indirectly a son of Adam (although the author of the *Thirty-two Questions* has affirmed, without qualification, that he was not a son of Adam), but it was contended that he was not a descendant of Adam because he could not be traced genealogically to Adam. To support this, Luke’s genealogy was said to be that of Joseph, not Mary. The fact that the genealogies of Matthew and Luke went through two different lines of ancestors as far as David, was considered no obstacle to such an extraordinary conclusion, though no explanation was given. Matthew expressly states that the father of Joseph was ‘Jacob.’—(chap. 1:16.) If Luke’s genealogy be also that of Joseph, then he must have had ‘Heli,’ for his father in addition to ‘Jacob’ (Luke 3:23): and, as a consequence, Joseph must have been begotten by two fathers, which is an impossibility. A man may have an ancestral father and a begetting father—notwithstanding the assertion to the contrary by the author of the *Thirty-two Questions*—but he cannot have two begetting fathers. The simple explanation of this genealogical difficulty is this:—the parenthesis in Luke 3:23, instead of being, ‘as was supposed,’ should be, ‘being as was supposed the son

of Joseph.' This shows that Jesus was 'of Heli,' not Joseph; Jesus was 'of Heli,' because Heli was the father of Mary.

5.—It was admitted that the Adamic penalty was simply death, and did not comprise corruption (contrary to the assertion of some Renunciationists); but an attempt was made to show that there was a difference between the sleep of believers and ordinary death; Luke 20:38, was quoted to show that Abraham and all his faithful children are not really dead in the sight of God, because they are to live again at a future day; though it could not be denied that the death of the heathen was spoken of as a 'sleep.' It is not difficult to see that if time were to last long enough, such language as this would gradually lead to a belief in sleeping saints having an existence in death.

6.—Stress was laid on the fact that the seed of the woman was not promised until *after* the transgression of Adam and Eve: from which it was inferred that Jesus was not in the loins of Adam at the time he sinned. On the same principle it might be said that Cain and Abel, and through them the whole human race, were not in the loins of Adam when he sinned; for, before the Fall, there was no indication of such beings coming into existence. If this fact be of any value at all, it shows that Jesus was not in the position of Adam before he transgressed; the promise of the woman's seed was based upon the fact that sin was already in the world.

7.—It was positively denied that Jesus was one of the 'heavenly things' typified in the Mosaic law, which required purifying 'with better sacrifices' than animals (Heb. 9:23); but no reason was furnished for excluding him who was the 'body' or substance of the Mosaic 'shadow.'—(Col. 2:17; Heb. 10:1.)

8.—The physical purity of the typical Lamb was considered a strong argument in favour of the physical purity of Jesus Christ. This idea destroys the relationship between type and antitype; and it is contrary to the inspired statement that 'the law' was 'not the very image of the things' in the heavens.—(Heb. 10:1.) The types exhibit, on a lower scale, that which was to occupy a higher sphere; the former were, for the most part, physical; the latter, moral. If both type and antitype were physical, they would be on the same level, and the former would be the 'very image' of the latter. Moreover, the very term 'heavenly things,' or exalted things, applied to the antitypes, would be nullified.

9.—In connection with the last statement, it was asserted that Jesus Christ required no purification beyond the sanctification referred to in John 10:36, and that he was in as fit a condition for believers to be baptised for the remission of sins in his name, before crucifixion as he was after resurrection. The only reason vouchsafed why none were so baptised at that time was, that they did not understand it. If the only sanctification required by Jesus was that which took place at his birth, when he was called 'holy,' then it follows that remission of sins could be obtained through him while he was a babe! This is the inevitable result of a theory which makes a 'free life' the all-important thing in the way of salvation; for the natural life of Jesus was just the same in his first year as at thirty.

10.—Without any proof it was affirmed that Jesus Christ was the same at birth as we are at adoption. In the sense of being sons of God this is correct; it is also true that both are alike physically, that is, in regard to flesh and blood nature. But it is not true in regard to relationship. A moment's consideration will show this. When men become adopted sons of God by immersion into Christ, they are the subjects of redemption, and are, therefore, entitled to resurrection in case of death. If this was the position of Jesus by birth, then if it had been possible for Herod to carry out his nefarious designs, the infant son of Mary would have been entitled to a resurrection! It is said that such things as these should not be supposed. The answer is, that it is only done to show the fallacy of an erroneous theory. It is, indeed, much the same as saying that if Jesus Christ had yielded to temptation, he would have sinned, and been unfit to be the Lamb of God. The fact is, there is not a complete parallel between Jesus at birth and his brethren after baptism;

the latter are intelligent believers of the truth, whereas the frailties of the former were not fully developed, and, therefore, there could not be that intelligence and wisdom in the things of the Spirit which were afterwards—even at twelve years—exhibited by him. This alleged parallel only exists in the imagination of those who place Adam and Jesus Christ on the same level.

11.—The offering up of sacrifice ‘for himself,’ in the age to come (Ezek. 45:22), was stigmatized as ‘absurd.’ It was considered that the ‘prince’ mentioned by Ezekiel could not be the Messiah, because of the statements in Ezek. 45:9; 46:16-18. The first passage simply shows the contrast in the character of the ‘princes of Israel’ in the age to come, and the princes of Israel in the past; the latter were unjust, the former will be just. The second passage is perfectly compatible with the name given to the Messiah in Isaiah 9:6, ‘Everlasting Father,’ or ‘Father of the Age, and with Heb. 2:13: ‘Behold I and the children which God hath given me.’ To deny that the ‘prince’ of Ezekiel is the Messiah is equivalent to affirming that there is one who will attain a higher position on the earth, in the age to come, than the ‘King of kings;’ for in Ezek. 44:1-3, it is expressly provided that the eastern gate of the future ‘sanctuary’ shall be reserved for the ‘prince,’ that he may go through it to ‘eat bread before the Lord.’ This is sufficient in itself to show that Ezekiel’s ‘prince’ is identical with the ‘prince of the kings of the earth.’—(Rev. 1:5.)

12.—Total inability was expressed to see that the fact of Jesus Christ being under the Mosaic curse was evidence of the necessity of his being made under the Adamic curse. For all who are, unfortunately, in such a blind condition as this, we can only hope that they will, in time, obtain that ‘eye salve,’ by which they ‘may see;’ when they do, they will marvel how ‘blind’ they have been. In the course of the discussion a statement of mine that there were contradictions among the ‘free life’ believers was positively denied, but in process of questioning, we came across one, which is mentioned above. If it were worth while the time and trouble, a number of such contradictions could be collected, as anyone who has carefully read what has been in print and has heard them talk, can testify. If, therefore, the dictum of one of their number be correct, this is sufficient to show they are in the wrong.

I was glad to find that there were nearly a dozen at Maldon who have not denied the name of Jesus Christ, and who meet in brother Mann’s house to break bread.

As there appears to be some misunderstanding as to how David Handley came to be immersed while holding his free-life theory, and as I have had some enquiries on the subject, I may as well briefly state the facts. When looking into the truth, he objected to our belief, that Jesus Christ was born under the Adamic sentence of death. I endeavoured to show that this was so, and that he was wrong. Finding that what was said made no impression upon him, I communicated his ideas to you, and asked you to write something in reply, thinking that printed arguments might have more effect than spoken ones. This resulted in the article in the *Ambassador* for March, 1869. That article cleared the matter up to a few at Maldon; or, as David Handley said to me at the time, ‘the women swallowed it.’ Among these were Mrs. Handley and Mrs. Mann, who came up to London to be immersed, as I understood, with the belief that Jesus Christ was born under the Edenic curse; the latter has held fast to this truth from that day to this. David Handley came to Birmingham, and was immersed there the same night that his wife was immersed in London. According to his own account, narrated before our ecclesia last month, what passed between you and him on that occasion, on this point, was as follows:—He objected to the statement in the *Birmingham Record*, that Jesus Christ ‘purchased eternal life by obedience;’ he would rather say that Jesus Christ did not forfeit his life. To this you replied, ‘I think that is a better way of putting it.’ From this it would appear that the impression conveyed to your mind was, that the difference was simply one of words. (It certainly was so. I understood the remark to apply to Christ’s personal sinlessness, as to which we were both agreed: I had no conception that it was meant to convey the Renunciationist idea of Christ’s non-inclusion in our hereditary mortality.—R. R.) For some time after his immersion, I heard nothing from him about the idea, and so concluded that he was clear on it. Even when he did begin to talk about it,



it was with some diffidence, and for the most part, as a physiological question; the amount of scriptural evidence adduced was so infinitesimal as not to make it worthy of being exalted to any prominence. Moreover, there was the hope that time and reflection would make the truth of the matter clear. Until the Nottingham pamphlets appeared, the theory was never set forth in the full-blown manner in which it has recently been exhibited. The idea that David Handley was the first discoverer, in the present generation, of this supposed ‘glorious truth,’ is quite erroneous. It was one of the elements which led to a division among the Plymouth Brethren upwards of twenty years ago. One of their leading writers (B. W. Newton), contended that Jesus Christ ‘was exposed because of his relation to Adam to that sentence of death that had been pronounced on the whole family of man;’ that ‘he had in his nature not only a possibility and aptitude, but even a necessity of dying;’ all that pertained to man’s nature in Mary, pertained to Jesus—its weakness, its dishonour—sin only was excepted. He was in the likeness of sinful flesh; penalties, therefore, of the fall were connected even with the constitution of his human nature;’ this was ‘a condition,’ said B.W.N., ‘out of which he (Jesus) was able to extricate himself, and from which he proved that he could extricate by his own perfect obedience.’ The opposite party, answering to the Renunciationists with us, held that the miraculous action of the Holy Spirit, in the conception of our Lord, removed not only the sinfulness of nature, but the seed of physical corruption and decay which exists in all others, so that in this sense they understood the meaning of the words, ‘That *holy thing* which shall be born of Thee, shall be called the Son of God.’ So far from it being a new idea, it is as old as the apostasy and no older. It is necessarily involved in the popular idea of substitution. And those who, while professing the truth, still believe, show thereby that they have not got their minds wholly exorcised of the wine of the Romish harlot.”

(Excerpt from March 1874) BIRMINGHAM. —To J. S. D., who asks the question, and to all others who by the power of false reports may be led to imagine it is true, be it known that it is not true that the Birmingham ecclesia has offered to “re-admit” those who have embraced the Renunciationist heresy without an abandonment thereof, or that it has intimated that the holding of that heresy is no obstacle to fellowship; or that they immerse or have immersed any who have not confessed that Christ came in the flesh common to men; or that there are any among them believing the heresy and “allowed to remain on the score of prudence.” Reports to the contrary are the misrepresentations of gossipmongers, who seek, by the circulation of such reproaches, to inflict injury where argument is powerless. Presumably, the first false report is founded on the remark made to one of the subverted, that there was no reason why he should not be with the brethren, *if he carried out his admissions to their logical conclusion*; the omission of the second part of the sentence makes all the difference. As to brother Rowley and his family, they made confession of the truth, and expressed their rejection of Renunciationist error, without being dragged through the subtleties of the Renunciationist controversy. When, therefore, they were asked by a Renunciationist busybody if they had been examined about the controversy, they naturally said No: hence the origin of a false report. There are many other false statements being made which we pass by in silence, simply asking friends not to believe anything to the detriment of the truth in Birmingham, without first giving the friends of the truth there an opportunity (by applying privately, if the thing is serious enough to call for it) of stating whether or not it is true. [Compiler’s Note: I put this here because I feel it is the Apostasy from within.]

(April 1874) EAST ZORRA.—Brother James Malcolm referring to the Renunciationist departure in Britain, says: “An apostasy tenfold more ridiculous has visited us in East Zorra, and has riven us in fragments. More than half of our little number have fallen in with the foolish, and we fear, fatal notions of J. K. Speer, and among those who have left us, we are sorry to say, are those who have heretofore taken the leading part. We could not have believed a short time ago, that such a change was possible. The views he holds forth in the tract noticed in the last *Christadelphian*, are, in our opinion, of too ridiculous a nature to be even combated, much more to be believed. It is very evident that the truth with those parties has lost its power. The good seed had fallen in stony places. We are left few in number but not at all discouraged with what has taken place. Why should we wonder at this latter-day apostacy when we look

at the past? Look at our first parents, at the antediluvians, at Israel in the wilderness, and Israel in the land of promise; and when we come down to New Testament times, we see the same tendency to corrupt God's way. A great number were brought out by the preaching of the apostles, but Paul could say, at the close of his career, 'All they of Asia have turned away from me.' John and Peter, in their epistles, bring to light the same state of things. Even down through the Seven Churches in Asia, in Sardis, there was only the few names left. Sin's flesh has manifested itself the same in all past ages. The tendency has always been to corrupt God's truth—to climb up some other way, and not by the door. J. K. Speer teaches we can get into the kingdom without getting into Christ who is the door. He says there is no use of a water birth: that was only meant for the apostolic age. But here he lacks a 'thus saith the Lord.' God left His commandments in His Word to be obeyed; and we are left powerless to alter God's way of giving life. Those who have found another door are thieves and robbers. If baptism is not binding upon us, then is the faith preached by the apostles not binding. The Speerites say all we need is the Abraham's faith, but we say there is none in Abrahamic family but circumcised persons. Abraham had to be circumcised, and so had all his family; none was a Jew without. And, according to Paul's teaching in Colossians, none can be a Jew yet unless they are circumcised with the circumcision of Christ, and that is to be buried with him in baptism, to signify just the same thing, namely, cutting off the flesh—burying the Old Man of the flesh, and putting on the New Man. But I need say no more. The remnant that is left in East Zorra hope to be able to hold fast the faith without wavering."

(August 1874) THE TENDENCIES AND OBJECTS OF RENUNCIATIONISM ILLUSTRATED.— Nearly ten years ago, there was a withdrawal of the faithful friends of the truth from a class, who, for the sake of distinction, have been known as Dowieites, from the name of a leading man among them. The association existing between the two up to that time was what might be called an accidental one, resulting from the first agitation of the truth in the country in 1849, which, presenting in its several aspects different attractions to different kinds of minds, drew them together on a crude and partial basis, and not as a community wholly devoted to the truth in all its parts and obligations such as now exists. The friends of the truth withdrew from the Dowieites for a variety of reasons, principal among which was their parley with the popular doctrine of the immortality of the soul, in the matter of fellowship; their belief in a supernatural devil; their denial that the living and dead, faithful and unfaithful will have to give account at the appearing of Christ; their non-belief in the Messianic character of the psalms of David; the practical destruction of the Apocalypse, in denying its historic bearing and symbolic character; and their fellowship of the world in politics and otherwise. In this withdrawal, Edward Turney took part, declaring in the *Christadelphian*, (then called the *Ambassador*) that he had for some years held a private measure of the Dowieites in accord with what was then set forth in the *Christadelphian* concerning them, and expressing his opinion that "with all their cleverness and versatility, they did not understand the A B C of the truth." What have we now? Edward Turney, filled with rage at the Editor's private rebuke of his carnal ways, wreaks his vengeance by renouncing an important element of the truth; declares that for fifteen years he preached it without understanding it; puts forth all his strength to subvert the brotherhood, fails, except with a few, and now goes to Edinburgh, and makes overtures to the Dowieites, who he knows will eagerly accept any alliance against those who have incurred their hatred for the truth's sake. An Edinburgh correspondent tells us of his presence in Edinburgh for a week, and of his sending for the Dowieites; of his holding a meeting with them; addressing them as "brethren;" apologising for what he had said in past times against them; and proposing they should sink "minor differences," and "unite under one standard to proclaim the gospel to those outside." The result of the interview was the formation of a committee to get up a public lecture by Edward Turney, under the auspices of the Dowieites, at which William Ellis took the chair, on the motion of James Cameron! The facts require little comment. There is a proverb about the dog returning to his vomit. We don't like to apply it, but it seems to fit the case exactly. Edward Turney and William Ellis vomited Dowieism years ago: and now we behold them with their muzzles in the old puddle, lapping the vomited stuff with gusto! The spectacle would be unintelligible but for the circumstances preceding the change. Is it the result of a long and gradually-growing conviction? No. The former, in a single night, and the latter in two days, threw aside a doctrine on which they had dogmatised

for years.—a doctrine involving so many the considerations as to require in reason much thought before decision; and then, without a single attempt at conference with colleagues, within a week of his change, Edward Turney proclaimed his renunciation to the four winds by printed pamphlet, when as yet his brethren in fellowship thought him true and faithful. This was the first intimation of it they had. Fire was scattered in the brotherhood, war against the truth declared, and then an ostentatious proposal for private meeting! And now we have the sequel — another renunciation. Edward Turney renounced the fellowship of the Dowieites years ago, and now he renounces his renunciation, and asks them, with open arms, to come to his bosom; not, we would warn them, for the love of them, but for hatred of others against whom he can use them. They will find the bosom cold when the heat of present hate subsides. The spectacle may open the eyes of some who are being misled to their destruction. As our correspondent remarks, the “free life” absurdity “never formed a cause of division between the truth and Dowieism; and why its acceptance by some professing the truth should lead these back to Dowieism, is not by any means clear.” In this proposal of marriage with Dowieism, Renunciationism is inconsistent with itself. It began by declaring that the reception of its doctrine was essential to salvation; its coquetry with Dowieism seems a declaration that nothing is essential except the historic faith of the old Campbellites with which Dowieism began. One of the more acute of the Dowieites laid his finger on this inconsistency, in asking Edward Turney how his relation to them would be affected by his re-immersion on turning Renunciationist. The interrogator was told the question would be answered privately. It is an apostolic declaration that “He that biddeth a rejector of the truth God-speed is a partaker of his evil deeds.” Fellowship is saying “God-speed”—receiving into the house. The Renunciationists in fellowshiping the Dowieites make themselves responsible for all their looseness and error, and give the friends of the truth a reason for avoiding them, in addition to their own renunciation of one of the first principles of the oracles of God.—EDITOR. [Compiler’s Note: I put this here because I feel it is the Apostasy within.]

(August 1874) LEITH.—Brother Ker writes to counteract the false impression that the Leith ecclesia has gone over to Renunciationism. He says they had a visit from Edward Turney and William Ellis, the former of whom was allowed to explain his “free life” theory, on the understanding that questions would be answered. He, however, occupied from a little before eight in the evening until about twenty minutes after ten, so that only one or two questions were put, and these under a sense that the questioners were intruding, they being reminded by the lecturer of the lateness of the hour. The brethren were afterwards surprised to learn from TWO different towns visited in the same way, that the Leith ecclesia was reported to have received the “free life” ambassadors with open arms, in a way to convey the idea that they endorsed the doctrine propounded to them. “The reverse,” says brother Ker, “is the fact, a single proof of which may suffice. One of our number, who had previously shown a slight disposition to sympathise with Renunciationists, rose to his feet at the end of the forenoon meeting, on Sunday, July 5<sup>th</sup>, announced that he wished to withdraw anything he might have said in favour of the Turney doctrine; that he saw he had been misled, and further, that he never had seen so clearly the fallacy of the arguments used in support of the new theory, as he had done since the visit of Turney and Ellis. Their visit, therefore, has done us good, but in a very different way from that represented. We have not a single Turney sympathiser now, far less accepting as an ecclesia their scheme of “free life” redemption.” Brother Ker adds a few remarks by way of answer to the arguments presented to them, but they are unnecessary, and only help to give importance to that which is unworthy of attention.

(September 1874) GALASHIELS.—Brother James Alexander says: “I write to give a flat denial to what Messrs. Turney and Ellis said about me on their visit to Galashiels. I did not say that I did not believe in the doctrine of sinful flesh, for I have believed it for eleven years, and do so yet. I did not admit that ‘there was great force in some of their arguments.’ I distinctly said that the only argument that had any weight on me, was the one concerning the nobleman, but immediately after it lost all its weight, as I showed brother Bell before I left him. All they have sent me in the way of printed matter has only shown me their reasonings, and the manner of them, which has confirmed me, if possible, stronger in the doctrine of the necessity of Christ coming in our condemned nature. I may say that if the Galashiels report

is a sample of the rest, their efforts in Scotland will be like water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered.”

Brother Alexander describes the “argument on the nobleman,” which is not at all worthy of being called an argument. It is a supposititious case of a married nobleman dying bankrupt, and another nobleman, with plenty of money, marrying the widow, and releasing her from difficulties. This may illustrate what the Renunciationists mean to teach concerning Christ; but is as far from proving that teaching as any fabulous story from a nursery picture book. Illustration proves nothing. Parables are useful to convey, but not to demonstrate a principle. The principle must precede the parable, and not depend on it. A parable, in the mouth of infallibility, is an instrument of instruction: in the mouth of a theorist in straits, it is a blind and a snare. That such an illustration should be used shews the carnal character of Renunciationist conceptions of the work of God in Christ. God is not a man in His ways and thoughts, nor can His work be ever regarded from “a commercial point of view” (!!)

(August 1874) LEITH.—Brother Ker writes to counteract the false impression that the Leith ecclesia has gone over to Renunciationism. He says they had a visit from Edward Turney and William Ellis, the former of whom was allowed to explain his “free life” theory, on the understanding that questions would be answered. He, however, occupied from a little before eight in the evening until about twenty minutes after ten, so that only one or two questions were put, and these under a sense that the questioners were intruding, they being reminded by the lecturer of the lateness of the hour. The brethren were afterwards surprised to learn from TWO different towns visited in the same way, that the Leith ecclesia was reported to have received the “free life” ambassadors with open arms, in a way to convey the idea that they endorsed the doctrine propounded to them. “The reverse,” says brother Ker, “is the fact, a single proof of which may suffice. One of our number, who had previously shown a slight disposition to sympathise with Renunciationists, rose to his feet at the end of the forenoon meeting, on Sunday, July 5<sup>th</sup>, announced that he wished to withdraw anything he might have said in favour of the Turney doctrine; that he saw he had been misled, and further, that he never had seen so clearly the fallacy of the arguments used in support of the new theory, as he had done since the visit of Turney and Ellis. Their visit, therefore, has done us good, but in a very different way from that represented. We have not a single Turney sympathiser now, far less accepting as an ecclesia their scheme of “free life” redemption.” Brother Ker adds a few remarks by way of answer to the arguments presented to them, but they are unnecessary, and only help to give importance to that which is unworthy of attention.

(Excerpt from September 1874) GLASGOW.—Brother Nesbit writes to say that the brethren in the fellowship of the truth now number 44, firmly established in the one faith, notwithstanding recent efforts to subvert them by a personal visit of Edward Turney and William Ellis. Only one declension has resulted—that of John O’Neill. “This is,” says brother Nesbit, “as far as I am aware, the only evil which has resulted, although Edward Turney, serpent like, makes it appear as if it would turn out otherwise. He called upon me (David was in at the time, as is his usual) and remained for about two hours. We cross-questioned him at some length, but were very dissatisfied with his answers; and so far from being favourably impressed by either his doctrine or himself, it was entirely the other way. He talked a great deal about the pleasing reception he was getting at the hands of the brethren, saying they were surprised on finding him at large, and not requiring to be led in a chain by William Ellis, whom he styles his “showman;” and further, that the brethren expected to see a rhinoceros or boa-constrictor. This I find is a stereotyped remark of his. He repeats it on all occasions, as I find from those with whom he has come in contact on his tour. I was struck by the difference in the atmosphere which surrounds him from that surrounding (and I say it without any intention to flatter) you. He has too many “good words and fair speeches” for our taste. Mother, who overheard part of the conversation, remarked, “Oh, but he has a wily tongue, that man.” It was nauseating. Lest he should gather a wrong impression from his interview—mistaking courtesy to himself for favour to his doctrine—I was plain at the end of our conversation. He

told us that many of the brethren had not understood his writings. I said, “what you have stated to us now is what I have always understood you to teach in your writings upon the subject.’ Notwithstanding our very apparent opposition to his doctrine, he represents us as saying we had heard something which was new to us, and favourably received the answers given, which is simply untrue, if he is referring to the subject of the sacrifice of Christ. It is also untrue what he says about brother Owler. Even the letter of complaint from brother O’Neill is founded on brother O’Neill’s misunderstanding, which I called on him and pointed out. In a letter he sent to me yesterday, he says he will write Turney, and get him to publish a letter contradicting his former communication, and exonerating the managing brethren from all blame; and he further states that the mistake was on his part, in accusing me of “not reading to the ecclesia a letter addressed to them which he did not write, but only thought he had done so.” But I will only have bored you with this. There is more ‘sinful flesh’ about it than anything else, so will close at this time.”

(April 1875) ROCHESTER (N.Y.)—Brother Sintzenich, whose communication referred to last month appears in this number with other documents, under the heading “Anti-Renunciationist Documents,” writes again with cheering intelligence. He says that when he and the four others spoken of last month, took the stand reported, great efforts were made on the other side to prevent others following their example. T. H. Dunn was sent for; meetings and lectures were held for a whole month; private visitations were industriously resorted to and carried out with a zeal and determination worthy of a better cause. The result of it all is that the greater part of those constituting the Renunciationist meeting have withdrawn from it and united themselves in fellowship with brother Sintzenich and the few who were with him. T. H. Dunn was subjected to a severe examination by some of those formerly in association with him, and his lame and impotent explanations had the effect of more firmly planting his questioners in the truth. (Nothing puts a matter to the test like a thorough unfettered colloquial interrogation: and there is nothing at which men with a consciously weak cause are so frightened; but friend Dunn seems to have bravely submitted with a result which he would have prevented if he could, yet which perhaps he may himself follow.—EDITOR.) Brother Sintzenich says few now remain to uphold Renunciationism in Rochester, and concerning some of those few, there is hope. He adds: “The agitation of this subject has among other things had the happy result of uniting with us some who were formerly estranged on points of order. This is now harmoniously arranged and the brethren and sisters in this city and vicinity all rejoice in one body as they do in one faith. We thank our heavenly Father for these glorious results. We rejoice, feeling greatly strengthened by the fiery ordeal we have passed through. We meet at present at the house of brother Tomlin, 11, Hudson Street, but purpose to obtain a public hall shortly, when we shall hope to draw forth the two-edged sword of the Spirit and give battle to Gentile superstitions, apostate Christianity, and false Christadelphianism.” Brother Sintzenich supplies the following list of names:

The undersigned have formed an ecclesia, on the basis of Moses, the prophets, Jesus and the apostles, repudiating the heresies taught by Edward Turney, Jardine, T. H. Dunn, and others, *in toto*; believing that GOD was manifested in Jesus in the days of his flesh; and that Jesus (while absolutely without sin in the sense of personal transgression) inherited in his flesh, equally with David, ourselves, and all mankind, the effect of descent from Adam: viz., death, disease, and trouble, (and that therefore when he was offered in sacrifice on the cross sin was condemned in the flesh).

JOHN D. TOMLIN  
ISABEL TOMLIN  
JAMES H. DEWEY  
M.P. DEWEY  
AUGUSTUS J.F. SINTZENICH  
JAMES McMILLAN  
GEORGE ASHTON  
JANE ASHTON

MELNIA CHEENEY  
S.T. McCONKEY  
ALBERT DUELL  
ELIZABETH DUELL  
EMMA DUELL  
Mrs. P. HILL  
Mrs. E. POPPY  
Mrs. COOPER  
Dr. JOHN RICHMAN  
HENRITTA RICHMAN  
CHARLES HUBER  
WILLIAM CULROSS  
SARAH E. CULROSS  
Dr. P.H. SMITH

(Excerpt from January 1876) MANCHESTER. — Mr. H. S. Sherwood, whose suspension of fellowship with the Manchester ecclesia, in connection with the Renunciationist schism, was reported twelve months ago, requests it to be made clear that he does not deny that the Lord Jesus “came in the flesh;” but suspends his judgment on the question raised by the schism in question, believing the Scriptures afford no answer to it.

(July 1876) GRANTHAM.—Brother Hawkins reports the return to the world of John Wright, who after a long process of gradual apostacy, with which the brethren have forborne in hope, has finally through drink and other causes, abandoned the life of godliness.

(February 1877) TEWKESBURY AND CHELTENHAM,—Intelligence appearing in the *Christadelphian Lamp* from these places, at one of which, Tewkesbury, several brethren were under appointment to lecture, application was made to the brethren there, asking whether the appearance of the said intelligence indicated that they considered themselves in fellowship with the Renunciationists, because if that were so, the brethren in question could not feel themselves at liberty to accept the invitation which had been given them. Brother Osborne wrote in reply:—“I know nothing whatever of the paragraph in the *Lamp*, nor of any brother here sending to it. It is a publication I never take in *or see*. Questioned this morning as to the paragraph referred to, Brother Horton did not know of it, and had not then seen it. So I do not think he could be a party to it, whatever it may be about, of which I am totally ignorant. The only other source of it must be brother Medlicott, who is out of town today and to-morrow, and cannot be referred to. I can only guess that he has possibly applied in that quarter for books. I do not think we have a brother with us—not even brother Horton—who has the slightest *doctrinal sympathy* with the Nottingham heresy. The utmost existing is a desire for re-union on the basis of *their return* to the old faith.”

Brother Otter also wrote:—“I am more than astonished; I am in blank amazement. I have *not written* to the *Lamp*, and have not authorized any person to do so, and neither by thought or deed can it be said that I have in any way countenanced Renunciationism. On the contrary, it has been thought that I have been a trifle too bitter against it. I will allow brother Medlicott to speak for himself. So far as I know, and I believe I do know, this heresy is as repugnant to the Tewkesbury ecclesia as it is to the brethren in this town.”—Brother Medlicott afterwards wrote, in a first letter, that he had sent no intelligence to the *Lamp*, and could not understand the question now raised; and in a second (after seeing the paragraphs), that he had privately applied to Mr. Farmer for certain books, and mentioned certain matters as to Tewkesbury and Cheltenham, which were made use of in the *Lamp* as intelligence. The *Lamp* cannot be blamed for

any intelligence sent to it, and to send to Mr. Farmer is to send to the *Lamp*. The mistake is in not standing absolutely apart from all who identify themselves with error that nullifies the truth.

#### CURIOUS CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF THE TRUTH

(November 1878) MANCHESTER.—Brother W. Smith announces that on Sunday, Sep. 29<sup>th</sup>, the ecclesia withdrew from Frederick Leary, *alias* William Entwistle, *alias* Thomas Metcalf, &c., for imposture and villany in general. The case—a painful and a saddening one—forms a very curious chapter in the history of the truth, going to show that imposture sometimes assumes incredible and scarcely-detectable forms, and that previous experience is not always a guide.

Early in the present year, the Editor of the *Christadelphian*, having just returned from a lecturing visit to Birkenhead, received the following letter which was simply addressed: “R. Roberts, Christadelphian Preacher, Birmingham.”

MANCHESTER, Feb. 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1878.

DEAR SIR.—I scarcely know how or why I should address you, but my misery must prove my excuse, and, perhaps, when you have read this through you will pardon the liberty I have taken. In my early days I received a substantial education, but my parents keeping a public house, I unfortunately, became acquainted with many young fellows leading a fast life, and became absorbed in a vortex of worldly pleasures. I lost situation after situation by my misconduct, until at last my friends refused to do anything more for me. I then became worse than ever if possible. I cohabited with prostitutes, and thieves and other bad characters, and thieves became my constant companions, and so I have been going from bad to worse for years. For all this, I could never altogether deaden that ‘still small voice,’ and in spite of Paine, Voltaire, Rousseau, Bolingbroke, Whiston, and others, it would at times assert itself, and at times drive me insane. But whenever I came to look reformation sternly in the face, what could I see before me? A dreary, dark, cold world that I should be flung upon, without character and without anyone to lend me a helping hand. How was I to obtain a livelihood? No! the prospect was too dismal and it was put off to a future time.

At the close of the last year conscience was pressing me to commence the new year with a new and better life; the same struggle was passing through my mind with almost the same effect as before, when, about a fortnight ago, I found myself in Birkenhead. I was then in the midst of uncertainty what course to pursue, when passing the Queen’s Hall something induced me to enter along with others. I could not join in the service for recollection of my early and happy days passing through my memory; but I soon found myself not looking back to childhood, nor to what I might have been had I built my house upon the rock instead of the sand, but looking to the future—What was to be the end of my career? Your words on redemption, however, made a deep impression upon me.

That night the struggle commenced with greater fury than ever; conscience would not give way. “Fool,” it said, “there is no time like the present; know you the number of your days? To-morrow you may be dead.” But what hope can there be for me? I asked “Look at the thief on the cross, the adulterous woman, even at Saul,” it answered. “Though your sins be as scarlet they shall be made white as snow, though they be like crimson, they shall be like wool.” “Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts,” &c. “When the wicked man forsaketh the wickedness that he hath committed and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive.” Then I would look to the world—how black and dreary; who would employ me? How was I to live? I was answered: “When the Lord sent out his

disciples, did he give them money to pay for food and raiment? Yet did they want? Who fed the Israelites in the wilderness? Who fed Elijah by the ravens? Who feeds the sparrows? And is not your soul worth many sparrows? Suppose you suffer, look what the Lord suffered for you—hunger, thirst; had no place to lay his head; deserted by his friends and companions in his misery; betrayed by another and denied by another, and then led to a lingering and painful death; and shall you complain after all you have done to raise his wrath and deserve his chastisement? Shall you not much rather thank him for his mercy in preserving you?”

The struggle with sin was desperate for a time, but I resolved, with the aid of God, to delay no longer. I cut all my companions, and have since rambled through the country in search of employment, but without success. The difficulties which lie before a man who has lost all are unknown except to those who have experienced them: they are, perhaps, the more so in my case as I have no trade, having been a bookkeeper, &c., and am not strong enough for any very laborious employment, although God, who knows the secrets of my heart better than I know them myself, knows that I would willingly embrace any opportunity of beginning an honourable mode of living, however humble or how small the recompense. But, sir, I know not what to do or where to look: there seems no employment of any kind to be obtained. Trade in the country is so bad that if a situation is vacant there are plenty for it. So a person like myself, without character or friends, stands no chance, and I am now at the far end. I have no money, and I have parted with everything except what I stand in, and I know not where to obtain a meal's meat or a night's shelter. Under these circumstances, something has induced me to write to you (I am told you were the preacher) to ask if you can advise me in any way how to proceed. I know not why I should trouble you, but any advice you can give me I shall feel grateful for. You will please excuse me sending this without stamp, as I have not got one nor money to purchase one. I intend to proceed on Monday to Ashton, where a letter will reach me. Yours truly,

THOMAS METCALF.

Please address: ‘Thomas Metcalf, Post Office, Ashton-under-Lyme, till called for.’”

Having received this letter, the Editor felt a difficulty how to decide to deal with it. It might be an imposture: its extreme character suggested that possibility. On the other hand, it was not a usual form of imposture for a man to confess having been a rogue; and it might by possibility be the case of a man desiring to forsake his evil ways, and to walk in paths of righteousness. At all events, it was a case of misery; and it is one of the commands left for the observance of the house of Christ that we are to do good to all men as we have opportunity, even to “the unthankful and *the evil*,” that we are to be merciful, and not shut our ears to the cry of distress; but like the Samaritan of the parable, to help the man whom we find in the ditch. Finally, if it turned out a case of imposture, it was better to be bitten in the doing of the commandments of Christ, than to run the risk of refusing the means of rescue to a man who might avail himself of them if placed within his reach. The Editor finally decided to take the course indicated by this line of reflection, but at the same time to do it in a way which would, while barely giving the man a chance, keep him at a distance till his true character might appear. He therefore—(withholding any address)—wrote him a distant note, in the third person, enclosing a little assistance, wishing him well in his endeavours to reform, but expressing inability to give advice, and the conviction that his return would necessarily be a work of great difficulty. To this the following answer was received:—

45, Emmett Street, Queen's Road,

MANCHESTER, Feb. 12<sup>th</sup>,  
1878.



DEAR SIR.—I received your note enclosing half-a-sovereign, and should have answered it earlier but I thought I should have something better to say than I have. The money enabled me to take lodgings at the above address, and I have been able to obtain two day's employment in a timber yard, but the work has proved too much for me and I have been obliged to leave it. This, however, will enable me to stay here until the end of next week, and if you hear of anything during that time you will, perhaps, let me know. I may say that I have been a bookkeeper and my past life has tended much to weaken me. I shall not object to a situation, however humble, if only I can do it. Thanking you again for your kindness, allow me to add that my real name, which I have now taken again, is William Entwistle, Metcalf being an *alias* by which I have been known, but which I now intend to drop. Yours obediently,

WILLIAM ENTWISTLE.

As the end of the week drew near, the Editor wrote again, sending a copy of the *Lectures*, with the idea that if the man were, as it seemed likely, a true man, it might prove the means of eternal benefit to him. Before committing himself further than this, he wrote to the Manchester brethren apprising them of the case and enclosing twelve shillings, and asking them to call at the address and judge for themselves as to whether they would be justified in giving him the money or not. In his letter to Entwistle, the Editor stated he would be visited. The following letter came in reply:—

45, Emmett Street, Queen's Road,

MANCHESTER, Feb. 23<sup>rd</sup>,  
1878.

DEAR SIR.—I received your kind letter this morning, enclosing silver and stamps to the value of 1s8d. It arrived just as I was thinking what I was to do. Your book did not arrive until this afternoon: and your surmise is true. I have already discovered many things, in looking through it, which have surprised me, yet many of them coincide with opinions that I have long held, without being aware that others held them—and other things which I could never understand, are put in a clearer light; for although educated in the Church of England, I am no bigot; and since the time I commenced to use my reason, I could never conform to all her doctrines; and the present discord in the Church and its leaning toward popery, disgusts me. Yet I doubt not there are and have been as good Christians in the church as can be found elsewhere. Your book, however, interests me much; and I will read it carefully through, for many things which before appeared incomprehensible to me are now quite clear; and I cannot but thank you for sending it. I am sorry to say that I have not yet been able to obtain employment of any kind, although I have tried very hard. I cannot disguise that it will be an extremely difficult matter, but I trust that the Lord will open out a way for me, and that the rest of my life may be spent to His honour and glory. I have waited in all day, expecting the gentleman (named in your letter) to call, but he has not yet done so; probably he may do so later on, or perhaps to-morrow; but as it is now post time (8.30 p.m.), I thought I had better acknowledge your kind letter and book. I am sure I shall be extremely grateful to anyone who can find me employment of any kind, no matter what, if my strength will only permit me to do it.

I am, very gratefully yours,

WM. ENTWISTLE.

There also came in due course, a letter from brother Dixon, stating that he and brother Smith had called at the address and found Entwistle in the position represented: a lodger in a decent house, respectable

looking, tallish, of dark complexion, black beard, sober, quiet and reticent, and apparently educated. They found him reading the *Lectures* and in the conversation that followed, he put many intelligent questions as to what he considered scriptural difficulties in the way of the truth. The two brethren were satisfied that he was no impostor, and leaving the small relief sent, they gave the address of their meeting place and left him. Then came the following letter:—

45, Emmett Street, Queen's Road,

MANCHESTER, *March 7<sup>th</sup>*,  
1878.

DEAR SIR.—I am sorry to say that I have not yet obtained employment. I saw Mr. Dixon last night in the meeting room and he has not yet heard of anything. I shall be glad to know if you have heard of any. This want of work makes me exceedingly uneasy, perhaps more so than it ought to do. I have to-day walked over twenty miles seeking it, but without success. As Mr. Dixon and myself were talking together the other evening, I told him I thought of trying in my rambles to obtain something to do in the way of writing tickets for shop windows, for I feel quite confident I could manage them, and if it only brought me in a few shillings weekly, until something regular turned up I should be satisfied. I have called at several shops but I find that if I must do anything, I must have a stock for them to select from. This, under present circumstances, is quite impossible; but I have made enquiries and I find that for a stock of brushes, cardboard, selection of cards, &c., it would cost about eight or nine shillings, and this I could work up into a stock that I could call on all shopkeepers with.—And having said so much about my present affairs, I will say a few words about the life to come. I intended to write more fully but it is near post time. I will do so at a future time. I have not yet read through your book, but as far as I have gone, I have not only been much interested but greatly surprised. How easy it is to understand the Bible when you look at it in the light of common sense and treat it as you would any other book. In our youth we are taught to twist and distort its meaning, and when we come to the years of maturity and begin to use our own minds and find that we cannot make things meet, is it wonderful that so many fly off to infidelity? Orthodoxy makes Christianity a science which it is impossible for any man to understand, and your work ought to be in the hands of all infidels. In reading the different lectures, objections have come to my mind which you have afterwards dealt with in a way to convince me, and I may have some now that may be dealt with before I get to the end. Your argument on immortality was certainly very startling, but putting prejudice at one side, I am convinced that your argument is the only way we can look upon it. As regards the appearance of Moses and Elias at the transfiguration, I have often wondered whether this has not been an error, and whether it was not *Enoch* and *Elias*, both translated—one before the law and one during the law. Of course it is not very material. I quite agree with your opinions regarding heaven and hell; and I believe the orthodox idea has been caused by the twisting of such texts as Mal. 4:1, and Ps. 37:20, where words such as “burn” and “consume” appear. I have not yet so far found what your opinions are respecting (I was going to say the Trinity, but I find that dealt with to my satisfaction)—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. From some remarks you make upon children, I presume you count baptism of no use to them. I myself could never see how the words “Suffer little children to come unto me,” could be construed into an argument for infant baptism. That it is necessary we cannot doubt as the Lord commands it, but I cannot yet see anything in the New or Old Testament that proves “regeneration by baptism.” As regards the Lord's supper, our Lord says: “Do this in remembrance of me.” How can it be held to be a sacrifice, and what is the meaning of John 6:53: “Eat the flesh and drink the blood.” I see the latter subject (the Lord's supper) is to be dealt with in a lecture on Priests and Priesthoods, at the meeting room here, on March 20<sup>th</sup>, and if I am still here on that date, I shall no doubt obtain some information on the point. I must now conclude as it is post time. Yours very truly,

WILLIAM  
ENTWISTLE.

A remittance to procure materials for ticket writing was the result of this, and was acknowledged as follows:—

45, Emmett Street, Queen's Road,

MANCHESTER, *March 9<sup>th</sup>*, 1878.

DEAR SIR.—I received your letter this morning containing a cheque for £1 and hasten to acknowledge it. I shall no doubt be able to cash it; if not I will apply to Mr. Dixon. I am sure I do not know how I shall be able to repay your kindness. Yours very truly,

WILLIAM  
ENTWISTLE.

Then followed a month's interval, during which there was no communication. At the end of that time the following letter was received:—

45, Emmett Street, Queen's Road,

MANCHESTER, *April 8<sup>th</sup>*, 1878.

DEAR SIR.—I have now gone carefully through your book. It has explained to me many things which I formerly could not understand, and though it has placed others in a different light than I have been in the habit of looking upon them, yet, putting prejudice at one side, it is quite impossible for me not to come to the same conclusion as yourself. Still, there are a few things I should like a little more light thrown upon. My Bible is not a reference one, and though my landlady has two or three, yet none of them contain references: it, therefore rather hampers me in my researches. I Thess. 4:17. This verse seems to imply that at the time Paul wrote this, he expected the second coming of the Lord during his life, or at least during his generation. ("WE which are alive and remain.") If this was so, Paul must have been ignorant of the time of the Lord's second appearing. Yet from other passages, I cannot think it. Compare 1<sup>st</sup> Cor. 15:24–28 with Luke 1:32, 33. Does there not appear to be a contradiction here? In lecture VII. You clearly prove to my mind "then cometh the end" to be 1000 years. Now if Christ is to give up his throne at the end of the 1000 years, how can he reign "for ever?" I have an idea that I have seen this dealt with either in your work or elsewhere, but in looking over it again I cannot find it. Lecture XI., page 301, fifth event. Where is the proof to be found of the "sending away of the unworthy into the territory of the nations on whom judgment will descend?" In the remarks above it is one of the events "already spoken of," but I do not remember it, neither can I find it again. P. 309. Can you tell me where this tradition is to be found? Zech. 14:3. "As when he fought in the day of battle." What day of battle does this refer to? The text is quoted on p. 338. It may refer to Isaiah 63:3, 4, 6, but I cannot, at present, see anything in Zech. To connect them. I think it conclusively proved by the Bible that the saints hereafter shall be princes and rulers; but a difficulty arises in my mind; it likewise proves that the wicked shall be destroyed, therefore there will be no one alive on the earth but saints. Who then are they to reign over? One another? This can scarcely be. I can well understand there being different degrees of honour, but some must be at the bottom of the list. Who are these to reign over? I Cor. 6:3: "Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" seems to imply that we shall be higher than angels. Can you direct me to anything on this point. I fully agree with your idea of

the Godhead, but there is one passage that I have been taught to look upon as proving the Trinity which you leave untouched: "Let US make man." I know the Unitarians have some way of getting over the difficulty, but I have not seen their argument. The original may bear a different meaning. Can you help me? I have always looked upon the baptism of infants as a foolish thing, and am now more than ever convinced of it. Still I cannot for a moment doubt that baptism is necessary to salvation, and that by immersion and not by sprinkling, for which I cannot find the slightest authority, at least in the Bible. I must, therefore, look upon my infant baptism as useless, and as I now, by the help of God, am resolved to lead a new life unto Him, I am very anxious to be again baptised. I intend to mention this to Mr. Dixon, whom I shall also ask respecting the above texts. As regards worldly matters, I have not yet been able to obtain any employment, yet, thanks to your last remittance, I have been able to keep "the wolf from the door." I certainly have not much time for reading or research, for I have to write my tickets at night and sell them during the day. Times are very bad, and I have to work for little, for I am obliged to sell; yet my wants are few, and, thank the Lord, I have been enabled, so far, to keep up my stock and pay my way with a little pinching, and hope to be able to do so (as my clothes are not bad, with the exception of my shoes, which are done and let in water), until something turns up for me, when I hope to be able to repay the money you have sent me—to repay all I owe you is an impossibility. I am, dear sir, yours very faithfully,

WILLIAM  
ENTWISTLE.

The Editor replied that he would answer the enquiries in due course through the *Christadelphian*. Time then went on without further correspondence. Meanwhile, Mr. Entwistle attended the meetings of the brethren; but as the brethren testify, he did so in a very modest manner. He kept himself in the background and left immediately the meetings were over, without giving any one the opportunity of speaking to him. At last he applied for immersion. He told brother Dixon he did not write the Editor of the *Christadelphian* because money always came back in response and he was afraid it might be supposed his objects were sinister. All this helped to strengthen the impression of his genuineness. His examination was all that could be desired, and he was immersed in due course. He wrote the Editor of the *Christadelphian*, stating that it would not be necessary to explain the difficulties he had raised, as they had been satisfactorily removed by his intercourse with the brethren. He also wrote the letter which appeared in the *Christadelphian* August last (page 369), under the title of "From Darkness to Light." After his immersion he became active in the ecclesia, particularly at the week night meetings, to which he brought written notes on difficult passages, and made himself an appreciated contributor to the instruction and edification of the brethren. His supposed slender earnings from ticket writing were meanwhile supplemented by a weekly allowance from the brethren till he should get a situation. That the case should turn out bad seemed impossible. But so it did. It was arranged for the Editor to lecture in Manchester in the last week in September. On his arrival, the Editor was rejoiced to be informed that "brother Entwistle" had obtained a situation as collector for Howe's Sewing Machine Co. at £1 a week, and would only have three days' work in the week. It seemed exactly the thing. He was to begin the following week. There had been a little difficulty in procuring the situation, however. A deposit of £25 had been demanded as security and at first "brother Entwistle" had given up all thoughts of it. A week after, however, he mentioned that his "landlady" (who had taken an interest in him) had offered to find half the money. He said he did not wish the brethren to find the other half. He merely mentioned the fact in case the brethren should afterwards blame him if he did not do so. The result was the brethren raised the amount £12 10s. among them, to be returned when he should leave the situation. On receiving the money Entwistle wept, and said it cut him to the heart to be the subject of so much kindness after having been such a wretch.

Just previously he had been away from Manchester for a week. His explanation was that he had fallen into conversation with a shopkeeper, on the truth, and found him a believer in the Hine Anglo-Israel theory. He combatted this theory with such effect that the gentleman offered to pay his expenses if he

would go up to London and have an interview with some of his friends who were also believers in Hineism. Entwistle consented and went, had the interview, and afterwards wrote a series of letters in refutation of Hineism, to the principal member of the group, with the result of eliciting a letter from that gentleman (which he showed to the brethren), imploring him to write no more letters. He handed over what purported to be copies of the letters to bro. Dixon, with permission to do as he liked with them.—Bro. Dixon showed the documents to the Editor of the *Christadelphian* on his arrival. They extended to no fewer than 140 closely-written pages of note paper. The Editor was contemplating a possible use of them when the sequel upset all ideas in that direction. Entwistle did not turn up on the Sunday. The brethren knew he had been ailing and therefore did not feel particularly uneasy. They, however, applied at his “lodgings.” There they heard he was the good-for-nothing husband of the “landlady;” that his name was not Entwistle but Leary; that she had not advanced any money towards a deposit to secure a situation; that in fact there was no situation; that in a word it was what is vulgarly called a “swindle.” Next day, this was confirmed by application at Howe’s. The Editor then went to the house, and was admitted without disclosing that he knew the truth. He was at first put off with lies; but at length he discovered that Entwistle was at home, upstairs in bed, and had given instructions to say he was not at home. The Editor, after a display of some firmness, obtained permission to go upstairs, and found the man buried in the blankets, face downwards. He pretended to be very ill. The Editor questioned him without at first making him aware of what he had learnt. In answer to these questions the man reaffirmed the whole string of falsehoods, as to his name and status in the house, saying in explanation of his position that he had sinned in going once more with bad companions and in getting drunk. The Editor then told him what he had heard, which agitated him greatly. He finally confessed it was all true—that his name was Leary, that he was the husband of the landlady, that there was no situation, that he had never seen anybody in London on Hineism—that the letters were a makeup, &c. He writhed and groaned and cried and said he was wicked, and desired to be forgiven.—The Editor replied that if there had been a single gleam of righteousness visible in the case, there might have been room to consider the question of forgiveness; but he had lied and defrauded up to the last moment till found out.—The result is to be found in bro. Smith’s announcement. To the brethren whose generosity has been imposed upon in the case, it is but necessary to say that their deeds in the case, done to Christ and not to Mr. Leary, are not thrown away but are as much accepted for the day of account as if the unworthy object of them had proved a genuine saint.

#### EDITOR

(January 1881) MUDDIFORD. — Brother John Sanders writes of withdrawal from brother Veysey. He says “I have not heard from Taunton since I last wrote you. Our brother Veysey does not reply now to our questions or letters, we therefore fear that he has or is leaving the truth for fables. In my last to him I told him that we must withdraw from fellowship if he continued to hold the dogmas on the Sabbath and other questions that he had circulated in the tracts sent out by him. To this we got no reply. We fear that brethren who may come in contact with these papers and doings, may be led away thereby if not warned in some way of the danger.”

(Excerpt from May 1881) SHEFFIELD.—Brother Boler refers to the difficulty of emancipating one here, and another there, from the spiritual bondage traceable to Rome. “Many of us,” he says, “when we first saw the truth, thought that our friends and coreligionists would at once accept it; that the true believers would soon become many instead of few. We thought such and such a man was a very humble minded person, and open to conviction. But alas! How mistaken we were in ninety-nine cases out of the hundred: the supposed lamb was a devouring lion, a wolf in sheep’s clothing, a sepulchre white and clean without, but within full of all uncleanness and dead men’s bones, infidel to all bible truths, atheist, without God and without hope in the world. From this state of things we are thankful there has been another emancipated at Sheffield.

(May 1881) MELBOURNE.—Brother Gamble writes: “We have changed our place of meeting to the Protestant Hall, Exhibition Street, City, which suits us far better than the Temperance Hall, in Russell Street. We are still endeavouring to cause the light of the truth to appear by the public proclamation week by week to a small assembly of those who choose to hear. The mutual improvement society, commenced a short time ago, is progressing favourably. For some time past the question of designation of our serving brethren, has been occupying the minds of the brethren and sisters, whether they should be called Presiding and Managing brethren or Elders and Deacons. At our last quarterly business meeting, it was reversed for the FOURTH time within the past twelve months, the ecclesia being about squally divided, so that now we have our Elders and Deacons. Personally I think it was inadvisable to change from Presiding and Managing brethren (not “Presidents and Managers” as some misrepresent), although there is no more meaning attached to Elders and Deacons than to Presiding and Managing brethren, but on the grounds of EXPEDIENCY I certainly give the preference to Presiding and Managing brethren. However, we hope the time will soon arrive when all difference will cease, and unity abound, when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.” (For remarks on the subject, see “Extracts from Correspondence,” page 218. EDITOR.) [Compiler’s Note: See Ecclesial Organisation in the Nineteenth Century under Futher Proof Taken / Volumes 1 to 30]

(February 1882) SCHOLLS FERRY (OGN.)—Since our divided condition in this State, six have left the Nicholites, and become united with our company On the other hand, we have lost one by death, as lately reported (our beloved Brother Stevenson), and two Brother and Sister Cooper, have removed twelve miles away (to Beverton), from whence we expect them to meet with us frequently. Then Sister Green dwelt in our neighbourhood for a while, but removed to California, where she has lately followed her husband (Brother Green) to the grave. Our much-beloved and missing Brother Quinn followed his daughter (SisterGreen) to California last summer. We have just heard from him. He is located at Forestville, Sonoma Co., California. Another sad event, that our brethren mourned with much weeping, was the withdrawal of Sister Miller, in order to re-unite with the Campbellites. This was on account of the bitter and (to her) irresistible opposition of her entire family. So you see changes are continually going on. Among others, one causing “great heaviness, and continual sorrow of heart,” is the dismal clouds of scepticism that have overshadowed Brother W. Wing for the last year. After his removal to the territory of Idaho, he was thrown into the society of infidels, and has not been able to resist their arguments. Truly, there are many dark clouds and little sunshine in this life. [Truly so: but the morning comes, when there will be life, and light, and liberty, and joy, to such as endure to the end.—[ED. C.]

(April 1882) DERBY—Since writing to you last month, we have added two more to the household of faith—and in each case we feel doubly grateful for the goodness of our Heavenly Father, inasmuch as they are the wives of brethren. HARRIET DRAPER, wife of Bro. Draper (who some 12 months ago came from Grantham, having obtained employment in Derby, but has just returned to Grantham, and, of course, takes Sister Draper and family with him); and HILDA RUCKWOOD, wife of Bro. Ruckwood. We are further encouraged by the fact, that two or three more have applied for immersion. We presume that there is still some hopes of your being able to induce those who have separated themselves from our meetings coming back, or should have heard from you.—W. CHANDLER.

[No; we are sorry to say the epistolary endeavours, extending over many months, have been fruitless. The brethren absenting themselves, justified their action on the ground that the organization of the ecclesia was on too republican a basis. The Editor asked them to suggest an improvement for the brethren to consider, adding that other ecclesias besides Derby might adopt it, if they could propose a constitution that would work better than the system of annual election. They responded by proposing the appointment of the seven eldest brethren to do everything—their appointment to be perpetual, and vacancies among their number to be filled up by themselves. The Editor pointed out that this would be a seven-headed

lordship, of a character inconsistent with the first principles of mutual love and submission upon which the house of Christ was founded; that every brother had a right to a voice in the conduct of matters which were the common interest and duty of all; that to deprive him of it would be a wrong; that this voice could only have effect by the system of submitting to the greater number; that, nevertheless, there might be modifications in the mode of appealing to this voice, resulting in the less frequent agitation of the merely personal questions raised by elections; and that a good compromise would be acceptable to all. The Editor indicated various forms of modification. The separated brethren then asked the Editor to suggest an alternative scheme to meet the case. He did so, proposing the election, by the vote of the majority of the ecclesia, of seven, to have power to make all other appointments; that they should be elected for seven years, but that one should retire each year, his place to be filled by open election—the retiring to be first alphabetical, and then in the order of election. This was finally accepted; but the separated brethren then desired that certain two brethren (whom they did not object to fellowship) should be held ineligible for office. This condition the Editor held to be absolutely inadmissible, on the ground that, if eligible for fellowship, no one in our day had the right to declare a brother unfit for office, except the voice of the majority; and that to comply with the condition required would be to indulge in that judging of one another which is forbidden by the law of Christ, and to attach a stigma to those objected to, which would be an injustice and a wrong. He appealed to the separated brethren to reconsider the point, and allow the constitution itself to be discussed, and trust the selection to open vote; but they insisted in their inadmissible demand, and, consequently, the action of the other brethren now comes into force. Many months ago, they withdrew from the separated brethren, on the ground of their unlawful separation. The Editor refrained from publishing the act at the time, addressing himself to the absentees, in the hope of averting the necessity of publishing the shame. But there is now no alternative—the absenting brethren having placed themselves undoubtedly in the wrong—from good motives, it may be; but it is not lawful to do evil that good may come. Those withdrawn from are those associated with Brother Thomas Meakin.—EDITOR.]

(Excerpt from April 1882) GLOUCESTER- In the January number of the *Christadelphian*, the announcement appeared, from the secretary of the Gloucester ecclesia, that the brethren had, “in consequence of their disorderly walk,” withdrawn from a number whose names were given. During the last month we have been threatened with legal proceedings on account of said announcement, which is alleged to be a defamatory libel. The words complained of are the words “disorderly walk.” This is assumed to mean drunken and immoral behaviour, and all Gloucester is appealed to in disproof of a charge never made. The parties mentioned (Frank Forester, Geo. A. Baker, Geo. A. Thody, Sarah Thody, Emily Baker, Mary Ann Forester, and Julian Hodges) are hereby absolved of all imputation of drunkenness and immorality. What was meant was their abstention from assembly with the brethren.

One of them, Mr. Frank Forester, caused a lawyer’s letter to be sent to us, demanding an apology and payment of costs, on pain of an action for libel. We wrote the lawyer to tell him there was no libel to apologise for, but the publication of a report of ambiguous wording, written and published without malice; and that any detriment arising from its uncertain terms would be remedied by the publication of his client’s disclaimer, which would also be an entire satisfaction of the law of libel, as amended during the last session of Parliament. The lawyer forwarded a document written by his client for publication, which he called our “apology.” We wrote him we did not publish it as an apology, but as his client’s version of the case, which is as follows. With legal bludgeon in his right hand (a most disorderly attitude for anyone professing subjection to Christ.—1Cor.6:1-6; Matt. 5:39-45; Rom. 12-19; 1 Pet. 2:21-23; 1 Thess. 5; 15),

Mr. Frank Forester Saith

“Mr. Frank Forrester, of Gloucester, complains of the paragraph on page 45, January number of *Christadelphian*, headed “Gloucester,” in which he is said to have been withdrawn from for disorderly walk, the same not being correct as to facts, and is a libel on his character. The facts of the case are as follows:—On January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1881, Mr. Forrester, with others (having charged the managing brethren at Gloucester with unscriptural conduct) withdrew from them and their sympathisers only, and communicated the fact, and copy of the withdrawal, to the *Christadelphian*, which paper declined to recognise the withdrawal, but stated that we had isolated ourselves from the brethren everywhere, thus judging before hearing. Mr. Forrester has never since been in fellowship with the managing brethren at Gloucester individually, because of their persistent unscriptural conduct; consequently, he was not in a position in which he could be withdrawn from by them at the time the report was sent from Gloucester; and having never been charged with disorderly walk by the brethren at Gloucester, or elsewhere, he is in fellowship with true brethren everywhere, not having withdrawn from the whole body, nor having isolated himself, as would be gleaned from report in the *Christadelphian*. His position, therefore, is that, not having been withdrawn from, he is in good standing, and within the ecclesia, and those withdrawn from are without; to place the matter in any other light, is untrue and unjust.”

#### THE EDITOR REJOINS

Mr. Forrester’s statement is only part of the truth. The omitted facts are as follows:—The managing brethren at Gloucester, after a certain time, declined to accept the services of a lecturer approved of by Mr. Forrester, on account of the reproach brought on the truth by said lecturer’s name. For this reason, Mr. Forrester and the others separated from the meeting, and sent to the Editor of the *Christadelphian* a report of their proceeding, as an act of withdrawal from the brethren. The Editor of the *Christadelphian* replied that before he could use their report, he must have the opportunity of judging whether it ought to be published, as it was open to doubt whether it was valid. This opportunity he asked in the shape of a personal interview with them and the parties affected. This they declined, consequently, there was no other course but to refuse to publish, and to accept their act as an act of self-isolation from the brethren in Gloucester and therefore from the brethren everywhere else, for the brethren are one. If this was “judging without hearing,” whose was the fault? It was in fact not judging, but accepting facts. It is Mr. Forrester who would judge in saying that the brethren in Gloucester from whom he separated, are “without.” They are not “without,” but in fellowship with the brethren everywhere as earnest, righteous, worthy men, submitting themselves to the will of God in their day and generation. Those who cannot claim such a position are those who disregard the commandments of Christ, and seek to avenge themselves by taking or threatening legal proceedings.

(June 1884) BIRMINGHAM—Brother Williams (who has fallen away from the faith) has published a pamphlet in defence of his course. The pamphlet takes the form of an attack on *The Trial*. Bro. Roberts has written a reply. He hesitated for a moment in the midst of much other brain-wearying occupation whether to take any notice of it or not. But inferring from incidental remarks that the pamphlet might cause distress in some cases, he allowed himself to be drawn into the idea of writing an answer, which he has since accomplished. It will be ready before the issue of this number of the *Christadelphian*. The title of it is “SCEPTICISM ANSWERED, in rejoinder to S.W.’s attack on ‘THE TRIAL,’ in a pamphlet, wherein that exbeliever vainly tries to undermine the hope of eternal life in Christ, as assured to the believer in the Resurrection of Christ from the dead.” Price 4d.; by post, 4½500.

(March 1886) Wadebridge.—Sister Hawken, fearing that Alfred Nicholls may impose on brethren elsewhere as he has done here and in London, wishes to make known that, after obtaining a sum of money to take himself and wife to America, he deserted his wife, and has disappeared with a young woman, with whom, for a long time, he carried on a clandestine acquaintance. Anger, says sister Hawken, yields to pity when we think of retribution.



(June 1886) Tamworth.—Brother Wood forwards a Vicar's letter appearing in the *Tamworth Herald*, which illustrates the state of things in the religious Babylon, out of which we have escaped. It contrasts strikingly, he says, "with the large heartedness characteristic of the brethren generally." The Vicar, referring to the discussion of the accounts at the Easter Vestry, says, "A statement was made in the course of the discussion which revealed a depth of meanness of which I did not dream, a statement made not by one only, but by several gentlemen who had held the office of churchwarden. It was that a very large number of people put their hands in the bag pretending to put money in, but, in reality, put in nothing at all. The person who is too poor to give anything one can respect, and the person who sees no need of giving and does not give, and makes no pretence of giving, one can respect too; but the person who is ashamed of his poverty, or evades a duty, which he recognises as a duty by lying pretence, is beneath contempt. To be mean is bad enough, but to hide one's meanness, by hypocrisy and a lie, is infinitely worse. I was a good deal astonished when one of my boys preparing for confirmation confessed without a blush that he would not hesitate to tell a lie to save himself from trouble, but I am still more astonished that people who have just risen from kneeling in prayer to God should lie before God and man Sunday after Sunday. If all the good they get from their prayers is to gain courage to lie more barefacedly, the sooner they give up praying the better."

(July 1888) INNERKIP.—We are pleased to report that we are again striving to hold forth the Truth in a public way in the midst of the surrounding darkness. We have had no public lectures in this locality since the apostacy of nearly all the ecclesia which took place nearly 14 years ago. You are perhaps aware that those who left professed to fall in with the views promulgated by J. K. Spear, a fanatic of the worst type, and, although professing to believe God's word, the views entertained by him were in reality infidelity in disguise, as only a short time was required to make manifest, as they are now all professed atheists. Being left few in number, and also being aware of the disgrace brought upon the truth by its professed friends, we felt it would be useless, at least for a time, to make any public effort on behalf of the truth until the odium brought upon it had, through the lapse of time, somewhat subsided. As brother Williams, of Waterloo, Iowa, has been making a tour through Canada visiting the brethren, we thought the time opportune to have him deliver some lectures to the alien. We therefore made arrangements for two in the public hall, the subject of the first lecture being "Christ is coming: Where to, What for, When?" second lecture, "The Resurrection: When, What for, What after." On each occasion a goodly number were present, and it was quite apparent that a few in the audience gave ear to what was said. Brother Williams has a fascinating way of presenting the great truths of revelation. He rivets the attention of his hearers in spite of themselves. We consider him one of the most able among the speaking brethren. We earnestly hope, should the Lord delay His coming, that our brother's life may be long spared for the defence of the truth in its purity, as well as to assist in the building up and strengthening those already in the faith. I may say, in conclusion, that the brethren here are more than pleased with the enlarged *Christadelphian*. We pray that God may reward and bless your noble effort.—JAS MALCOLM.

(May 1889) NORMANTON- Brother Warwick regrets that by the lending of *Æons* and *Investigators*, and other misleading publications, an attempt is being made to corrupt the minds of some who have recently obeyed the truth. He and three or four others are set for the defence of truth and purity. This is all that the faithful can do—to hold fast till the time arrives (which it certainly will at last) when the Lord will speak for himself and settle all matters.

(June 1889) NORMANTON- Brother Lockett reports that at a meeting called to consider the paragraph appearing in last month's *Christadelphian* (brother Pickles, of Leeds, presiding) it was decided that brother Warwick's apprehensions of some being wrongfully influenced were groundless.

(July 1889) NORMANTON- Brother Warwick demurs to the intelligence appearing last month under this heading, and reiterates the previous statement. He enters into details in justification of his contention,

which would be out of place in the *Christadelphian*. So far as the *Christadelphian* is concerned, the matter must be left where it is. Brother Warwick says their little company is now doctrinally pure and peaceable. During the summer months they lecture in the open air. Last month the lectures have been as follows:—"Coming honour" (brother Mitchell, of Leeds); "The coming universal kingdom" (Ditto); "One God" (brother Welshman, of Huddersfield); "The great salvation" (brother Barraclough, of Heckmondwike).

(Excerpt from February 1893) HAMILTON (Mo).—Brother A. L. Sweet writes:—"Christadelphianism in this country is slowly but surely loosing its hold on the truth, if indeed it held it at the start. Uncertainty in matters pertaining to the truth are so palatable and so much easier to swallow that certainty goes a-begging. How do you know you have the truth?" asked an elder of me a few Sundays ago. To have given a lengthy answer would have been to waste words — words do, sometimes, glance off, I suppose you know. So I asked, "How do you know when you have got the measles?" "I don't know it," said he, "until they break out." "That," said I, "is the way one can tell when one has the truth. Unless it 'breaks out,' uncertainty in matters pertaining to the faith will answer equally as well as certainty." His answer was a big "Haw Haw," which meant, I took it, "You *can't* know." Last Sunday I let drop a few words that caused him to "break out"—not with the measles, nor with the truth—but with the words, "You are always finding fault." I had said, "If the truth is proclaimed in this country as Paul proclaimed it, and as Dr. Thomas after him proclaimed it I don't know it." This was a little too much for the old gentleman, and he "broke out" much as "Christians" break out, and in a "Christian spirit," too. To understand matters you must know that we have "wheat and tares" here, and that it is insisted these must grow together till the harvest. I am not sure but that "tare" business belongs back 1800 years ago, but I won't quibble. I do insist, however, that the tares must resemble the wheat in *some* particulars, if not in all, until trodden out, and that they who are more concerned in the welfare of the tares than in the welfare of the wheat will bear watching. When a "tare" tells one the territory of the kingdom is the earth, and quotes, "His dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river to the end of the earth" (land) to prove it, I correct him. If this is finding fault, please tell me how else is one to do? When tares think one way and talk another, shouldn't the wheat correct them? If we "*think with the Deity*," as Paul did, and as Thomas did, shouldn't we express our thoughts in the same words that Paul and Thomas did? Is it presumption in one to claim to be a wheat? It is coming to that here, and when it comes to that, hadn't we better all go back to the Baptists? for there we can sing with them—

## LEAVING THE APOSTASY AND EMBRACING THE TRUTH

(May 1868) OLDBURY (near BIRMINGHAM.)—A Methodist local preacher, by name T. Watton, having become convinced of the truth, writes to ask what course he ought to take. He has been preaching the truth instead of Methodism, and was, in a few days from writing, to be brought before the district authorities to answer for it. He says there are others in the congregation besides himself who have embraced the truth, and are determined not to flinch from it. The question was, should they come out at once or stay to be excommunicated. The latter course was recommended, as likely to afford them the best opportunity of raising an agitation in the congregation in favour of the truth, and giving them an opportunity of defending it before the Sanhedrim.

(June 1868) OLDBURY (near Birmingham). — Mr. Watton, the local preacher referred to last month, has sent in his resignation, and the consequence has been the division of the small Methodist body with whom he was connected into two bodies, the Methodist section withdrawing and those who sympathize with Mr. Watton, remaining in possession of the preaching room, which will henceforth be a Christadelphian synagogue. Our readers will probably hear more of them anon.

(Excerpt from June 1869) LEICESTER. — Dr. Wilby has, heretofore, occupied a leading position in one of the leading independent congregations in Leicester, and his defection will excite notice, and probably work to the greater power of the truth in Leicester.

(March 1871) MALDON.—Brother D. Handley, writing Jan. 30, announces, with thanksgiving to God, two further additions to the ecclesia, which now numbers 25. The new-borns in Christ are JAMES SEARLES (40), market-gardener, and JOSHUA DYKES (22). Concerning the first, brother Handley supplies some lengthy and interesting particulars. He was the leader of the Peculiar People in the district. To this post, he was appointed after brother Handley had withdrawn from them on the subject of mortality. Brother Handley frequently assailed him with the shafts of the truth. These, Mr. Searles did his best to ward off for a while, but was finally so far subdued as to confess man was mortal, and ask baptism which he also came to see. His wish was complied with some years ago before the faith was apprehended in its fulness either by himself or the friends who have since progressed to completeness in Christ. This baptism was the break up of the “Peculiar” cause in the neighbourhood. Mr. Searles, however, had a hankering after the old love. He thought the study of the scriptures which took place among those connected with brother Handley, something dry and spiritless, and along with his wife (who had been baptized at the same time) returned to his former friends, thinking to hold on to what new light he had obtained, at the same time rejoicing at what was considered the “outpourings of the Holy Ghost,” among the Peculiar People. He now confesses that he lost the light of the word in proportion as he entered into the feelings of the “Peculiar” meetings. He and his wife felt this at the time, and it caused them to think seriously. They saw that the word of God and the spirit of the Peculiar People did not agree, and that they must either shut the book, or lose the “spirit.” This conflict continued for a time. Finally, a society of “Peculiars” was formed, about four miles from Maldon, of which Mr. Searles was desired to take the oversight. With this wish he complied, but he got into trouble for bringing out what the people called “Handley doctrine.” Things were in this way nine months ago, when brother Handley attacked him, since which time they have often met with the result of the truth gaining the ascendancy. While progressing in the truth, Mr. Searles brought it out before his people, which has led one to come to Maldon to be baptised, of which notice has appeared. About a month ago, Mr. Searles invited brother Handley to go and speak to his people. Brother Handley went three Sunday afternoons, and brother Lewin went the Sunday before brother Handley’s writing. This has led some of the flock to desire immersion, but at present their minds are not sufficiently in the light. “We hope,” says brother Handley, “that several of them will (if the Lord delay his coming) come on. Brother Searle’s wife sees the truth, and has tried to rest on her former immersion, but I believe she can now see that she was not in the one faith at that time, and will, no doubt, before long apply for immersion into the one and only name wherein is salvation.— Joshua Dykes was formerly a Primitive Methodist. He heard the truth in London, and has been feeling his way for months. He is a sailor, and coming within ten miles of Maldon, of which place he is a native, he applied with the humility of a child, and upon a clear confession of the faith, stepped out of the condemnation of the first man, into him in whom we stand complete, even Jesus Christ, who is made unto wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.”

(April 1880) BIRMINGHAM.—During the month obedience has been rendered to the truth by the following: JOSEPH THOMAS, boot maker, formerly Campbellite; and JANE SEAMARK (46), formerly Church of Christ, so-called.

The lectures on the Apocalypse continue to be attended without visible diminution of numbers or interest. The question of publication is not yet decided. We hear of many who intend to have them, but have not yet signified their mind.

Campbellism in Birmingham is being severely exercised by the truth. It will be recollected that some time ago Mr. Andrews, a principal man in their meetings, obeyed the truth. He was immersed at his own request by the brethren in Birmingham, but did not at that time identify himself with them. The result was a division in the Campbellite meeting, and the secession of a large number with Mr. Andrews. Many of these—to the number of 26—have been baptised by Mr. Andrews, and meet together in the Alexandra Hall, Bloomsbury, separately from the Campbellites, who meet in a chapel of their own in Great Francis Street. The fear of being compromised in an uncertain profession of the faith (a fear entertained on various reasonable grounds), has hitherto prevented the Birmingham brethren from according that cordial recognition to the new community which is desirable: but there is a likelihood now that all difficulties will disappear. The new community has formally applied for recognition and co-operation. This has been followed by an interview at which the various elements of the truth were defined, by a deputation from the Birmingham brethren, and endorsed by Mr. Andrews in the presence and on behalf of those in fellowship with him. It had also been signified that the new meeting were not unwilling to be known as Christadelphians. A formal compliance with their request for fellowship will probably have taken place before this meets the eye of the reader.

Meanwhile, the incident has stirred up Mr. David King to make strenuous exertions to avert further disaster to Campbellism in Birmingham. He has been lecturing specifically against the Christadelphians. Brother Andrews invited him to debate the subject with the Editor of the *Christadelphian*, but Mr. King took refuge in a proposal to have a committee to investigate the nature of an incident that transpired between himself and the Editor of the *Christadelphian* sixteen years ago, the particulars of which are in the possession of the early readers of the *Christadelphian*. The Editor of the *Christadelphian* declined to waste time in such obstructive trifling, remarking that having the answer of a good conscience towards God, in the matter that seems to have inflicted such a deep and lasting wound on Mr. King's feelings, he was willing to bear any amount of odium Mr. King might please to cast upon him, caring more for the unspeakably more important question "What is the Truth?" He was ready to discuss this without condition or preliminary; but Mr. King could not be brought from the miserable corner in which he prefers to stand. However a sort of discussion has been proceeding notwithstanding. By arrangement of brother Andrews the Editor delivered two lectures in Duddleston Ward Hall, in exhibition of the true nature of the kingdom of God. After this Mr. King lectured, with the view of showing that the kingdom of God was set up on Pentecost. This lecture was answered in a counter lecture in the Ward Hall, by the Editor of the *Christadelphian*. Then at another meeting in Great Francis Street Chapel, Mr. King answered written questions submitted by those who sympathised with the truth. His answers were at another meeting reviewed by the Editor of the *Christadelphian*. No definite result can be reported; but any agitation on the subject of the truth is better than stagnation, and may be the means of doing good all round. The lectures during the month have been as follow: Feb. 29th, Hope as an element of the human constitution.—(Brother Roberts). March 7th, Infant baptism a human invention.—(Brother Hodgkinson.) 14th, The predicted falling-away from the truth.—(Brother Bishop). 21st, Charity, false and true.—(Brother Roberts). [Compiler's Note: Dark gray Examples of the likes of the Apostasy- External]

(Excerpt from December 1867) EDINBURGH.—MRS. HUGHES, lately among the adherents of George Dowie in Edinburgh has been added to the ecclesia. She was formerly a member of the New York ecclesia; and coming to England in ignorance of a division prevailing, she became a member of the Dowieite meeting; but, however, after a considerable time, she came to see their false position in relation to the truth, and renounced their fellowship.

## FURTHER PROOFS

### VOLUMES 1 TO 30

*The Christadelphian (1867) pg. 225*

[Compiler's Note: See (Excerpt from August 1867) EDINBURGH.]

#### GATHERING OF BRETHREN IN EDINBURGH

*(Reported by Brother R. Paterson, of Edinburgh.)*

NEXT to the reception of the truth, the most important duty is the building up in it. It is necessary that we should not remain on the surface of things, or be only partially covered with the armour of God; for not only is the enemy in our front, but we are encompassed by him on all sides, and from no quarter are we assailed with more dangerous effect than from those who, while professing to be our friends, are our deadliest foes. But if we have so digested the "strong meat" of the truth as to be covered with the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, and, by reason of use, have our senses exercised to discern *good* and *evil*, we shall be able in the day of proof to discriminate *who* are our friends, and of consequence the truth's; and we ourselves shall be, as the Master tells us, like unto a man building his house upon a rock—nothing shall break down our foundations. In the realisation of this, the brethren in this city invited many brethren throughout Scotland, and also a few in England, to meet with them on Sunday, 14<sup>th</sup> July last, to spend the day in the examination of some of those points of our faith, which have been the subject of controversy within the more immediate circles of professed allegiance to the truth. To this was added the social element, as one calculated in an eminent degree to strengthen the ties that bind us together by fostering the feelings of love, mutual help, and forbearance one towards another.

The following brethren and sisters attended:—From Ayton—J. Yule; Alloa—James Durie and David Evans; Berwick—John Nesbit; Beith—John Gillies; Biggar—Gavin and Sister Cree; Dunkeld—James Milne and Sister C. Swanson; Dewartown—G. Fairgrieve and A. Pearson; Glasgow—F. Cameron, W. Clark, W. McIntyre, and Fleming; Galashiels—W. Milne and Sister Annie Milne; Haddington—W. Armstrong and Sister Shiels; Innerleithen—W. Dew; Pathhead—J. Lamb; Tranent—Brethren R. Strathearn, J. Archibald, A. Blackhall, D. Beveridge, J. Cunningham, A. Duncan, J. Henderson, C. Hogg, M. McLeod; Sisters M. Hastie, Henderson, and Isabella Strathearn.

In the first part of the day, brother Charles Smith delivered an address on the manifestation of Jesus the Christ, and in connection therewith, examined and refuted the doctrine of his "pre-existence." Referring to the latter part of his subject, he observed, that were the doctrine to be found only within the pale of the names and denominations of Roman and Protestant superstition, we could pass it over as a matter unworthy of remark in a meeting of the household of faith. But the case was not so; for there were men, who would claim us as their brethren, who propounded the doctrine that Jesus Christ existed as a living, acting agent, *in fact*, before the earth was. He dwelt for some considerable time on various scripture principles, which, in their proper understanding, altogether precluded the possibility of Jesus' personal existence before his being born of Mary,—such as—he had come in the flesh, he put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, and that he was made sin;—and then proceeded to examine one or two of the more prominent passages taken as direct proof on the subject of which the following is the substance:—"And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, the Son of Man who is in heaven." The first thing we require to understand is that expression, "The Son of Man who is in heaven." In what sense was he in heaven? We read, chap. 1:18, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only

begotten Son *who is in the bosom* of his Father he hath declared him.” Jesus, then, was in heaven in the sense of being in the bosom of the Father. He was so by the word of the Father being *the law of his life*, and by the spirit of the Father dwelling in him without measure. The Father, in this way, was manifested to Jesus himself and to Israel; for says he “No man hath seen God at anytime.” Jesus in person had not seen God, and yet he was in the bosom of the Father, and in heaven. In mental or moral relationship, he was in direct union with God, and was, therefore, in the heaven. He was in an earthly condition of heavenly things, and it was this he referred to when he said to Nicodemus “If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things.” The earthly things he had been speaking of were the manifestation of the spirit of the Father in him and the consequences flowing from that manifestation. Having this in our minds, let us turn to John 6:63, “What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before.” This verse contains the same idea as the one we have been looking at in chap. 3. But here the context will help us to understand what the expressions mean: “He that came down from heaven,” and “Ascend up where he was before.” In this chapter, the leading subject on which Jesus is speaking is eternal life and resurrection from the dead, the first being consequent upon the latter. He tells them to “Labour for the meat which endures unto everlasting life;” and again, “My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven, I am the living bread which came down from heaven, the bread is my flesh;” and again, “I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” All this is very high figure, and in it Jesus was speaking of his death and resurrection, but they could not comprehend him. Many, therefore, of his disciples, when they had heard this, said “This is an hard saying; who can bear it!” Jesus said “Doth this offend you; what and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before.” Keeping in mind that he was speaking of death and resurrection, and that before this took place, he was in the heaven, in the bosom of the Father, let us read the statement of Paul, that “He that ascended, who is it, but he that descended first into the lower parts of the earth. He that descended (from the earthly manifestation of heavenly things) is the same also who ascended far above all heavens (connected with this earth), that he may fulfil all things. For he is the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him (the Father), who filleth all in all. From this it will be seen that these two passages do not refer to Jesus before his manifestation to Israel. I shall now notice that passage in John 8:58: “Before Abraham was, I am;” and that one in chap. 17:5. I shall treat both these passages upon one principle, and that is, that with God all things exist. The Deity is a Builder, and he also is his own Architect. He had his plan all arranged before he began his work. Now take away from this plan the Lord Jesus in his glory, and what would it be? It would only, in the language of the dreamers of the Apostacy, be a collapse—a “crash of worlds.” In the existence of Christ’s glory, the Christ existed, but only in purpose, from the beginning. The Word of the Deity relates to all this glory, and he gave this word to Jesus. Jesus, in giving it to the Apostles, addresses the Father: “The glory which thou gavest me, I have given them.” In this sense, he existed before Abraham; for Abraham’s existence was in view of the Christ. The promise or covenant made to Abraham referred to this glory; and it was confirmed in Christ 430 years before the Mosaic Law. This statement of Paul’s in itself proves that Christ existed then only in type; for had he existed in person, the confirmation of the covenant would have required his personal death.

Brother Smith was supported by brethren Strathearn, Yule, Cree, and Nesbit.

*The Christadelphian (1867) pgs. 253-256*

GATHERING OF BRETHREN IN EDINBURGH,

*Continued from page 227.*

In the afternoon, after tea had been served to the brethren, the doctrine of resurrection was taken up. It was divided into three phases. The first, which was an examination of the teaching of Paul on “sowing”

and “raising,” in the 15<sup>th</sup> chap. Of 1 Cor., was expounded by brother William Ellis. The ideas contained in this exposition are doubtless new to most of the brethren; but they are the result of much thought, and on this ground, and also on the ground that, if they can be consistently established, they present a simple and direct teaching in the chapter, they deserve the candid attention of the brethren. ‘Brother Ellis’ remarks were substantially as follows:—“So also is the resurrection or standing again of the dead ones. It is sown in corruption,” &c. These verses have received very different and conflicting expositions from many who have tried to set forth what they mean. Some have set forth that the sowing time is the casting of a dead body into the ground, but this is opposed to the statement of Paul: “That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die.” The body cast into the grave is already dead, and cannot die in the grave after being sown; and besides, it would prove that all who were the subject of the casting into the grave will be the subject of immortality, a conclusion which must be set aside as false, seeing some will sleep and never rise, while others will rise to die the second death. No doctrine is more easily understood, or more clearly taught in the scriptures, than that there will be a resurrection of just and unjust, and a subsequent separation of them, the one from the other. The sowing cannot refer to the two classes, as being sown or cast forth indiscriminately, for the reason given above, that all who are sown or cast forth are raised to incorruptibility, unless we believe that the wicked arise in a deathless body of glory, honour, and power. The sowing cannot refer to the casting of the good seed of the kingdom into a man, for if it die after being sown there, there can be no reaping of life for him. The figure of a man sowing to the spirit does not apply, as in his case he is the sower and not the thing or body sown. If the figure of a believer, being planted into the Christ, be taken, it also miscarries of the result Paul contemplates, as all who have been cast into him or planted into his death have not died in him, nor have they been made alive by the truth, neither can they attain to the promised life. There remains, therefore, but one class to whom the comparison can apply without failure, viz., those who, during their lifetime, received the incorruptible seed of the word into good and honest hearts, and who, consequently, sowed to the spirit. These, when the wicked are severed from them, shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. The time when they are cast forth then, or sown, is after the chaff has been fanned away, that they, as the good grain, have been cast forth by the Husbandman, that they may flourish and fill the face of the world with fruit. Verse 52: “The dead shall be raised incorruptible” cannot refer to all who ever have died, nor to all who have put on the Lord Jesus Christ, seeing many of these die the second death. We conclude, therefore, that it can refer to those only of the *dead* who stand before the throne of the Christ, and are the subjects of his approval. This idea becomes the more evident, because death is not swallowed up in victory until the living approved and the *dead* approved have all been the subjects of change together in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. “For we shall not all sleep, but we shall *all* (whether *dead* or alive) be changed.”

The following free translation of the 42<sup>nd</sup> verse on to the 53<sup>rd</sup>, conveys, perhaps more clearly than anything else, the idea which brother Ellis entertains of Paul’s teaching on these points:—

“So, also is the standing again of the dead ones. It is cast forth in corruption, it is perfected in incorruption. It is cast forth without honour, it is perfected in glory. It is cast forth in weakness, it is perfected in power. It is cast forth an animal body, it is perfected a spiritual body. A body animal and a body spiritual there is, even as it was narrated—the first man Adam became a living soul, the last Adam a life producing spirit: the last man out of the ground a groundling, the second, the Lord from heaven. As is the groundling, such are they also who are from the groundling, and as is the heavenly, such are they also who are from the heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. And I say this, brethren, because flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither is it possible for the corrupt to inherit the incorruptible. Behold, I am declaring to you a secret (mystery), all we, indeed, shall not be asleep, but all of us shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, in the sounding of the last trumpet; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead ones who have been cast forth in corrupt, weak, animal bodies, shall be perfected in incorruptible, powerful, spiritual bodies, and we who are living in weak, corruptible animal bodies shall be changed into incorruptible, powerful,

spiritual bodies; for it is necessary that this corruptible put on incorruptibility and this mortal immortality.”

Brother J. Gillies, of Beith, followed with an address on Christ as the first fruits, being the second phase of the same subject:—Paul, in writing the epistle to the Hebrews, makes the law of Moses the basis of an argument, to prove that Jesus, who sprung from the tribe of Judah, had been accepted by God as the Melchisedec Ruler and High Priest under the new covenant; and also, that the means by which he could attain to that high dignity was through the sacrifice and offering of himself as God’s Lamb, first slain; afterwards its blood, which constituted its life, offered in the most holy place—that these were all shadowed forth in the law. But though minutely shadowed forth, “the law did not contain the very image of the things.” If the law had been the very image of the transactions it shadowed forth, then the High Priest would require to be slain, his life restored, and then offer himself within the veil, &c.; but this was both unnecessary and useless. The High Priest was a sinner, and could not get his life restored, save only through him who could offer himself without spot to the Deity. The Law, therefore, grouped many transactions together into hieroglyphic symbols, no one of which was the image of what is shadowed forth; and so we find that the slaying of the lamb, the offering of its blood, the offerer, and the altar, were all patterns of the better sacrifice which purified the heavenly things. But when and how was this better sacrifice offered and accepted? It could not be accepted while Jesus lay in the tomb, for a body without life cannot be immortal; and for the same reason, he could not offer himself when he died on the cross. His offering and acceptance could only take place after he rose from the dead. He first awoke from the sleep of death; and this waking, living state was clothed with the house from heaven, or put on incorruption. Accordingly, the dead body of the victim was on the altar while the High Priest carried the blood, which was its life, into the most holy place; this was the offering of its blood, and the High Priest being alive became the type of Jesus, who entered into the holy place, not by means of the blood of goats and calves, but by means of his own blood, which it was impossible for him to do had he been raised with the divine nature. But Jesus did not enter the literal holy place; indeed, he could not, because he did not belong to the tribe of *Levi*, “and no one of any other tribe had any right to officiate as priest under the law of Moses.” Jesus entered the holy place only in figure; and in chap. 10:20, the Apostle says the veil was a figure of his flesh, and like the high priest, he passed through the veil (or flesh) before he could offer himself as the first fruits in their nature, and was then clothed with incorruptibility, and has gone into the presence of his Father as High Priest for his household; but his presence there is not perpetual, because “the greater and more perfect tabernacle,” of which he is the High Priest, exists not in the heavens, but on the earth. It was all the salvation and desire of not only David and the many names recorded in the 11<sup>th</sup> chap. Of this epistle, as worthy examples, for their firm adherence to those exceeding great and precious promises, but of Jesus also. This constituted the joy that was set before him, and for which he refused not to suffer on the cross.

Brethren Robert Strathearn, of Tranent, and Andrew Tait next took up the last of the three phases into which the subject had been divided, viz., “the first resurrection,” and the law of life and death during the millennial age. The opinions they expressed were identical; therefore, their addresses are blended into one; so that not only space may be husbanded, but that the matter may be presented in one perfect whole, rather than in two sections. The ideas they propounded are as follow: The millennial age is one, the pre-eminent feature in which is the *presence* of Jesus the Christ, who is the life of his people, as it is written, “When Christ our *life* shall appear, then shall we appear with him in glory.” That he has abolished death, is a great truth; and the fact that it still reigns over his servants, can only be attributed to his absence from their midst. For if it is absolutely necessary that every son of Adam must return to dust and be raised again, before he can obtain the life which is in Christ, then upon no principle of equity can the mortality of the living at Christ’s appearing be clothed, “in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,” with the house which is from heaven. But we think that it is the greatest blessing of that age, that as death has held undivided sway over the righteous in the ages that will have passed, so then there will be “no more death,” save to the wicked, and to them a “perpetual sleep.” For if we hold that Jesus, after his



inaugurating that time by judging his household, dividing the good from the bad, and raising up his dead-ones (that is, those who have died, and those who were living at his coming, standing on one level—corruptible) incorruptible, is, with his glorified brethren, the ruler of the world, and administrator of the law of life, then if the righteous die during that age, Christ's functions are divested of their greatest glory. He is the antitypical Moses and if we admit that he administers the curse—the age-lasting punishment—without an intervening death and resurrection, after the similitude of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, why not the blessing on the same principle? Those who hold the contrary view think they find unqualified support in the 5<sup>th</sup> verse of the 20<sup>th</sup> chap. Of Rev. But this is but slender ground, seeing that the whole teaching of the Book is the other way; and, moreover, the argument based on this is by no means clear. The words are, “But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished: this is the first resurrection.” Now it is a fact worth noticing here that several versions of the New Testament omit the first part of the 5<sup>th</sup> verse, and read the latter part in connection with the 4<sup>th</sup> verse, thus, “And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them, and they lived and reigned with the Christ a thousand years: this is the first resurrection.” This, in the light of the views we have stated, appears to be a better reading of the text. But the word “again” is not to be found in any but the common version. Reading the verse, then, with only this alteration, it appears to us clearly a contrast in the Apostle's version of the “dead ones, small and great,” whom he sees standing before the throne, and judged every man according to his works, verse 11 to the end. Some of them sit down on thrones, and live and reign with Christ one thousand years. This is *their* part or inheritance. But the rest of these dead ones who were judged, did not live in the age, but on them, the second death had power. This is further confirmed in the 8<sup>th</sup> verse of the 21<sup>st</sup> chap. If it be argued that to have a part in the first resurrection means only the act of rising from the ground, then there is only *one* class in that rising up—they are all righteous. But this is so clearly opposed to the truth of the matter, that its refutation is needless. Amidst a multitude of references one will suffice, viz., Daniel 12:2. We are forced, therefore, to a different conclusion as to the words “first” or “chief” resurrection, if we understand this chief resurrection as such, not on account of there being another and a lesser one, but because that to have a part in it is to be of the first fruits unto God and the Lamb, to be one of the chiefs of the aion. Having this idea, therefore, we might paraphrase the verse thus:—“Blessed is he that hath a portion or inheritance in the exaltation of the first fruits, on him ‘the shame and contempt of the age’ has no power.”

The subjects presented, of which the preceding is a digest, were, if not exhaustive, at least highly suggestive; and on this score, were much appreciated by the majority of the brethren present, and will, doubtless, receive the same attention and thought from readers of the *Ambassador*.

Another meeting of the same character was fixed for Sunday, October 13<sup>th</sup>, to which brethren from all parts are invited. The subjects for consideration are 1<sup>st</sup>, The basis of the faith for fellowship unto true unity; 2<sup>nd</sup>, the apostolic teaching concerning the corporate manifestation of the saints as the body of Christ

*The Christadelphian (1872) pg. 225*

[Compiler's Note: See (May 1872) BIRMINGHAM]

#### PROPOSED FRATERNAL GATHERING

IT has frequently happened that special occasions (such as the recent discussion with the Jews), have brought together a number of brethren at Birmingham, from divers parts of the country. This has given opportunity for mutual acquaintance and encouragement which have been found serviceable in the subsequent operations of the truth. These and many individual and detached visits to Birmingham have

originated the question:—Why should there not be a stated opportunity for a gathering of brethren from different parts? The same question has been put by some who have never been out of their own immediate circle, but to whom the advisability of such a thing has suggested itself. The desire for mutual acquaintance and encouragement is reasonable, and if practicable, there could be no objection to its gratification, provided the gathering was simple and spiritual in character, and kept free from anything involving organization, or legislation, or interference with the independent action of ecclesias. The truth must be left to work its own work in the minds and consciences of believers. **We must set up no authority. We must preserve, in its most untrammelled form, the liberty of voluntary fraternal association and co-operation, requiring, as our only condition, the belief and obedience of the truth. On subsidiary matters, we must preserve absolute independence of each other. We must beware of taking a step towards ecclesiastical law-making, which while intended for good, has in all the history of the world, worked evil. The beginnings are insidious, and have to be guarded against.** If we are to meet, let it be as brethren merely, seeking to help each other in the work of preparing to meet the Lord.

The question has been brought forward in a definite shape at Birmingham, as the result of suggestion from other parts. A meeting was called to consider the question on Tuesday, March 26<sup>th</sup>. Three points were distinctly developed:—1. It could not be denied that much good would result from such a gathering, in the way of refreshment and encouragement to isolated brethren, or brethren from small ecclesias, who might attend. 2. On the other hand, it was certain that unless carefully provided against, the evils would arise which had developed themselves in America, where fraternal gatherings had degenerated into ecclesiastical synods, with an objectionable machinery of paid evangelists, and “committees,” “funds,” “reports,” and the rest of the paraphernalia which tend to overlay and suffocate spiritual life. 3. Provided these were expressly and effectually excluded, and the gathering restricted in the most absolute manner to non-official, non-legislative, fraternal intercourse, it seemed safe to make the experiment for one year at all events. The difficulty was as to the accommodation of the brethren who would come together. From this point of view, Birmingham, as the seat of an ecclesia of 200 brethren and sisters, was considered the most eligible place to have the meeting. It was thought there would be no difficulty in providing for a goodly company of brethren from divers parts for, say four days. It was, therefore, unanimously resolved, after thorough discussion, on a motion and amendment, to extend a general invitation to all brethren and sisters who can make it convenient to meet the Birmingham ecclesia on Saturday, Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, August 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, and 13<sup>th</sup>.

The idea would be to come together informally on the Saturday afternoon, for mutual introduction and allotment of lodging places. 2. To meet on the following Sunday morning for the breaking of bread. 3. In the evening for the proclamation of the word; 4, on the Monday forenoon (say from 11 to 2), for free intercourse in open conference on matters appertaining to the working of the truth; in the evening for tea, and edifying addresses. 5. On Tuesday evening, a public meeting, at which various brethren should, by pre-arrangement, deliver addresses on the truth as bearing on topics before the public mind. Brother Andrew suggests a choice from the following list:

#### THE DIVINE SOLUTION OF THE RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS OF THE AGE.

1.—The future universal Jewish Theocracy the only form of government adapted to meet the wants and promote the welfare of mankind.

2.—The abolition of war and the establishment of peace over the whole earth, impossible until the Prince of Peace obtains possession of the kingdoms of the world.

3.—The Missionary schemes of Christendom ineffectual to regenerate the world, which is an honor reserved for Jesus and his brethren.

4.—The approaching disendowment and disestablishment of all existing State-churches, preparatory to the establishment of the divine State-church, which will provide one religion for people of every nation, climate, and tongue.

5.—Parliamentary Reform mere political patchwork, destined to be superseded by thorough political remedies of magnitude, expedition, and value, when England shall be under the rulership of the King of Kings.

6.—The Education of the People on principles of truth and righteousness, a hopeless task until the administration of human affairs is taken from the powers that be and given into the hands of God's immortal kings and priests.

7.—The inequalities of Society to be rectified, not by Communism, Socialism, or Republicanism, but by divine Laws, hereafter to be promulgated from Jerusalem when it becomes the capital of the world.

Those intending to be present would have to announce their intention early beforehand, in time for making the necessary arrangements. Such would, of course, have to travel at their own expense, or at the expense of those who might send them; but while in Birmingham, the brethren would strive to make their stay comfortable and agreeable, without a "bill" at the end. If the number attending exceeds the resources of the brethren, brother Andrew suggests that those who are able provide themselves at the hotels.

*The Christadelphian (1877) pgs 130-136*

[Compiler's Note: See (Excerpt from March 1877) HUDDERSFIELD]

#### THE NO-WILL NULLIFICATION OF CHRIST'S WORK & MISSION

THAT Christ had a personality, will, or character of his own, developed by trial, is one of the most obvious facts of his case as narrated in the gospels, and as depicted in all the allusions to him in the apostolic epistles. It is a self-evident necessity of the case. We never heard it disputed by any class of professors of faith in him. Whether it be the mere-manist, or the Trinitarian, or the believer in the truth that Jesus was the exhibition in the seed of David of the divine character which had been spiritually ingrained in his conception, and afterwards developed by growth and experience and nurtured by assistance from above; and afterwards the direct manifestation of the Father's wisdom and power by the descent and abiding presence of the Holy Spirit at his baptism, we never until now met with the denial of his personal and independent volition except in the pages of a remote ecclesiastical history. It has sprung up now through a mistaken construction of the fact that he was God in manifestation. It has ensnared some whom we regret: at the originator we are not surprised. It is an obliteration of our Elder Brother; the eclipse of the captain of our salvation; the blotting out of "the mediator between God and man." As such, it is a serious interference with the truth—the substitution of incomprehensible phrases and embarrassing definitions for a glorious and practical fact: the existence and submission and love of our personal head and friend, with whom we hope shortly to be united.

In the intelligence from Sale two months ago, we were obliged to indicate the reservation arising from the acceptance of this error. Brother Birkenhead responded by requesting insertion of the following notice:

“The brethren and sisters at Sale wish it to be understood, that in relation to the doctrine of ‘God-manifestation,’ they believe that in accordance with Jehovah’s statement to Moses, He caused a portion of His Spirit to become a flesh and blood body, in which He veiled Himself, and through which He manifested Himself from its birth, forward. The eternal Christ-power veiled in the flesh, and the flesh in which the Christ Deity dwelt was known to men as Jesus Christ, *was and is the true Deity*. The side which men saw was the flesh, which the indwelling and ever present Deity used for the purpose of His manifestation of righteousness or character, which character being produced by the Spirit or Eternal Christ-Power, was without spot, and 33½ years from the birth of the flesh, the flesh was given by Deity for the life of the world. Having provided and offered this spotless Lamb, which took away our sins, the body was again vivified and raised to Spirit nature, so that Jesus Christ, who was first God manifest in flesh, is now God justified in Spirit, believing that the flesh and blood body seen by men was prepared for the use of the invisible Deity dwelling therein (from the moment of its formation, and not simply from the immersion of Jesus), and whose intelligence, wisdom and power thus embodied, were manifested through the flesh in the various words spoken and actions performed, we understand all scriptural statements concerning Jesus Christ in harmony therewith, and give the glory therewith to the Eternal Spirit, Jehovah, while at the same time we honour the Son as we honour the Father, because the Son was the Father in flesh-manifestation, His Spirit having become that flesh.”

To this the Editor returned the following answer:

*Birmingham, 14<sup>th</sup> Jan., 1877.*

DEAR BROTHER BIRKENHEAD,—Your letter deals only with points of agreement. I should have been glad if you could be equally satisfactory as to the conclusions you draw from the premisses laid down. If you can say “yes” to each of the following questions our difficulty will be at an end:

1.—Had Christ, the manifestation of God, a will of his own, which he voluntarily subjected to the requirements of his Father who sent him?

2.—Did Christ undergo probation before exaltation?

I should feel unspeakable relief if you could answer these questions affirmatively. God forbid I should misrepresent you. It goes hard with me I assure you to be at issue with those with whom I have been in so much unity in the truth as with you; but you leave me no alternative if you cease to confess the truth in that element of it which you now call in question. Relieve me of my embarrassment by saying “Yes” to the questions. I will then know how to deal with the statement which you desire to be published.—Faithfully yours in the hope of present and future unity,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

P.S.—Loveto all of your house.

*Sale, Jan. 15<sup>th</sup>, 1877.*

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—Yours of yesterday is to hand, in which you ask me to give an answer to two questions. I will willingly do so, but must trouble you to write me again before I do it. The matter at issue is of the greatest importance, therefore we shall do well to avoid doing anything hastily, and we must strive to avoid misunderstanding. For these reasons I think it well that, in the words of the Dr., “The first thing we ought to do is to arrive at a distinct comprehension of what each one understands by the phrase

*Jesus Christ,*” and in addition to this also, what each one understands by the words “will,” “voluntary” and “probation.” As these words occur in your questions, I must ask you to write me again, when I will gladly answer you. This is certainly necessary, as they are all words having various meanings. (Here followed lengthy extracts from writings on the subject by Dr. Thomas and the Editor). Excuse me writing at such length. Please to give me the necessary assistance that I may know what you mean in the questions by the words “Christ,” “the manifestation of God,” “will,” “voluntary” and “probation,” and I will immediately reply.—In the hope that we may all be found prepared to enter the presence of Jehovah’s glory in Christ at his coming, and reciprocating your love expressed for us, believe me to remain, yours faithfully,

J. BIRKENHEAD.

*Birmingham, 22<sup>nd</sup> January, 1877.*

DEAR BROTHER BIRKENHEAD.—I have been too busy with a pamphlet on the Eastern Question and with the coming *Christadelphian* to answer your letter. In doing so now, I must be very brief.

1.—By “Christ” I mean that individual personage whom Paul describes as “the man Christ Jesus;” and of whom Peter says “God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and power.”

2.—By “will” I mean individual volition or power of choosing according to the ideas before the mind.

3.—By “voluntary” I mean the exercise of this power.

4.—By “probation” I mean proof, trial, temptation.

I hope these definitions will enable you to say “Yes” to the questions I have propounded, and which I here repeat. 1.—Did Christ, the manifestation of God, have a will of his own which he voluntarily subjected to the requirements of the Father who sent him? 2.—Did Christ undergo probation before exaltation?

I would remark with regard to your quotations from the Dr. and myself, that while quoting one part of our statements, you leave out of account and object to other parts. This ought to suggest to you that your treatment of the Scriptures, which cannot stand up and speak for themselves as living writers can, may be of the same one-sided character. Hoping we may not be separated, I remain, with love to all, your brother in the hope.

ROBERT ROBERTS.

P.S.—I have no sympathy or connection with any who say Christ was a mere man.

In answer to this, a long letter was sent, from which we subjoin extracts sufficient to indicate the nature of the reply as follows.

*Sale, January 25<sup>th</sup>, 1877*

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS.—Your note came duly to hand, but great pressure of business has prevented me answering sooner, which, however, does not much matter, as it is too late for anything I may have to say to influence you in regard to putting or not putting my former communication in the February *Christadelphian*.

I regret that what you have further said in your last letter in explanation of terms used in your first one, is not such as we can heartily say Yes to. We may misunderstand you; but some of the expressions used convey ideas which we cannot endorse, while others are still indefinite.

The personage alluded to by Paul when he said “the man Christ Jesus,” is certainly the one whom he, in the chapter following that from which the phrase is quoted, speaks of as “God who was manifested in the flesh,” but, at the time he wrote was “God justified in Spirit,” the same personage throughout. So also the personage whom Peter speaks of as being “anointed with Holy Spirit and power” is the same he speaks of as “our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.”. . You ask, “Had this personage a will of his own or independent volition? Independent of the flesh in which he was manifested? Yes. Independent of the Eternal Christ Power? No. Had he the power of choosing according to the ideas before his mind? Yes, as God unmanifested has; but that the Son could have chosen to do evil we do not believe any more than he unmanifested could have so chosen. The word “subjected” also implies the idea of “opposition” on the part of the will existing in the Son, which we cannot endorse for the reasons given above.

That in the living flesh and blood man, existed, as in us, impulses and natural inclinations, which required keeping within legal bounds, we fully recognise; but this was done by the eternal Christ Power dwelling in the Son, and constituting him Jesus Christ, or God manifest in flesh, and not by the good organisation of the Son as a man merely. I need scarcely say that after the Eternal Spirit, in accordance with the oracle, “I will be who I will be,” became Jesus of Nazareth, there were steps of progression in the manifestation of himself. Just so much of his intelligence, wisdom and power were manifested through the body prepared” as he, the Christ Deity, thought proper, so that the Son spoke and acted according to the wisdom and power dwelling in him; so that while the Son, as a second intelligence, was ignorant of various things during the days of his flesh, he was at the same time as Jesus Christ, or the human and divine in combination—the *personage* by whom the worlds were made—the true Deity, whom to know is life eternal, and such we cannot recognise as having a volition independent of the Father.

The “subjection” of “the man Christ Jesus” to the requirements of the Father, was the result not of the good intentions of the human, carried out by the assistance of the Divine Spirit, but the result of the divine intelligence, wisdom and power of the Spirit, which was the directing and controlling power embodied. Without this we say “the man” would not have been “Christ Jesus”—in combination they were Jesus Christ.

To your second question, did “the man Christ Jesus” undergo trial, or temptation before exaltation? We answer Yes, as Christ before he clothed himself with our sinful flesh, was tried, tempted and proved by the Israelites in the wilderness 40 years. So when he became “the man Christ Jesus,” he was tried, tempted and proved by the Israelites again.

With reference to your remark that our quotations from the Scriptures may be as one-sided as those from the Dr.’s and your own writings, we would say that we can understand and harmonize all the statements of the Scriptures upon both the sides of this glorious subject, which, however, we are unable to do with the Dr.’s and your own; and while we can heartily endorse many things you both have written, there are others we cannot. The first we quote, because we believe them to be the exposition of Scripture; the others we leave alone for the opposite reason.—That you and all truly desirous of God’s glory, with us, may then be accepted, with love from those associated with me, I remain, dear brother, yours fraternally,

J. BIRKENHEAD.

Remarks on the Foregoing

The confusion apparent in the foregoing is the simple result of failing to distinguish between God and the manifestation of God. This distinction is visible in all the information we have of Christ or allusion to him. It is involved in the very fact that he is the Son of God. It is a distinction so constantly conspicuous in the New Testament, that we shall not cease to hope concerning our friendly correspondent, that in the continuous and contemplative reading of it, the distinction will so dawn upon him and those with him, as to compel them to recognize it and to throw down the barrier which the denial of Christ's voluntary obedience at present interposes.

The letter draws metaphysical distinctions between the Spirit that formed and fashioned the man Christ Jesus, and the flesh-nature in which the form was exhibited. It is this that creates the difficulty. It is an unscriptural way of dealing with the subject. We are not to speak of Christ as if he were a compound of two chemical substances; we are to look at him as a whole—the Word made flesh—the man Christ Jesus—the Son of God. If we do this, we can have no difficulty in recognising his independent volition and his individual distinction from the Father, to whom he was obedient. His manifestation of God and his individual compliance with the will of God are facts, and they are consistent facts to those who take the subject in its practical New Testament form, without seeking to square it in its abstract elements. We ought not to distress ourselves with abstractions. They are beyond the range of the human intellect. It is facts we have to deal with, and the facts in this case are matters of testimony. We must receive all matters of testimony. It is a mistake to discard a testified fact, because we are unable to reconcile it with some other fact. It is a testified fact that Christ obeyed, that he obeyed for the joy set before him; that he was tempted; that though he were a son, he learned obedience, and with strong crying and tears, he made supplication to the Father, and was heard in that he feared (Phil, 2:8; Heb. 12:2; 2:18; 4:15; 5:7, 8.) To say that these things are not so because he was the Word made flesh, is to reason against the testimony. It is not for us to say what the effect of the incarnation of Jehovah's word must have been; it is ours to receive the testimony of what it was. The letter, under a wrong guidance, fails to do this, but makes use of the God side of Jesus to blot out the obedient and well-beloved Man of Sorrows. The letter makes the obedience of Christ the act of God in the Son, instead of the act of the Son to God. It does this from a fear that to say it was the Son's obedience, would be to say it was the obedience of the "man merely." There is a wholesome fear of mere-manism; but it is misplaced here. You cannot have the obedience of a "mere man" where no mere man was. The man Christ Jesus was not a mere man, but the exhibition of the divine character by the means employed in bringing him into the world. After his anointing, he was the exhibition of the Father's power and wisdom, as well as character.

Take away the individual volition of the man Christ Jesus, and you destroy the beauty of this most blessed matter. This is done in the well-meant but misleading definitions of the foregoing letter. The answer to the second question, for instance, completely nullifies the fact of the Father's subjection of Christ to trial. It says Christ was "tried, tempted and proved" as God was "tried, tempted and proved by the Israelites in the wilderness for forty years." Now, the testimony of Paul is that he was "tempted in all points *like as we are*."—(Heb. 4:15.) The letter says he was tempted *like as God was*. Can God be tempted with evil? James says No.—(Jas. 1:13.) It is testified that Christ was faithful.—(Heb. 3:2.) To whom was he faithful? According to the indiscriminating language of the letter, he was God faithful to himself or faithful to the Israelites. Paul's representation of the matter is, "He was faithful TO HIM THAT APPOINTED HIM, *as also Moses was faithful in all his house*."—(Heb. 3:2.) This is the completest condemnation of the No-will theory. It takes away Christ's faithfulness to God: it hides the Son of God and destroys the relation between our Elder Brother and our common Father. It is testified that the Father "scourgeth *every son whom he receiveth*." That Jesus was no exception is expressly testified in the declaration that "*though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things that he suffered*."—(Heb. 5:7, 8.)

The writer cannot harmonise his theory with these testimonies. He says he can; no doubt he thinks so, but true discrepancies remain in logic, even if a man be not able to see them. The writer cannot reconcile

what Dr. Thomas has written on the subject, and he finds the same difficulty in what the Editor has written. One of these writers is alive, and asserts harmony to exist where the writer of the foregoing letter sees contradictions. What does this mean, except that the latter is not accurately putting all parts of the subject together. An argument against the view that Christ is a mere man necessarily lays stress and emphasis on the divine side of the case; but there is no exclusion (though there may be no mention) of co-ordinate truth. Christ is the Spirit's work, but an argument to prove this is wrongly construed if it is construed to exclude the *Spirit's mode of doing the work*. This mistake has been made—we doubt not in good faith on the part of some. We are sorry for it, but we are not at liberty to partake in the error resulting from this mistake. We pray that God may restore unity among all who, in sincerity and truth, seek to do His will and to uphold the glory of his name in the earnestness and simplicity of childhood.

EDITOR.

*The Christadelphian (1877) pg. 36*

[Compiler's Note: See (Excerpt from January 1877) SALE]

#### A LEAFLET FOR MEETINGS EVERYWHERE

BROTHER Laverock, of Edinburgh, suggested and drafted; the Editor has revised; and brother Doe, of Yeovil, has printed a leaflet (which can be had from the offices, 8d. per 100, post free,) suitable for giving away at meetings held in connection with the truth everywhere. It consists of a definition, in 13 brief propositions, of the faith he'd by the Christadelphians, and an advertisement of the principal works in which the demonstration of them is to be found at length. We cannot better introduce it to readers than by re-publishing herewith the propositions which are as follow:—

#### THE CHRISTADELPHIANS, OR BRETHERN OF CHRIST, BELIEVE

- 1.—That there is but one God, the Father, dwelling in heaven, having underived existence, essentially immortal in His nature, the Maker and sustainer of everything, animate and inanimate.
- 2.—That there is one Lord of men, viz., Jesus Christ, who was the Son of God by conception, and the Son of Man by birth; the bringer of life by obedience under trial: who, in the days of his flesh was, in his life, the manifestation of the Father who abode in him; in his death, the condemnation of sinful flesh; and, in his resurrection, the means of salvation to all who put on his name.
- 3.—That the Spirit is the effluence or power of God. Proceeding from Him, and filling all space, for the execution of the works He may design to do.
- 4.—That man is a creature of the dust, condemned to die because of sin. He lives by the breath of life common to all creatures; and, though organically superior to them he is, like them, a living but not an immortal soul.
- 5.—That immortality is a future condition of existence, attainable only by those who please God, by faith in what He has revealed, and obedience to what He has commanded. The notion of natural immortality is of Pagan origin, and inconsistent alike with Scripture and science.



6.—That life is ended by death, and can only be resumed by resurrection; which will take place both in the case of the just and the unjust; only with this difference, that the righteous will rise to live for evermore, while the wicked will be punished and die a second time.

7.—That the Lord Jesus Christ is to return from the heavens, and re-appear on the earth to set up His kingdom (the restored kingdom of David), in the land promised to Abraham; to bless all nations with his righteous reign, and to raise the dead and reward them according to their works.

8.—That everlasting punishment is not eternal torment, but a casting out of the kingdom of God; a giving over to die the second death, which will be final and irrevocable.

9.—That the devil is not a supernatural being, but the evil principle in human nature apostolically styled “sin in the flesh,” which makes devils of all men who are not subject to the will and commandments of God.

10.—That hell is not a place of fiery torment for immortal souls that do not exist, but the Bible name for the unseen state into which death resolves all men. It is, therefore, the name for the grave; when the original word is *Gehenna*, it is the locality of punishment at the coming of Christ.

11.—That belief of the gospel, described by the Spirit of God as “The things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ,” together with baptism (immersion in water), and the obedience of the commandments of Christ, are indispensable to the obtaining of eternal life.

12.—That the earth is the promised inheritance of Christ and his people. Therefore, it is not to be burned up, but will exist for ever, in a renovated state as the abode of the righteous, after the rooting out of the wicked.

13.—That the immortal saints (all who are accepted when Christ returns), are to reign with Christ over the nations for a thousand years in a real personal manner; after which, death will be abolished from among mankind, and God shall be all and in all.

*The Christadelphian (1878) pg. 245-254*

*[Compiler’s Note: See (Excerpt from June 1878) BIRMINGHAM.]*

## FREEMASONRY, ODDFELLOWSHIP AND BROTHERHOOD IN CHRIST

### AN ARGUMENT ON THE SUBJECT

REFERRING to the letter appearing under this head last month, the name of the writer (brother W. Gunn, of Walkerton, Ontario, Canada) was withheld because he had not at that time assented to its publication. The letter was apparently intended as a private communication to Birmingham, and consequently could not be used as the writer’s communication without his sanction. Its contents, however, were of general interest and value; and the advantage of these was secured by an anonymous publication, which at the same time reserved the private rights in the case. Bro. Gunn has since, of his own accord, given the necessary permission.

The subject treated in it has recently received considerable attention—particularly in Birmingham. It came up for consideration there, through an application for re-admission on the part of a brother who, in

the interval of his separation from the brethren (since the Renunciationist schism), had become, not only a member of the Oddfellowship fraternity, but an official in one of the lodges, and who defended that position as a position compatible with brotherhood in Christ. The managing brethren declined to accede to his request in such circumstances. In due course, their decision came under the review of the ecclesia at their regular quarterly meeting; and on that occasion, it transpired that several brethren, to whom it had never occurred to doubt the propriety of their position, were members of similar organizations. It was consequently decided, after a little discussion to suspend the decision of the managing brethren, until a special meeting should consider the question. A special meeting took place a few weeks afterwards, when it was decided to adjourn the matter still further, for an unspecified time till the brethren generally should have had time to consider a question new to many of them. This unspecified time was abruptly and prematurely terminated by a resolution at the next quarterly meeting, promoted by those affected by the question, and carried, that a meeting for the consideration of the question should take place within a month. Accordingly, it was fixed to take place on Tuesday, April 30.

The following letters had meanwhile been written:

DAILY POST OFFICE, *April 29<sup>th</sup>*, 1878.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS.—I shall not be able to be at the meeting to-morrow, on oddfellowship. Perhaps not to be regretted. Those who are personally associated with the “order,” seem to be anxious to get an expression of opinion. I should have preferred to have left the matter open in the hope that everyone interested, would sooner or later set themselves right under the discipline of the truth. Under the circumstances, however, would it not be well for you to propose a decisive resolution, condemnatory of fellowship with anything except the truth. Were I present I would support such a motion which seems to be the only one possible.

In hope of the time when all difficulties will be of the past, I remain, yours truly,

JOSEPH J. HADLEY.

18, GOLDSCHMIDT STREET, STOCKPORT ROAD, MANCHESTER.

*28<sup>th</sup> April*, 1878.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS.—I am glad to hear that the subject of “Freemasonry,” “Oddfellowship,” &c., is about to undergo discussion as to its consistency with professed fellowship with Christ. With a view to assisting with information, I send you a small book I have by me connected with Freemasonry. I was not aware till I received this present month’s *Christadelphian* that the meeting was coming on so soon, or I should probably have sent you many particulars from works which I have tried to borrow, but have hitherto been unsuccessful. I am glad you have received evidence from my “Brother Mason” abroad. I allude to the letter in the last issue of your periodical—evidence which is valuable when considering the length of his contact with that order. My connection with it when the truth found me was comparatively short to his, but the conclusion I came to respecting it was the same. I gave it you, you will remember, in the *Christadelphian* for March, 1875, p. 140. I might supplement my remarks, perhaps, by saying I more than ever am of opinion that “Benefit” societies are not compatible with union with Christ. It is true that Freemasonry is not professedly a “Benefit” society (in the acceptance of the term as used by Oddfellows, Foresters, &c.), and that one is not supposed to join with “mercenary motives.” Nevertheless, it is difficult for a logical mind to reconcile this profession. In the case of Foresters, Oddfellows, &c., there can be no quibble of this sort. These institutions are certainly “arms of flesh,” and it is with much regret that I know those who profess to trust only in the one God do use these fleshly supports. I have been pained by such

an expression as this: "What would brother So-and-So have done in his late illness had it not been for his connexion with the Foresters?" "He who owns the cattle on a thousand hills," to my mind, is practically set down by them as not to be trusted for daily bread of a temporal character. I trust you will arrive at a satisfactory solution of this question, and if I can be of any service, command me.

With love, yours very faithfully,

C. W. CLARK.

31, FLINT STREET, LEICESTER,

*29<sup>th</sup> April, 1878.*

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS.—In view of the meeting that is to take place to-morrow, I have thought it would not be out of place to write you a few thoughts and show you my own position in regard to the subject to be brought forward. I am glad the meeting is to take place, and hope the matter will be so decided as to set at rest the minds of all concerned. Because, to my mind, the arguments used to uphold connection with the clubs savour of expediency. But I, for one, want to know whether continuing to pay money into a club, conducted by men of the world, who style themselves "Oddfellows," would imperil my recognition by Christ, at his appearing and kingdom and constitute a flaw in my title deed to the inheritance of the saints in light: because, if so, although I have paid a great deal of money into such a club (and that is all I have to do with it, that I may receive benefit in sickness, &c.) and should, in case of withdrawing from it receive nothing, I should consider myself mad to continue my connection with it. I trust the meeting will be guided by the mind of Christ and his apostles, so far as can be applied to a modern institution, in the absence of any living infallible guide whom they could consult. In hope of having the approval of the Anointed One at his (as I think speedy) appearing,

I remain, yours sincerely and fraternally,

WILLIAM COLE.

*April 29<sup>th</sup>, 1878.*

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS.—I see you intend discussing the propriety of brethren being connected with Free Masonry. I have no sympathy with that institution; but I fear there is some misunderstanding in connecting the word Oddfellowship with that of Free Masonry. I find that many of the brethren belong to the order of Oddfellowship, which, to my mind, is only a sick benefit society, in which a number of persons, by paying, say 1s4d. per month, provide in case of sickness for their families, by being able to receive, say 10s. per week during sickness, or in case of death the widow receives £10 to inter or bury the deceased. Almost without an exception, the truth finds persons in these societies. Are they to separate themselves from such societies? So long as they continue to send their contributions regularly, they remain entitled to all the benefits of the same. They can do this without taking any part in their formalities in opening the room, or in conducting their business, which are really simple and nothing at all akin to Free Masonry. Oddfellowship is a term given to a fraternity, although I am not prepared to discuss how far this term can be maintained. There is what is termed the Bolton United Order of Oddfellows, then there is the Manchester Unity; I should presume the two Orders will have upwards of 30,000 persons.

Brother Roberts, the point at issue seems to me to be this: can brethren who have allied themselves to Christ remain in connection with such a society as Freemasonry? No! but I think such societies as I have just described, are different. Members are not compelled to take any part in their meetings, and it is only

doing good to all men as opportunity offereth. Suppose the person contributing never being sick; all the better. I am quite sure that we are commanded to come out from the world and be separate; and if both these societies be wrong, we have no right to belong to them. But in that case, we have no right to insure against death, for the society I have mentioned is really nothing more than an Insurance Company. If we must not insure then I fear a great many of both brethren and sisters have a great deal to do yet, and the brethren, perhaps, will be called upon in some localities to contribute largely towards defraying the expenses of burying poor brethren, when a few pence per week would have made the necessary arrangement, in contributing to an Insurance Company or Benefit Society.

Then we might carry it still further, and say, that brethren have no right to contribute to Trade Unions, in which case, we shall have brethren out of work in every town and village, for if they do not contribute to these, they are kept out of employ by the Unionists.

I think so long as brethren can remain connected with these benefit societies, without being compelled to take part in any of their meetings, I don't see any real harm. I have been connected with a society of this sort for upwards of twelve years, and only been in the room twice since I became related to Christ, and the last time five years since; yet I am in receipt of all the benefits of the same by sending my contribution. On my father (also a member) lately coming into the truth, I told him to withdraw himself from office, he being secretary of the same. He has done so, and now he sends his money by some friend or neighbor, and still remains a member.

There are some objections, I know, to these societies. They are generally holden at some public house or beershop, and for brethren to attend these places of meeting, is liable, I fear, to be a stumbling stone to them. I cannot agree with brethren going to these rendezvous, and spending two or three hours every meeting-night. It savours too much of serving God and the world. But is there any objection to membership merely, when a brother never goes near the place, but only sends his subscription?

Brother Roberts, if you think I am wrong, I will gladly forego even this, if you will show me why I should give it up, for I am exceedingly anxious to be found worthy of eternal life at the appearing of Christ.

Yours patiently waiting for Him,

\*\_\_\_\_\*\_\_\_\_

363, S. WELLINGTON-ST., GLASGOW,

*April 28<sup>th</sup>, 1878.*

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS.—I write to you at this time for the purpose of putting before you a view of the case to be discussed on Tuesday first, that may not be apparent to any not personally connected with the societies to be spoken of. I have been a member of a Friendly Society, called the “Ancient Order of Foresters’ Friendly Society,” for some years. My reason for joining this society was purely a money matter, viz., that I might, by paying a certain sum weekly (8½d.), receive a certain benefit, viz., 18s. per week if sick for a period of six months, with medical attendance and medicine; after six months the scale of benefits during sickness are reduced—and also £10 at the death of a member, and £7 at the death of a member’s wife. Now what I would wish the brethren to consider in this discussion, is this: in what sense is it wrong for me to take advantage of this method of making a provision for those who are dependent on me for support during a possible period of sickness? Is it not much the same as having one’s life insured, or putting money in a saving’s bank—both of which institutions are certainly of the world? And if all these are wrong, would it not be well for the brethren to make the evil so apparent to those, who, like me,

may require to give up our connection with these institutions in order that we may walk worthily in this life?

I hope you will excuse me for writing to you on this subject, but I am anxious to have any information that can lighten up the way in these days of darkness.

I remain your brother in the hope of life

ROBERT WALLACE.

### The Position and Duty of Brethren in the Matter

The meeting was duly held on the day appointed. At the previous meeting, arguments were used which, though not now repeated, formed part of the discussion. Brother Roberts moved the following resolution:—

“That it is unlawful for a brother of Christ to be a member in any society of unjustified men constituting a brotherhood, or whose objects either rival or oppose the principles of the brotherhood established by Christ himself of which he is the head. That Freemasonry, Oddfellowship and kindred institutions are rivals in so far as they propose friendship and mutual care as the objects of association: and that they are opponents in so far as they use forms and names of honour one to another which Christ forbids, and exclude and discourage faith in God which Christ enjoins. That, therefore, we cannot entertain the application for admission to our fellowship of—, who is not only a member but an official in such an organization. That, on the contrary, we confirm the suspended decision of the managing brethren.”— (See next page.)

“That we wish, at the same time, to leave every brother, as a steward responsible to the judgment-seat of Christ, free to make such private arrangements as he sees fit in regard either to the husbanding of the substance God has given him, or the insuring himself against probable contingency, such as want of work, sickness, &c., requiring only that he do not make himself part of any organization incompatible with the brotherhood to which he belongs in Christ.”

In supporting this resolution, brother Roberts presented the following considerations (here amplified): Christ, by the hands of the apostles, visited the Gentiles 1,800 years ago with the object of developing for himself a brotherhood, whose foundation, during their probation in the mortal state, should be the belief in and love of God and of Christ, his Son; hope in His promises; obedience to His commandments and confidence in His care, in all things pertaining both to the life that now is and that which is to come. On this foundation, the brotherhood established was for friendship and mutual care of one another, which was made a matter of “command.” The brotherhood so established was holy to the Lord. The members of it, if they came up to the standard of their profession, were “not of the world.” Jesus, the head of the body, told them “Ye are not of the world even as I am not of the world.” They were forbidden to cultivate friendship with the world, on pain of alienation from the friendship of Christ. The language on this head was precise and vigorous: “Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?” “whosoever will be a friend of the world, is the enemy of God.”— (Jas. 4:4.) “Ye cannot serve God and Mammon” (Luke 16:13). “Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers . . . come out from among them, and be ye separate.” (2 Cor. 6:14, 17) Some would limit this distinction to separateness of ecclesiastical fellowship; that is, while insisting on a brother having nothing to do with the religious exercises of the alien, they would suffer such an one to identify himself as closely as he liked with their pleasures, their friendships, their business schemes, and occupations and aims in life in general. Such an interpretation of the mind of Christ does violence to the facts of the case, and the manifest intention of the separateness enjoined. Let us take the

case of Christ himself, for instance: in telling his disciples not to be of this world, he said, "I am not of the world." These words could not mean that he was not in ecclesiastical fellowship with those whom he here styles "the world." That world was the world of the Jews, and with them he was in ecclesiastical fellowship; for he was subject to the law, and took part in all its exercises and feasts, and ecclesiastically identified himself with the Jews, as in his conversation with the woman at the well of Samaria, saying, "ye (Samaritans) worship ye know not what: we (Jews) *know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews*" (Matt. 4:22): furthermore saying to the people, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you to observe, that observe and do, but do not ye after their works."—(Matt. 23:1–2–.)

In what sense, then, though ecclesiastically in fellowship with them, was he not of them, but separate from them? The sense manifest in all his discourses, is brought to a focus in the following statement: "I speak that which I have seen with my Father; and ye do that which ye have seen with your father . . . Ye are of your father, the devil, and *the lusts of your father ye will do.*"—(John 8:38, 44.) The difference was a difference of doing. Hence, the burden of his practical exhortations to his disciples, was: "Be not as the hypocrites (the Scribes and Pharisees) are: do not as they do." This not doing as they did, became an offence, and a ground of hatred, as it does in all circumstances. "If ye were of the world," said Jesus to them, "the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."—(John 15:19.) He said, on another occasion, "me the world hateth, because I testify of it that *the works thereof are evil*"—(John 7:7). This is why friendship with the world is a declared impossibility on the part of the sons of God. There can be no friendship where there is no concurrence and approbation. For a man, therefore, to cultivate or to have the friendship of the world, is a proof either that he approves their ungodly principles or that he fails to "reprove" them (Eph. 5:11), either of which is unfaithfulness. A man may enjoy the good opinion of the respectable sinnership of the age by such a course; but it is dearly bought. Jesus says, "Woe unto you when all men speak well of you." Modern sentiment reverses this saying. For a man to have no enemies is considered a good indication, and that fact is generally stated as an eulogy of the person concerned. It is impossible for a man who is faithful to divine principles to be in this apparently happy state. His faithfulness will infallibly create enemies. Jesus is an example; he was surrounded and embarrassed by them during his life, and overpowered by them in his death. We cannot expect to excel him. "The whole world lieth in wickedness," as John testifies (1 John 5:19.); and if a man, in such a world, upholds the divine standard, he does it at the expense of general friendship and good opinion. John defines the point, "All that is in the world,—*the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life* is not of the Father."—(John 2:16.) But of the saints, he says, "We are of God;" and Paul exhorts them, "Be followers of God, as dear children;" "as he that hath called you is holy, so be ye holy, *in all manner of conversation.*" And Peter: "Let the time past of our lives suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles." "We are his workmanship," says Paul, "created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained, that we should walk in them . . . in whom ye are also builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."—(Eph. 2:10–22.) To be not of the world, is, therefore, something altogether more thorough than a mere separation of ecclesiastical fellowship. It is to be of a different spirit from the world, of a different mood, of different aim, of different affection, of a different joy, and of a different line of action. Jesus draws the contrast between the two, in many ways. On the one side we have, "BLESSED are ye that are poor, that hunger, now, that weep now, whom men shall hate and separate from their company." And on the other hand, "WOE UNTO YOU that are rich, that are full, that laugh, and of whom men shall speak well.—(Luke 6:20–26.) Then we have the distinction thus indicated: "Seek not what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind, for *all these things do the nations of the world seek after*, and YOUR FATHER KNOWETH THAT YE HAVE NEED OF THESE THINGS. But rather seek ye the kingdom of God, and *all these things shall be added unto you.*"—(Luke 12:29–31.)

Those who would limit the separateness of the saints to ecclesiastical relations merely, furthermore overlook the practical object aimed at in that separateness. That object is stated by Paul to be to "*purify*

UNTO HIMSELF a peculiar people, zealous of good works.” Now, the people gathered out, cannot attain to this purification if they remain in association and alliance with those whose affections and principles appertain altogether to the present evil world. If they are on terms of friendship and co-operation with these, how can they obey the command, “Seek those things which are above where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth, for ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God.”— (Col. 3:1–2.) Where a man’s friends are—where a man’s treasure is, there will his heart be also. So Christ said and such we know to be true. For this reason, he forbids us to lay up treasure, and for a similar reason, we are to make no friendship with the world. What is in danger of stealing our hearts, is in danger of stealing that which God wants. Therefore we are commanded to withdraw from this danger.

It is not the first time in the history of divine operations in the earth that His people have been enjoined to keep themselves aloof from those who know not God. Thus God commanded Israel by Moses: “Thou shalt make no covenant with them—the nations of Canaan—nor show mercy unto them, neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son, for they will turn away thy son from following ME, that they may serve other gods, so will the anger of the Lord be kindled against you and will destroy you suddenly.”— (Deut. 7:3–4.) The influence of one man upon another is a fact of very practical bearing in this matter. It is recognised by Solomon in these words: “He that walketh with wise men shall be wise, but *the companion* of fools shall fall.” The saints stand related to this fact and the duty arising out of it. In their present probation, they are no less but more than Israel after the flesh, “an holy nation, a peculiar people.” Their business is to “shew forth the praises of Him who hath called them out of darkness into His marvellous light.”— (1 Pet. 2:9.) In this their Gentile neighbours can have no sympathy, but contrariwise, and such society has, therefore, the wrong influence. The saints are said to have been, “in time past, not a people, but now the people of God”—(*Ib.*)—to have been “as sheep gone astray, but now returned unto the shepherd and bishop of their souls.”— (*Ib.*) What is their position in this capacity? It is defined in the same chapter (verse 11): “Dearly beloved, I beseech you *as strangers and pilgrims*, abstain from fleshly lusts (lust of the eye, lust of the flesh and the pride of life) which war against the soul.” Again, he says (4:2), “We should no longer live the rest of our time in the flesh to the lusts of men but to the will of God.” As regards the brethren among themselves, Paul tells them to, on the one hand, imitate those who walked according to apostolic example (Phil. 3:17), and to be followers of those who set the example of faith and patience (Heb. 6:12); while on the other, they were to turn away from those who with a form of godliness, were lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God.—(2 Tim. 3:4–5.) As regards those that were without, he says plainly: “Be not ye partakers with them; for ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord; walk as children of the light. See that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools but as wise, redeeming the time because the days are evil.”— (Eph. 5:7, 16.) “Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean, and I will receive you, and will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.”— (2 Cor. 6:17.) “Be not partakers of other men’s sins.”— (1 Tim. 5:22.) “Deny ungodliness and worldly lusts. Live soberly, righteously and godly, looking for that blessed hope.”— (Tit. 3:11.)

How forcibly are these exhortations expressed in the Psalms, “Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful, but his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in His law doth he meditate day and night.”— (Psa. 1.) Again, “I have not sat with vain persons, neither will I go in with dissemblers. I have hated the congregation of evildoers, and will not sit with the wicked.”— (Psa. 26:4, 5.) And again, “I AM A COMPANION OF ALL THEM THAT FEAR THEE, AND OF THEM THAT KEEP THY PRECEPTS.”— (Psa. 119:63.) When we remember that David was “*a man after God’s own heart*,” we apprehend the value of these sayings as furnishing a guide to us in our endeavour to attain and maintain an acceptable attitude before God, whose view of our action is our sole rule.

Now, when we turn from the contemplation of these things, to look at “Freemasonry, Oddfellowship, and kindred institutions,” the most natural effect produced, is the impulse to exclaim with Paul: “What communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?” For what are these institutions, viewed apart from all questions of detail, in which many objections might be found? Are they not leagues of friendship devised by man, and founded on the principles of the flesh? Are they not universally composed of men of the world, who are unenlightened in the purpose of God and unsubject to His will? This cannot be contradicted, and on this simple ground alone, a brother of Christ can form no part of the compact, for to do so would be to contravene the first requirement of the household of Christ—that the sons of God are not to be in relations of friendship with the world. “Freemasonry, Oddfellowship, and kindred institutions,” are, as brother Andrew has styled them, “Devil’s contrivances.” They are the attempts of unjustified and disobedient man, to rival God’s own appointment in Christ for friendship and well-being. They are the arrangements of men without God, by which they aim to secure love, peace, and protection, on their own principles, having no faith in Him, (though professing a belief in His existence,) and no recognition of His commandments, which in many cases they expressly set aside. They are the corporate illustration of the truth of Christ’s statement, that “after all these things, (what shall we eat, what shall we drink, and wherewithal shall we be clothed?) do the Gentiles seek,” after which things he tells his disciples they are to “seek not.” They are, in fact, the world’s ecclesia; the world’s brotherhood; the world’s scheme for securing peace and security without God and Christ. Consequently, for a man who has named the name of Christ, to continue in such a fellowship, is an impossibility, unless he be of those who have need to be taught which be the first principles of the oracles of God.

“Granted,” say some brethren, “but may we not pay in our contributions, without taking part in the working of the system?” The answer must be obvious. If it is wrong to belong to the system, it must be wrong to pay contributions which makes you part of the system; for by paying contributions, a man is a member—“a fellow,” one of “the brethren,”—and morally identified with all that appertains to the society; consequently, though he may stay at home, he is responsible for what transpires in the lodge room—for all the foolish talk and ribald songs, and drinking and smoking, by which “miserable sinners” seek to beguile the tedium of their unholy lives. He is responsible for all that is involved in the rules, and for all the “mastering,” and “worshipful grand-mastering,” and all the other flesh-pleasing elements of the institutions, which are in direct opposition to the laws of Christ, who forbids his disciples to call any man master, and disparages the receiving honour one of another. In short, contribution makes a man a part of the “friendship,” or “order,” and if the man is a disciple, it puts him in a position inconsistent with his acceptance of a place in the “order” of God.

But are we to make no provision for contingent wants? Are we to spend all we have to-day without reference to the wants of to-morrow? Are we to have no reciprocal dealings with fellow men?

These questions introduce a totally different topic, and one that should be kept entirely distinct from the question of membership in “Freemasonry, Oddfellowship and kindred institutions.” The mixing of them has interfered with clear perception on the part of some and caused embarrassment in the taking of a clear decision. Doing a thing and the way of doing it are two separate points. A brother may possess, but may not possess wrongfully. He may earn money, but not illegitimately. The question whether he may make a provision and whether he may make it by becoming a brother and friend of the world organized into an “order,” are two separate questions, and keeping them separate will disentangle the question of some of its difficulties. The second of the two has been discussed in the foregoing. The first now claims attention.

Some propose to settle it very summarily, by saying that faith in God dispenses with all need for precaution of any kind; that provision for sickness, want of work, &c., are inconsistent with faith, and that in fact money in the bank and investments of capital in every shape and form are in the same category;



that we ought absolutely to spend all and let to-morrow bring its own provision. This view will not be sustained by those who read and reflect closely. It is not the teaching of the holy oracles, though isolated sentences might seem to sanction it. God promises to give, and we are to have faith in His promise and to be without anxiety, especially that kind of anxiety that interferes with the doing of our present duty of giving through fear of future want. But God gives in His own way; part of the way consists of our dutiful co-operation.

God blessed Abraham, who became rich and prosperous; but the blessing consisted in overseeing, protecting, supplementing and working with Abraham's wise arrangements, whether in husbandry or war, which comprehended the use of 318 trained servants. God fulfilled to Jacob the promise that he would be with him and supply his wants; but the means employed was Jacob's wise use of the opportunities God brought within his reach. God was with Joseph, but Joseph was a faithful steward and adopted the measures that led to the blessing. God brought Israel out of Egypt, but they had to perform their part in equipping, marching, &c. He subdued Canaan before them, but it was by means of their armies used as His instrument. He gave them their enemies' lands, but only the land that they actually trod with the soles of their feet was theirs. He was with David and exalted him to be head of his people; but study David's life, and see how willingly and skilfully and faithfully he executed his part of the process that led to the throne.

The same principle will be found throughout. It is expressed in the phrase not exactly applied in this connection: "workers together with God." If we do our part, God will guide our efforts through to that degree of success which He may see fit to allow. If God second not a man's efforts, they will fail. "Except the Lord build the city, they labour in vain that build it." On the other hand, the Lord in building the city makes use of those who willingly build. God's method towards man is that of co-operation, though He can and does work otherwise when need calls for it, as in the resurrection. Now this method is observed in the matter under consideration. He promises to "add" to us the things which He knows we need, concerning which we are forbidden to be anxious; but the mode of the "adding" does not take the shape of bringing food to our door every morning as the milkman brings his daily supply of milk. He commands us to "labour, working with our hands, the thing that is good, that we may have to give to them that need" (Eph. 4:28); to be not slothful in business (Rom. 12:11); to provide things honestly in the sight of men (Rom. 12:17). If any man with mistaken theories of "faith" refuses to work, Paul, the teacher of us Gentiles, says he is not to eat. "We hear," he says, "that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busy-bodies. Now them that are such, we command and exhort, *by our Lord Jesus Christ* (and, therefore, it is vain for anyone to attempt to draw a distinction between the teaching of Christ and the teaching of Paul in the matter), that with quietness they WORK AND EAT THEIR OWN BREAD."— (2 Thess. 3:11.) He sets himself as an example in the matter. "We behaved not ourselves disorderly among you, neither did we eat any man's bread for nought, but wrought with labour and travail night and day that we might not be chargeable to any of you, not because we have not the power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us; for even when we were with you, this we commanded you that if any would not work neither should he eat."— (*Ib.*, verses 7–10.) He further declares that "if any man provide not for his own, especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel."— (1 Tim. 5:8.)

It is, therefore, evident that those would err who would so construe the rule of faith as to exclude individual effort for the possession of what we need. They would, in fact, exclude the very means appointed by God to ensure the blessing. It may be said this view of the matter leaves no scope for faith; that the labour of a saint, in such a case, differs, in no sense, from that of a sinner; but such a criticism would be superficial. A saint trusts to God for the means and opportunities of providing daily wants, prepared faithfully to do his part, and to accept the results realised as the bounty of God; whereas a sinner has no such view; exercises no faith; and is a stranger to thanksgiving. The difference between the two

ways of regarding the matter is well illustrated in the words of Moses to Israel: "Beware . . . lest thou say in thine heart, my power and the might of mine hand hath gotten me this wealth. But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God FOR IT IS HE THAT GIVETH THEE POWER TO GET WEALTH."— (Deut. 8:17.) God can give or withhold the power and opportunity, and a man's surroundings shall all the while seem perfectly natural and apparently accidental. The way of man is not in himself. There is unbounded scope for the action of faith; for "it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps."— (Jer. 10:23.) "Commit thy way unto the Lord and He shall direct thy steps."— (Prov. 3:6.) But this directing of the steps is effected in a way that not only does not interfere with but calls forth the performance of our individual part. There is no room for sloth or idleness in the divine ways of dealing with men. On the other hand, the success or failure of human effort depends on the divine co-operation or obstruction. Consequently, while a man is doing his best, there is a boundless margin in all his works for the operation of faith.

He is to labour, then, for the food and raiment which God has promised, and yet accepts them from the hand of God, for the power and opportunity to labour are His gift, and so are the results of the labour when put forth.

The next question is, is he, according to the theory in question, to use at once all that he receives, and reserve nothing against the need of to-morrow? The answer to this depends on the sense in which we speak of the need of to-morrow. If it be a remote to-morrow, which will bring its own supplies, and bear its own evils, we are positively to dismiss all care and provision on the subject. Jesus speaks expressly on this point. To-morrow, in this sense, will take thought for the things of itself. Caring for to-morrow, which may never come, will interfere with to-day, which is ours, with its duties. But the morrow in a more limited sense is part of to-day; and necessary provision for it was exemplified by the Lord himself in the recognition of a treasurer (dishonoured, it is true, by the officership of Judas), who bare what was put therein, and out of which it was customary to purchase provisions (John 4:8; also 13:29); also by the order at the miracle of the loaves, to "gather up the fragments that remain that nothing be lost." The lesson is taught by the form in which God's bounty comes in nature. There is a harvest at the end of the year. This has to serve for the whole year round. It therefore has to be taken care of and wisely used. If it is consumed or squandered in the week of its ingathering, there will be no supply for the rest of the year, and man must perish. Hence provision by caretaking is a duty, and the neglect of it would be a sin. But suppose a farmer should be so much afraid of lack in years to come as to hoard the present year's supply, or deal it out with pinching hand, withholding supplies from those to whom it is his duty to give, then there would be sin in the opposite direction. This case illustrates all cases. If a man knows he will be out of work a certain part of the year, or is liable to be so at any part of the year, he is not acting inconsistently with the law of faith in providing for it by the means at present in his hand. So with sickness: it is like having an umbrella in the house in dry weather; we know it will rain sometime, and it is only adapting ourselves to God's own arrangement, to be ready for a known contingency.

As to how you will use your present means of providing for probable contingency, there is no law, except that we are not to do anything inconsistent with our profession. You may save something of what you can spare, and keep it by you; or you may prefer to give it to another to keep for you, as in the case of a bank; or you may think it a better plan to put it out in a sick society—that is, to give it, in a small definite amount, to the present use of others, under an agreement that when you need it, its use will come to you again. "Freemasonry, oddfellowship, and kindred societies," embody this last-mentioned feature, and if this were their only feature, there would be less difficulty about the question of duty in relation to them; but they embody other principles and features which are inconsistent with the position of a brother of Christ. There are societies, however, that are not brotherhoods, and whose relation to those who contract with them is limited to mere finance. A transfer from the brotherhoods of friendship to these mere sick societies would simplify the position of those brethren of Christ who feel called upon to make provision for the uncertainties of their position. Insurance stands somewhat in the same position. Such arrangements

may all be said to be questions determinable by degrees of faith. He may make a present provision for future need in faith, in the same way as if he be a tiller of the land, he parts with a present supply of corn and potatoes as seed for the needed crop of the future. All depends on the spirit in which it is done and on whether his doing it is consistent or inconsistent with the performance of his present duties. Of this no man must be another's judge. We are all responsible for the stewardship of our affairs, and will have to give account when we get through. There are degrees of faith; and the principle enunciated by Jesus holds good: "according to your faith, so be it unto you." There are also degrees of liberality to God in such things as we have; and on this point we shall all at last experience the truth of the words of Paul: "He that soweth sparingly, shall reap also sparingly; and he that soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully." A believer in the Lord Jesus will always, in all his practical arrangements, recognise the fact stated by Paul: "God is able to make all things abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things may abound to every good work."— (2 Cor. 9:8.)

We may, in closing, consider another point, viz., the question of riches, on which some, and those poor, of course, are disposed to hold very democratic doctrines. Paul lays it down, as a general rule for the guidance of the saints in their temporal endeavours, to be content with the attainment of food and raiment, adding that "they that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in perdition and destruction." (1 Tim. 6:9). There can be no question of the wisdom of his advice, or, as to the truth of his statement as to the tendency of riches which experience and other parts of the Scriptures confirm. But advice of this description is a very different affair from the law that some poor friends would lay down: that there ought to be no rich in Christ, but that all brethren with substance ought to follow the example set in Acts 4:34: "As many as were possessors of lands and houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold and laid them down at the apostles' feet; and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." Those who quote this in support of the view that we ought to have "all things common," forget one or two points. The case of what happened at Jerusalem, in the opening of the apostolic age, is recorded as a matter of fact and not as a matter of precept. There is no command that this course should be taken by brethren in ordinary circumstances. It was a course suited to the exigencies of the times. A public law had decreed that all who confessed that Jesus was the Christ, should be put out of the synagogue—which was equivalent to modern outlawry, by which a man becomes disqualified for the holding of property: what more effectual proceeding could be taken by a multitude of disciples in such circumstances than to turn their property into money, and hand it to the apostles? It was not a matter of compulsion: for in the case of Ananias Peter expressly says his property and the disposal of the proceeds were "in his own power." It was a matter of wise arrangement in a great public exigency; and there were inspired apostles to whom all deferred and who could therefore work out a measure which in ordinary hands would be impracticable. That it was not intended, as a rule, for believers in general, is shown by the recognition of the existence of a rich class among the brethren, such as where Paul says "Charge *them that are rich*, &c."— (1 Tim. 6:18.) The rich have a special responsibility, and will be judged by a higher measure than the poor; for "to whom much is given, of them will much be required;" but it is not for man to judge them, and still less is it for poor brethren to wish rich brethren to their own level. It is lawful to be rich, though dangerous; and it is God and not man who shall require an account of their stewardship in the day of Christ.

We do not pretend to report the discussion, but merely to rehearse the grounds on which the resolution submitted was commended and adopted. The remarks made for this purpose also contain an answer, more or less to the points raised in the letters quoted at the commencement of the article.

*Birmingham, 8<sup>th</sup> May, 1878.*

*The Christadelphian (1881) pg. 218.*

[Compiler's Note: See (May 1881) MELBOURNE]

Ecclesial Organisation in the Nineteenth Century.—Brother Henry D. Hardinge, of Melbourne, Australia, submits a question on this subject, as follows:—“About four years ago, several persons who had come to a knowledge of the truth, in Melbourne, resolved to form themselves into a community for their mutual upbuilding, and in order to be better able to spread the truth they had found to others. In order that all things might be done decently and in order, they appointed brethren to dispense the bread and wine, and exhort and instruct the others; these they would style “*Elders*,” believing that they who instruct, &c., are the elders of the household of faith, and that they had scriptural and reasonable grounds for so doing. Also brethren appointed to attend to the business matters connected with the ecclesia, in compliance with apostolic precedent, they would style “*Deacons*.” Then certain of their brethren became aware that the people of like faith and hope with themselves in Britain, whom we rejoiced to call brethren, did not designate their official brethren Elders and Deacons, but “*Presiding and Managing Brethren*,” and these our brethren were anxious that we should adopt these same terms. The matter was fully canvassed and discussed, and seeing that the terms “*Elder and Deacon*” were *Scriptural*, and that we did not consider that the other terms were so, we considered that it would be inexpedient to change, and our wisest course would be to abide by the *Scriptures* in all matters of faith and practice. And though we loved and esteemed our brethren in Britain, especially for their work's sake, yet we felt that in this matter they were at fault. We think that they have either adopted this without due consideration, or that there are reasons to be urged, and arguments to sustain their position which we are ignorant of. Therefore I write to ask you either to re-consider this matter, or to furnish us with the reasons which led you to decide in favour of “*Presiding and Managing Brethren*” in preference to ‘*Elders and Deacons*.’” [Compiler's Note: Refer. To below]

#### REMARKS ON THE FOREGOING

The difference between the arrangements in vogue among the brethren of the nineteenth century and those of the first century, is due to the differing circumstances of the two centuries. In the first century, the Spirit of God was present in the ecclesias, (1 Cor. 12:7 But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.), and by the hands of apostles imparted to them various powers and gifts which qualified official brethren for the exercise of a rulership to which it was the duty of the rest to submit (Heb. 13:17 Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.). The men exercising that rulership were appointed to it by the Holy Spirit (Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.). They were not elected or appointed by their brethren. They were chosen by the Spirit after the example furnished in the case of Barnabas and Saul: (the Holy Spirit said, “separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereto I have called them,” Acts 13:2 As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.). The laying on of the hands of the apostles was the Spirit's appointed token of appointment (Acts 13:3 And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.; 2 Tim. 1:6 Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands. ), and also the mode in which it chose to be bestowed (Acts 8:17–18 Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. <sup>18</sup> And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, ). Men so appointed, were variously designated bishops elders, and deacons, not as a matter of title but simply as defining their functions. The overseer was to oversee: the elder was to exercise the influence that naturally goes with the age of those who are older than the rest: the servant was to serve.

These significances have been obscured by the non-translation of the names of the ruling brethren (except in the case of elder). The word translated “bishop” simply means *overseer*: deacon, servant: elder, one older. In the corrupt ecclesiasticism that came afterwards, the titles became symbols of office and position, instead of the modest definition of duties to be done. To the brethren so appointed, it was the duty of the brethren to submit (Heb. 13:17 Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that *is* unprofitable for you.; 1 Thess. 5:12 And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you ). They exercised authority by reason of authority received—not from their brethren, but from the Holy Spirit appointing them through the imposition of inspired hands. No doubt, it was a good and a wise institution, as all institutions are that come from God; and had it continued in all its circumstances and surroundings, it would have been in suitable and beneficial force to-day.

But who can shut their eyes to the great change that has taken place? There has been a break in the continuity of the apostolic institution even more than in the apostolic faith. Where is the ministration of the Spirit that distinguished the first century? Where the Divinely appointed officials to act as its media? As with the house of Israel after the flesh, so with the apostolic institution “the earth is without form and void, and the heavens have no light” (Jer. 4:23). There is no one with authority from God to appoint: and no one with the Spirit to make the right appointment. We have recovered the apostolic faith from the apostolic and prophetic writings, but God has not seen fit to revive the apostolic privilege of spirit ministration.

What are we to do? Shall we appoint brethren by selection to exercise authority among us? How can we impart an authority that we do not ourselves possess? And would it be wise, in the absence of spirit guidance, to invest a man with a permanent office for which he might prove unsuitable? If God were to speak again before the Lord’s return and give us a divinely appointed rulership, our difficulty would be at an end, and our position much more privileged every way, but in our peculiar position, the most we can do is to do our best by mutual consent and co-operation. A good deal can be done in this way, but it is not to be done by the adoption of names. It is better not to have apostolic names when we cannot have the apostolic thing designated by the name. The so-called “Holy Catholic Apostolic Church” of Edward Irving, abounds in apostolic names. It offers us “apostles,” and “evangelists” and “angels”: how do we feel at the offer! Do we not feel we are mocked? Does not the sound of the titles convey a sense of irony and sarcasm and absurdity?

No, the age of apostles and elders and the like is past for the present—past for ever: for the next age will be an age of much higher forms of authority—kings and priests. It is better to recognise facts and adapt ourselves to the circumstances of our position. The bishops, elders and deacons of apostolic usage were all brethren exercising authority by appointment of the Spirit of God: to use the terms now would be misleading in the absence of the authority which they represented. Let us have what we can have: it is not all we need, but it is all we can get. We can have brethren for the performance of the various duties arising out of the collective life of a body. As these must be designated in some way, designate them with modesty, in the “all-ye-are-brethren spirit. Abstain from everything that will lead in the direction of lordship or distinction of one over another. Do not call them official brethren, but “serving brethren.” In defining the various parts, describe them in a way that will define their part without obscuring their brotherhood. Don’t call them, presidents, managers, committees, &c., but presiding brethren (the brethren who preside): managing brethren (the brethren who manage): doorkeeping brethren (the brethren who attend to the doors) and so on. Names, while more than worthless when they do not represent things, are very important as regards the ideas they may foster or otherwise. A wrong designation, in the present state of human nature, will lead to the wrong thing by-and-by.

This is the spirit of the appointments that have taken place among the brethren of the Nineteenth century. The only point truly open to debate is as to the time for which the appointment is made. In practice it is for a year: it is a question whether it ought not to be *during good behaviour*. Annual appointments stir up feelings in many cases that ought to have as few opportunities as possible. We sympathise entirely with those who speak of these annual appointments as the annual attack of measles. The appointment or request to a brother to perform a certain duty until he was asked to refrain would be more conducive to the calm that befits the house of God, whose house are we if we hold fast the hope. This would be getting as close to the apostolic appointment as our circumstances admit of. It is a question for consideration. We have long felt in its favour, but have resigned ourselves to the annual system for the sake of peace and growth. Perhaps peace and growth are in the opposite scale.

We are poorly off altogether just now; groping our way through this Gentile darkness without the visible hand of divine direction that guided the early brethren. Perchance, we are guided another way. "Father in heaven, have pity on thy children, whose lot is cast on this most hapless age of darkness brooding over all the earth. Guide their feeble and uncertain steps: protect them from the perils of the way, and grant them soon the breaking of the morning light in the rising of the glorious sun, at whose bright presence the shadows will flee away."

EDITOR

*The Christadelphian (1881) pgs. 455-458*

*[Compilers Note: October 1881 Jersey City N.Y]*

#### THE TRUTH IN AND ABOUT NEW YORK

NEW YORK was favoured with the presence and labours of Dr. Thomas for a number of years before his death. New York was not much the better for the privilege. "The light shined in the darkness, but the darkness comprehended it not." The result of the seed-sowing at any time depends as much upon the soil as upon the seed. This Jesus teaches in the parable of the sower, which experience confirms. A worse soil it would scarcely be possible to select in the realms of civilization than New York, the escape valve of European rascality (means untrustworthy; dishonest)—not that the soil is good anywhere in the world; but where there is a considerable collection at one place of the poor soil of other places, the chances are all against that place. There are, doubtless, good and honest hearts in New York, but they take considerable search to find. We speak of good and honest hearts in the divine sense: hearts that have a desire to know the divine will, and to do it with all docility when ascertained. Lots of people are to be found, who are sociable enough and honest enough in a certain way towards man: but few have faith in God, or any care for his will or concern for his glorious plan. The mass are swallowed up in "the cares of this life, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things."

It is not wonderful, under the circumstances, that the history of the truth in New York, has not been a prosperous history. The democratic spirit has not been favourable to the growth of that spirit of reverence and submission, which is the first law of the gospel. This spirit is shown first towards God, and then towards one another. Democratism interferes with its nurture in either direction. It is not a spirit of submitting to one another, but a spirit of ruling one another as much as possible. Whatever may be the nature of the phenomenon, as a fact, the community developed by the labours of Dr. Thomas has not held much together, or attained in its fragmentary parts to that unity and brotherly love which are the undoubted characteristics of the body of Christ, however exotic they may be in this world of strife. We speak of them collectively, recognising the individual exceptions of the right sort there may have been. First one outbreak and then another, has spread desolation, till a testifying community, exemplifying the

mind of Christ, has scarcely been discoverable. There has always been a nucleus of healthy life, but circumstances have rendered this powerless.

A change seems now setting in. A faithful few are arriving at the establishment of the faith upon an organic basis of soundness and purity. They have resolved to insist upon clearly recognised foundations, apart from which, progress and consolidation are impossible: for a community that is always discussing its first principles among themselves, is on the high road to disintegration. The change is reported to us for publication, in a document referred to last month, as emanating from the ecclesia in Jersey City, a suburb of New York. The following extracts will speak for themselves:—

Jersey City, New Jersey,

June 20<sup>th</sup>, 1881.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS,—I am directed by this ecclesia to forward to you a copy of our “*Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship*,” and to accompany the same with a statement explanatory of our action and position.

The members composing the Christadelphian body in this city, after having given up their place of meeting in Franklin Hall, as you are aware, connected themselves with the body meeting in Lundy’s Hall, West Hoboken. Continuous disorder and dissension was the result of this fusion, which, while deleterious [destructive] in its effects and disheartening to all true brethren of Christ, was patiently but painfully endured, in the hope and desire that matters ultimately might improve. This hope was manifestly not well founded, matters waxed worse and worse, until forbearance ceased to be a virtue.

In addition to this, efforts, which many agreed should be made on behalf of the truth, were opposed, and last, but *not least*, there were false and defective doctrines held and advocated by some. Matters continuing in this condition, it was apparent beyond all doubt, in the interest of peace and harmony, and for the preservation of the truth in its purity and completeness, that a change should be effected, and that a separation from the contentious was absolutely necessary.

Accordingly, on Sunday, March 6<sup>th</sup>, a meeting was called on March 13<sup>th</sup>, “for the purpose of taking measures for the formation of an ecclesia which shall, in *Name and Doctrine* fully conform to the Representative Christadelphian Ecclesia, in Birmingham, England.” After an informal expression of views by the several brethren, a committee (composed of Bros. Johnson, Scott, Vredenburg, Coddington, Washburne, and Seaich) was appointed, “to prepare a statement expressive of our faith, (the same to be the truth, the *whole* truth, and nothing but the truth), that is, the unadulterated, unqualified, and uncompromised truth of the gospel of our salvation, viz.:—the ‘One Faith,’ once for all delivered to the saints, and in complete harmony with the doctrine believed and proclaimed by our late brother, Dr. John Thomas (of revered memory), and the Representative Christadelphia Ecclesia, in Birmingham, England, the same to be submitted to the ecclesia for their consideration, which, if approved, shall be recognised as their ‘Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship,’ and shall receive their assent, agreement, and signature; and shall also require and receive the same from each and all others who shall seek to fellowship with them.”

In accordance with these directions, the said committee, on March 27<sup>th</sup>, formally presented a document, which, having been fully considered, was duly accepted, and unanimously adopted, and received the signature of every member present. (This document was what might be called an act of incorporation). It set forth, that, “We, the undersigned, do hereby form ourselves into an association, which shall be known as ‘The Christadelphian Ecclesia of Jersey City, New Jersey,’ for the purpose of a weekly remembrance

of the Lord Jesus, in the breaking of bread; for the proclamation of ‘the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus the Christ;’ and for mutual spiritual edification and encouragement; and to this end to herewith acknowledge the following ‘Statement of Faith’ to be our ‘Basis of Fellowship,’ to which we give our unqualified assent, agreement, and signature.”

Here follows a statement of faith and basis of fellowship, “largely compiled,” as the secretary observes, “from the *Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia*; statements and epitomes made at various times in various published works.” (Any one applying to Bro. Joseph Seaich, Jun., 47, East 31<sup>st</sup> Street, New York City, N. Y., will be furnished with a printed copy). With the leading features of it our readers are familiar. We subjoin a few extracts of a special character:—

Faith and Obedience must be accompanied with and manifested by good works, for as “the body without the spirit (breath) is dead, so faith without works is dead also.”

“It is incumbent upon us to render willing obedience to those (secular rulers) who are in authority over us, in all matters *which do not conflict* with the commandments of our Heavenly Father, when in such event it is our imperative duty to obey God rather than men.

It is contrary to the teachings of Christ and his inspired apostles to resist evil, or to take up arms for any purpose whatever.

WE REJECT the following theories and dogmas, as making void the Word of God, and being *altogether contrary* to the “form of sound words” recorded in the scriptures of truth, and *we hold no fellowship* with any who believe, advocate, or sympathize with them:

‘The Trinity—the Eternal Sonship of Christ—the Personality of the Holy Spirit—the Personality of the Devil—the Immortality of the Soul—No Judgment at the coming of Christ—Immortal Emergence of the just—Bestowal of Incorruptibility or Immortality before Judgment—that Jesus suffered and died as a substitute for man, to appease the wrath of an offended Deity—Heaven the abode of the Righteous—Eternal Torment of the Wicked—Salvation out of Christ—Universal Resurrection—Universal Salvation—Infant Salvation—Infant Baptism—Salvation achieved by Works—‘Renunciationism’ of every form and colour.

‘*All intelligently immersed believers* in the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus the Christ.’ Who ‘walk worthy of the high calling to which they have been called,’ and who shall give their *unqualified* assent, agreement, and *signature* to our ‘Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship’ shall be eligible to membership in this Ecclesia.

‘All persons of good report, resident in this city, or visitors from abroad, who have been immersed upon an intelligent profession of their faith, in the ‘things concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus the Christ,’ who shall give their *unqualified* assent, agreement, and *signature* to our ‘Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship,’ are cordially invited to participate with us in our order of worship. No persons shall be entitled to, or receive our fellowship in the truth, who, while they may themselves believe and ‘declare the whole counsel of God,’ and are in every respect unobjectionable in their own persons, yet join themselves to, or fellowship with others who ‘consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness,’ (from whom we are commanded to withdraw ourselves), and *reject or deny any portion* of our ‘Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship.’

*The present membership.*—The following named persons constitute the present membership:—Brethren: John Johnson, Chauncey Vrendenburgh, Josiah Coddington, John N. Scott, Joseph Seaich, jun., George



T. Washburne, J. Ward Tichenor, James M. Washburne, Frank Norton; Sisters: Ellen Thomas, Eusebia J. Lasius, Anna C. Johnson, Anna Vredenburgh, Mary H. Carstens, Jennie Carstens, Kittie Seaich, Mina Scott, Anna Smith, Sarah L. Sadler, Mary E. Yates, Caroline Johnson, Emma Washburne, Barbara B. Yates, Dora H. Scott, Libbie H. Wasburne, Mary A. Magan, Annie E. Cole.

*Explanatory.*—The Secretary adds:—“Concerning our ‘Basis of Fellowship,’ it may appear at first sight to be too stringent, and that we have exceeded our proper limit by our insistence, not only upon the assent and agreement, but also upon the *signature* to our ‘Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship,’ by those who shall desire to join our body; and the provision that, ‘no persons shall be entitled to, or receive our fellowship in the truth, who, while they may themselves believe and, declare the whole counsel of God,’ and are in every respect unobjectionable in their own persons, yet, join themselves to, or fellowship with others; who consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness (from whom we are commanded to withdraw ourselves), and reject or deny any portion of our ‘Statement of Faith and Basis of Fellowship.’”

“An explanation of our action in this matter is necessary to the thorough understanding of our position, which, we trust, will tend to efface any unfavourable opinion which first impressions may suggest. We desire to assure you that, we have in all things been actuated by a scrupulous regard for the truth, its interests and requirements, and for the conservation of that love, peace, and harmony which should characterize the members of the body of Christ.

“The circumstances surrounding us are peculiar from the fact, that, in and about our vicinity there are (exclusive of ourselves) no less than six bodies professing to hold the truth, some accepting, and others rejecting the name ‘Christadelphian,’ each and all of whom hold more or less corrupt doctrines. Heretofore it has been customary, as inclination favoured, for members of these bodies to promiscuously intermingle with one another and with ourselves, and this admixture of truth with error, has exerted a decidedly demoralizing influence upon us personally, as well as proved detrimental to the interests of the truth. There are a few, comparatively sound in doctrine, not in union with us. These, as formerly, would, through motives of curiosity, pleasure, or convenience, as the case might be, desire to attend our meetings and fellowship with us, which, if permitted, would soon result in the presence of others to whom we could not object, seeing that they are all members of the same body, and we would consequently soon find ourselves relegated to the same deplorable condition from which we have so recently been emancipated.

“Having relieved ourselves from the undesirable society of all who hold corrupt doctrines, whose connection has been so injurious to ourselves and to the cause of the truth, we were naturally desirous of devising some method by which we might secure the continuance of our highly prized freedom from these debasing influences, so that we might be enabled to preserve the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, and devote ourselves with renewed and unrestrained ardour to the proclamation of the Gospel in its purity and entirety. Having been trammelled in all our efforts in this direction heretofore, we mutually determined that under no circumstances would we allow ourselves to be again placed in such a position, as to necessitate us for the sake of a false peace, to compromise truth with error, and we also further determined that we should be *true* and *consistent* Christadelphians, with all that the term implies, *both in name and doctrine*. After careful consideration we came to the conclusion, that the only feasible, practicable and effectual way to accomplish our object, was to adopt the repressive measures referred to in our “Basis of Fellowship.”

“We have since the adoption of these requirements, had opportunities presented demonstrating their practical value, and their adequacy, for they have proved thoroughly effective in preventing the unprofitable presence of those we strove to guard against.

“We feel thoroughly convinced that we have not been too stringent, and have not required more than the circumstances which surround us, and the duty imposed upon all true brethren of Christ, to believe and teach the one faith in all its purity and fulness, imperatively demands. We expect that our action will be unfavourably criticised on the part of those who prefer peace at the sacrifice of duty, and are willing to compromise with error to obtain it, but as to the opinion of these we are indifferent; but we do care for, and are solicitous to receive the sympathy, encouragement, approval, and endorsement of all brethren who are faithful in their adherence to sound doctrine, and stedfast in their obedience to “*all things whatsoever*” the Lord Jesus hath commanded, and this we believe will be cheerfully accorded. The ecclesia meet in Franklin Hall, corner of Montgomery and Warren streets, Jersey city.

“There are many brethren in this country, as well as across the ocean, who knowing of the unfavourable circumstances which have surrounded us, will be heartily glad to be informed of our present position, and we are unable to convey the information otherwise than through the columns of the “*Christadelphian*”

On behalf of the ecclesia,

JOSEPH SEAICH, Jr., (Secretary),

No. 47, East 31<sup>st</sup> Street,

New York City, N. Y.

#### CHAT WITH CORRESPONDENTS, AND EXTRACTS FROM SOME OF THEIR LETTERS

*(The Editor considers himself at liberty to quote from letters that are not marked “private.” When so marked, the mark should be inside the letter on the top of the first page, and not on the outside of the envelope. If placed on the outside of the envelope, it is liable to lead to delay in the letter being attended to. When a letter is really private, mark the word outside the envelope, or it will be opened in the office.)*

*(Excerpt from The Christadelphian 1886 pg. 66)*

J.S.—Having come to see “eye to eye” with the brethren in so much, there is every reason to hope that all difference will in course of time disappear. “Agreeing to differ” is not an apostolic recommendation. There is such a thing truly as growth; but this consists of progress in the apprehension of a principle discerned—not in the discarding of one principle for another.—See remarks to J.C.H.

I. B.—Christ “gave himself a ransom *for all*,” in the sense that none are excluded who may come into the terms of the ransom (for there are terms). When we say that an exhibition is “open to all,” it is understood that the conditions of the exhibition will be complied with. The apostolic applications must always govern apostolic statements and apostolic principles. They always required and enjoined compliance with the divine conditions—faith and obedience. Idiots and infants are incapable of these. Your idea that because they are incapable, they will receive the benefit, is not supported by any proof, and is inconsistent with every revealed principle of divine action. “to be testified in due time,” was a reference to the fact that at the time of the death of Christ, that event was a mystery. Its intent had not been declared. It was to be “testified in due time.” The “due time” came after Christ’s ascension, when the apostles went forth to preach “Christ and him crucified.” The idea that it refers to a future opportunity for all the dead is a Universalist gloss.

R. G. B.—There is no necessary contradiction between Paul’s statement (Gal. 1:18–19) that he saw only Peter and James on the occasion of his first visit to Jerusalem, and Luke’s (Acts 9:27) that Barnabas, on that occasion, introduced him (Paul) to “the apostles,” with whom for a time, he was “coming in and going out at Jerusalem.” No doubt “the apostles” reads as if it were them all: but it is indefinite. Paul’s statement defines the exact extent of the meaning. Peter and James would represent the whole apostolic body: introduction to them would be tantamount to introduction to all. The others might either be absent at other posts of service, or not present at the particular interview that Paul alludes to. (We have seen, but have never had time to read *Ecce Homo*, and do not know how the author deals with the temptation. Your remark is probably correct, namely, “some of the book is very good, but I think tainted all through by the partial and probably erring inspiration theory which is no new thing.”

W. H. M.—Marvel not. Jesus spoke of some receiving the word with joy, but who, when tribulation by-and-bye arose because of the word, were offended, or stumbled, or driven out of the way. If this were so with men who received the word at his hand, need you be surprised if we should witness the same result in our own day, when it comes only as a written testimony? It is no matter of wonder at all: it is to be looked for. Wise men will not only not be disturbed by it when it happens, but will look for it. If the inspiration controversy is able to stop attention to the truth, it is because there are men who can “look back” after putting their hand to the plough. You know what Jesus says: such are “not fit for” the kingdom of God. The word of God has remained steadfast in the midst of the storms of centuries—storms of hail and fire mingled with blood. It cannot be moved by the petty quibblings and oppositions of our day.

A. B. D.—It would be more satisfactory for you to say that you believe in partial inspiration, or that although not believing it yourself, you are prepared to fellowship those who do, than to say that you believe all that the Scriptures say on the subject, and that you object to be ruled by a theory. Who would propose to deny what the Scriptures say on the subject? And who would maintain a theory that was not the truth? Such a way of putting it is an evasion of the issue that has been raised. Nothing can be settled by this mode of treating it. Candidly declare that you mean to tolerate partial inspiration, and you will at the least earn the respect of those who differ from you. If you do not mean this, but mean what those mean who feel bound to object to the doctrine of partial inspiration in fellowship, there ought to be nothing to prevent you coming into harmony with them, and so end the strife.

A.C.—You have never changed your mind on the subject of inspiration. Good: but ought you not to let your brethren know what your mind is that you have not changed, and what you think of the change we have all been invited to make, and that many have made? Is this change a change from the condition which you have always been in, and, therefore, from which you have not changed? Or is it a change which you regard with indifference? Or is it a change that you approve of? Or is it a change which you resent as an invitation to corrupt the word of God, and to unsettle the foundation on which faith is built? (for certainly our faith is not built on the word of man, but on the Word of God). If *you* have not changed, the circumstances among ecclesias have changed; and your view of those circumstances becomes a matter of importance as determining your relation to those who can make no compromise whatever with the suggestion that we have a Bible historically fallible, or a Bible which is partly the production of the will of man. To be silent is to give your brethren sorrowing cause for believing you are on the wrong side.

## INTELLIGENCE (Ecclesial Notes)

(September 1884)

Do not call your open-air fellowships “pic-nics.” What’s in a name? A good deal. We know what a picnic is in Gentile hands, and we have all come from there. If you call an outing of brethren a “pic-nic,” old

ideas will revive, and brethren will come together to play the fool instead of acting the part of brethren whose calling in Christ requires them at all times to behave with reason, grace, and sobriety.

A brother is censured for marrying an alien: he leaves the meeting: he now sees he has made a mistake. He wants to come back, but you want to humble him, and make him confess formally before the body what all know he admits. This is wrong. You ought to run to meet him, like the father in the parable of the prodigal son. Do not be exacting in such cases. Remember your own sins and have mercy.

Collections for hospitals are unobjectionable, provided we run clear of the ecclesiastical association implied in the collective efforts of the sects. Have it some other time of the year than when they combine for a collective dishonour of Christ's command, by parading to every left hand in the world what their right hand has done. We shall gradually be sucked into all the old corruptions if we don't mind.

“Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?”—We ought not to bully friend or foe: we ought not indulge in the harsh expletives of the natural man: we ought not to backbite with the tongue: we ought not retaliate in word or deed. We ought not to cultivate the use or custody of “carnal weapons” (gun making is another thing). The knowledge of Christ without the spirit of Christ is worse than the ignorance which alienates from the life of God.

A sister, who once waited on a company of clericals at a private dinner, tells of their behaviour like jockeys and mountebanks. The highest joke of the evening, which elicited roars round the table, was the report of one of them that a woman came to consult him as to the state of her soul.—Considering that these gentlemen believe in the soul and profess to be its physicians, such an incident was an outrage. Clerical religion is a thing for the pulpit, which a man leaves behind him with his robes. It is to be hoped that no abomination like this will creep in among the brethren. Pious tones and elegant definitions on the platform, while frivolity and Esauism are rampant in the every-day run of life. True brethren of Christ are brethren all the time: speech always with grace seasoned with salt.

The *Ecclesial Guide* is a suggestion: not a mandate—which is not within the function of any (by Christ) unauthorised brother. It only becomes a rule when made such by an ecclesia adopting it: and even then it remains outside the structure of an ecclesia's constitution. The ecclesia takes so much of it as pleases them, and makes it theirs. There must and there always will be rules of some sort in every body of people who have a collective and mutually-related existence. It is a question of rules that work for good or those that work for evil. If we could have apostolic bishops, it would be a relief: but where is the wisdom of playing at what we have not and cannot have unless God speak by the spirit?

An ecclesia excludes a number of brethren and sisters who are in the faith, and who cannot be convicted of teaching or practising disobedience of the commandments of Christ:—brethren and sisters who wish to remain.—What can such do but meet by themselves and break bread: and if their cause is righteous, what can brethren elsewhere do than countenance them? And if their cause is righteous, what is the position of the excluding majority, but one to be reconsidered as possibly one involving the abdication of the true character of an ecclesia. Very great patience requires to be exercised: otherwise it is impossible to reach the little good that may be attained in this evil age.—EDITOR.

(October 1884)

It is not a bad idea to read a published lecture if there is no competent lecturer in a meeting. Though reading is objectionable, as compared with extempore delivery, it is better to hear read what is instructive

than to listen to the vapid remarks of well-meaning incompetence. Dr. Thomas recommended this, in his own absence from New York, on his tours. He gave them *Twelve Lectures*, and said, "Read these." The brethren said, "What shall we do if you are not back by the time we get through." "Begin again," he said. So he informed the Editor of the *Christadelphian*.

It is not a happy way of describing the acceptability of applicants for immersion to say that they "passed a satisfactory examination." It seems to suggest a pretentious examining board whose sanction is necessary to the validity of immersion. Nothing depends upon anyone's sanction as things are at present in the earth. "Examination" is merely an act of self-defence, on the part of those already in the faith, whose fellowship is sought. The function ought to be exercised with as much modesty as possible. It is better to say that the applicant has "made a scriptural confession of faith," or "has given evidence of a sufficient understanding of the truth."

There is a good deal about the system of "challenging to debate" that is repugnant to the new man as he gets older. It is better to substitute the word "proposal" for "challenge." Challenge appeals to the natural man. It is well not to appeal to him, but keep him dormant. "The meekness and gentleness of Christ" will prefer modester forms of speech than those that are popular with the old man. Contention is one of the unhappy necessities of the present situation of the truth, but there are different ways of conducting it.

Don't let correspondents take their cue from the newspaper style of reporting. This is reeking with the spirit of the flesh. Keep "committees" and all other forms of official pomposities out of sight. Don't speak in any case as if authority were exercised, for none of us have any, except to do good. Don't speak of the amount of credit due to this one and that: leave it to the Lord at his coming. So with "presidings," and how it is done; so with the chair being "supported" by this one and that; so with all kinds of mutual glorifications. Let all our ways be in simplicity and the fear of God. Men who are itching for notice are not in their place in the house of God.

Cheer up, bro. Malan, in your lonely effort at Geneva. Perhaps you are God's missionary to some good and honest souls who could not learn the truth if it was not addressed to them in French. What you are doing, as regards its loneliness, is what the Editor of the *Christadelphian* did 25 years ago in Huddersfield, where he had to sweep out the hired room, arrange the seats, deliver the lecture, re-arrange the seats, and pay the rent and printing bill, without a soul to join, except the one precious soul God has permitted him to have for companion along life's rugged way. The loneliness has long since come to an end in his case. So may it be in yours.

Our remarks last month with reference to bro. Chamberlin have inflicted pain. They could not do otherwise. With all our hearts we wish we could have spared them. But we were helpless. We are, and were, in a corner, in which we had either to appear by past action, to countenance an enterprise full of danger to the true work of the gospel among the brethren, or inflict pain and run the risk of creating misapprehension, by a word of caution. We chose the latter escape, doing it, however, as mildly as possible. We are asked to unsay the par. Or explain. The former is out of the question. The latter seems premature, and may become unnecessary. Brother Chamberlin (for the mere sake of temporalities) is proposing to bring his influence to bear on the brethren "throughout the world" in the intimate and powerful way implied in a weekly publication to which he invites ecclesial communications. Had we considered it safe for him to be entrusted with such a means of influence, we should have handed him over the *Visitor*, which was "paying," as commercial people say. There would have been no need for him to go away from Birmingham. But a twelvemonths' contact has had the effect of producing a very contrary impression to this. We should esteem it a great calamity for the brethren to be innoculated with his spirit and principles. If we make enemies by this declaration, we shall be sorry. But we are helpless. We can but submit to the evil inseparable from the endeavour to uphold the highest interests of the truth in

this our evil day. Bro. Chamberlin can write well, so can the clergy—beautifully; but what are they in their daily lives, as regards the spirit and deportment required by the gospel? A man should exemplify what he teaches.

Had bro. Chamberlin contented himself with the local effort implied in his removal to Glasgow, we should have been silent. But he has presented himself before the entire brotherhood, after only eighteen months' connection with them, with proposals for which, from an apostolic point of view, he lacks nearly all the qualifications except literary ability; and this merely for a living. We confess, after many years of painful effort to obtain a little footing in the midst of the abounding corruption, for the spirit of the apostolic work in the earth, as well as the purity of its doctrines, that we view with nothing but feelings of the sharpest distress, the prospect of an inrush among the brethren of the spirit of uncircumcised clericalism which now raps at their door with editorial proposals. We took brother Chamberlin into the office in the mere spirit of brotherly help for Christ's sake. We gave him the commandments of Christ to write about in the hope that he would come under their power. We hoped thus to justify the apparent guarantee which his accidental presence in the office afforded the brethren that all was right in a spiritual sense. But in the end, we saw well to let him go, and to let the *Visitor* drop which we were physically unfit to carry on by ourselves. It is with nothing but grief of mind that we yield to the necessity of saying these things. Should it subsequently appear necessary to speak more particularly in the way of explanation, we shall do so.—ED.

*(November 1884)*

There can be no objection to the reporting of scriptural withdrawals from offending individual brethren: but when an ecclesia parts asunder on some dispute which is discreditable to both parties alike, the only course is silence towards both—in sorrow.

“In bondage to Christ Jesus:” that was a good form of epistolary subscription, brother. The man with whom this is a reality, and not a mere ornamental pietism, is a true brother, of a pleasant fragrance to all true brethren, as well as to our elder brother in heaven, whom we hope presently to behold.

Don't speak of serving brethren as “officers.” It may not seem to matter much; but it is astonishing how much power there is in a right phraseology to diffuse the kindly spirit of the house of God, and how much power there is in an opposite direction, in the adoption of the cold and technical nomenclature in vogue among “those who are without.”

Mr. Oliphant's letter (at the commencement of the present number) brings home the question of the annual contribution to Jewish need (first Sunday in December). Shall we, or shall we not, continue it? Each ecclesia must decide for itself. The question has been before the Birmingham ecclesia, with the result of a resolve to act on Mr. Oliphant's suggestion, without making it the subject of a very heavy effort. A moderate collection once a year will hurt no one, and will, meanwhile, put in our hands the power of helping effectually in an emergency that must come.

No one controlled by apostolic principles would talk of “we, the heads.” These principles exclude headship, and command the taking of the lowest place. The “servant of all” becomes chief in a certain way, as Jesus said would be the case: but this is a different thing: it is not the result of aiming at being head, but of aiming the other way. And it is a result that is not valued or recognised by those who may reach it through compliance with Christ's precept and example, who “came not to be ministered unto but to minister.”

“Jealous?” Yes. The Editor confesses himself very jealous, as he did to brother Chamberlin while in Birmingham—jealous of every interference, direct or by inference, with the Bible, or the ascendancy of Bible principles in theory or practice among the brethren. This jealousy has led him into many difficulties for 25 years past; but out of them all the Lord has delivered him. It is a jealousy with which every enlightened lover of the Bible will sympathise. Those who insinuate any other kind of jealousy, must be left to their misapprehension. Surely the Editor’s attitude towards good men, whenever they have seemed to arise, is a sufficient confutation of a thought which he feels humbled to have to repel.

It is good to keep all “business” away from Sunday. Business is a necessary evil forced upon us by the absence of divinely-appointed shepherd-brethren: but there are two ways of dealing with it—one of which is incalculably the better. You may make business so prominent as to make it almost the object of the brethren coming together at any time, and get them into the mood that when there is no business, there is no interest. The result is blighting to the growth of the new man, who delights—not in business, but in faith, hope, righteousness, love, and praise. Business, to the new man, is a necessary evil, to be minimised exceedingly—fenced off into the business days of the week and compressed into the briefest practicable limits. Let us not be like some wretched sectarians who are always on hand at what is called “church meetings,” but show no zest in the direction of good works.

We repudiate all sympathy with the suggestion that the secular literature of the day is the offspring of the Bible. Bible thought has tintured human writing in a degree too homoeopathic to constitute kinship in the most distant degree. It has affected the national dialect somewhat: it has left national thought substantially untouched. The Bible is all of God: human literature is all of man. For this reason, the natural man does not care for the Bible, and regards the study of it as a bore. For this reason, the Bible is not daily read: and for this reason, the public mind—(especially of public writers)—is not assimilated to the Bible philosophy of things. Society around us, and especially the literature of society, is involved in the Lord’s declaration to Peter: “*Thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.*” If there is a literature in our day that is the offspring of the Bible, it is the writings of Dr. Thomas; and if there was any truth in the apology for secular literature, these are the writings that would find favour with the apologist.

The worship of beauty is a dangerous doctrine for the house of God. It is not a Bible doctrine: it is not a rational doctrine. It is the moral relations of things that affect wellbeing: it is these that are extremely difficult to put on the right footing. And there is no greater impediment to their robust and effectual rectification than the cultivation of the “æsthetic” as the standard of taste and enjoyment. The devil has all the “æsthetic” arrangements on his side just now—beautiful music, beautiful art – accessories, beautiful literature, beautiful theatres, beautiful people. (By the way, there is a devil, though the popular devil is a myth. It is important to remember his existence. There are those who think we are swearing when we mention his name in a Scriptural manner: and there are those whose blank countenances seem to say there is no such thing anyhow.) When Paul inculcated attention to “whatsoever things are honest, just, pure, lovely, of good report,” he did not intend to recommend us to things current among those who are controlled by “the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life.” Any suggestion to this effect is only to be met with in Christ’s words, “Get thee behind me, Satan.”

*(April 1885)*

Brother Ashcroft’s pungent “parable” is written with the graphic power that he possesses as a writer. It is not, however, an appropriate reflex of the situation. We could set forth a parable much more faithful in this respect: but we refrain, from a desire to avoid even the appearance of retaliation. It is more in place, perhaps, to soberly emphasize the action of those Nottingham brethren who insist on a commandment of Christ which brother Ashcroft sets aside by his action. This commandment requires a brother who thinks

he has been personally wronged by another (and cannot let the matter pass), to go and confer with him on the subject alone, first of all. Brother Ashcroft thinks we have personally wronged him in the attitude we have been compelled to take against his published theory of inspiration. On this ground, quite apart from the question of inspiration itself, he refuses to appear on a platform open to us. What is this but saying in the strongest manner that we have “trespassed against him.” What if the alleged trespass were a matter of public attitude? Since he makes it the ground of private hostility, the law of Christ requires him to reason the matter with us “alone.” It requires him to come to us for the purpose: but, at the suggestion of the Nottingham brethren, we have waived this point, and given him the opportunity, by going to him at his own house. He did not accept the opportunity. He refused to see us, though under his own roof. We try to endure this great trial with patience, however difficult, in view of all we have done for him in past times to our own hurt; and in view of the fact that our only offence is the adoption of a course to which we were compelled by his own published departure from faithfulness to the oracles of God, and his own declaration of war against the work established by the instrumentality of Dr. Thomas—an attitude on his own part to which previous circumstances had imparted an unfavourable significance and made us feel we had no alternative—a conviction we still entertain.

It will yet be found that this divergence on the question of inspiration is but the beginning of a general corruption of the way of truth. The symptoms of this are already manifest. One of them is the advocacy of laxity (carelessness) in the basis of fellowship. That is, the suggestion is finding favour that we ought not to require an entire recognition of the truth as a condition of admission among us, and that we ought not to withdraw from those who may dissent from some of its elementary constituents in detail. The brethren, it is approvingly remarked, “require a broader way.” It seems as if we may have to fight over again the battle of 20 years ago. It ought not to be difficult for men of ordinary discernment to see the truth of the matter. Why do we stand apart from the churches and chapels? Is it not because we recognise that the truth, mutually received, is the basis of association in Christ? If this is a right view (and who will doubt it that is acquainted with apostolic writings?) then it is inconsistent to connive at any denial of the truth in our midst. By Paul’s description, the ecclesia is “the pillar and ground of the truth”—that which gives it standing-ground and support in the midst of men. But if we connive at the denial of it in one item, the denial will spread to other items as time goes on, and we shall soon cease to possess the character that gives an ecclesia any scriptural value or life. The truth will soon be dead in our midst, and we shall lose all reason for standing apart from the religious organisations around us to which it would be so much more convenient to belong. It is easy to call by a bad name this insisting on the purity of the faith of Christ as the foundation. With this, men striving for the few remaining days to be faithful, must be prepared to put up. The bad names do not alter things, though they may hurt our feelings. Those who contend earnestly for a pure apostolic foundation do not “put men away from the table of the Lord.” They do not “excommunicate.” They are guilty of no Papal arrogance or assumption. They simply refuse to be implicated in an unsound position. They simply yield to the apostolic guidance which forbids them to receive any who bring not with them the doctrine of Christ; and which tells them that if they act otherwise, they make themselves responsible for the unscriptural principles involved in the case, whatever they may be. Now, in our day, the beginning of all “doctrine of Christ” is belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures. This is the first proposition of the system of the truth as existing in this God-silent latter day; and to make light of this, as a question not affecting the faith, is to take a position that it is impossible for faithful men to accept. Fellowship is a standing together on a common foundation, and there can be no genuine fellowship without a genuine standing together. The vital importance of maintaining the complete inspiration of the Scriptures as the basis of our fellowship is practically illustrated in the following letter from bro. J. Malcolm, of Innerkip, Canada:—

“The few believers here send greeting. I can assure you we feel deeply in sympathy with you in the present trouble with regard to the inspiration of the Scriptures. Perhaps we feel more deeply on the question on account of what we have had in past time to pass through from the same cause.



“You will no doubt remember well when on your tour through Canada the very high opinion you formed of the ecclesia in East Zorra. There were then meeting together nearly thirty individuals, men and women, who were, to all appearance, enthusiastic in the hope, and not a few very intelligent in the Scriptures. You supposed the time would never come when any of them would deny that the Bible was a revelation from God to man. Such would have been considered an impossibility. But, sad to say, the time came—not all at once. Doubts began to arise in the minds of some with regard to the inspiration of some parts of the Bible. They were warned of the danger that might arise, but they gave no heed. They allowed the point of the wedge to enter, and what has been the result? Nearly all have become atheists. This is the sad experience the truth has been made to suffer here from such a course of reasoning. And will not the same fruits result from the same cause in other places? Who will dare say no? Have not the professed friends of the Bible given up their armour to the enemy with this partial inspiration theory? We hear of some of the most inveterate infidels near us already making capital out of bro. Ashcroft’s attitude on inspiration. They say he has made one step in advance. I think no better proof could be given that he has made a step backward. Time will very soon demonstrate. If man is left to decide what is inspired, and what is not, the Bible then becomes a dead letter.

“You are, and will be blamed for the bold stand you have taken. But the ground you have taken is the only safe one, as time will shew. I would rather be one of the four brethren in Halifax, who have taken sides with you on the inspiration question, than to be numbered with the hundred and forty-six. (There has been some mis-representation here. The case is not so bad as bro. Malcolm has heard. About twenty-five have formed an ecclesia, at Sowerby Bridge, and 15 are meeting separately, on the basis of a wholly inspired Bible, and many of the remaining number will doubtless see their way to a right position by-and-bye—EDITOR.) If they pass through the same or deal as we here, in Zorra, they may not in twelve months have ten remaining. God will not be mocked. He will make manifest who are the approved ones. They that honor Him, He will honor. They who throw doubt upon His word, make it void, and of no effect.”

Another symptom of the unscripturalness of the new “departure” is the emphatic objection made to a “self-constituted” service of the truth. What does this involve? Why, that a man must not for himself listen to the divine command to serve the Lord Jesus in every diligent way he can devise, but must wait to be “constituted,” “appointed”—by whom? Here is the root of the matter—the marrow of this threatened revival of clericalism in the midst of the brethren. *He must wait to be appointed.* Now, who is to appoint? Who is to “constitute?” We have no apostle, no bishop, no pastors and teachers, such as the Spirit conferred on the ecclesias of the first century. We have no source of authority whatever. We have simply the word of God and liberty to read and obey it. All are at liberty to read: all are at liberty to obey with all the diligence and bountifulness their heart may fit them to devise. But no one has any authority to appoint.<sup>2</sup> Ecclesial “appointments,” so-called, are merely voluntary concurrences as to the most convenient and orderly method of conducting the proceedings inseparable from ecclesial association. Speaking broadly, “self-appointment” and “self-constitution” is the very essence of the divine service in the particular age in which we live. A man has authority only over himself—not over his neighbour at all. And if he give himself to the Lord, and distinguish himself in the zeal and liberality of his service to the Lord, his brethren will have cause for thanksgiving. But abolish “self-appointment” and introduce some specious substitute (call it by whatever name you please), you have begun to march back to the dead systems of the apostasy. Conferences of delegates are ecclesiastical synods in disguise, and represent a spiritual abomination to which free men in Christ will not submit.

(August 1885)

Efforts are being made to find a basis of re-approximation among those who are going asunder on the subject of inspiration. There may be a beneficial result in some cases. If the result were to be general, it

would be a cause of gladness, but it is scarcely possible to hope for this. It is not merely a question of inspiration, but of the position we are to give that truth in our midst. Granted that the Bible is wholly inspired, are we to maintain that doctrine as a first principle? There are always these two aspects to every vital doctrine. A truth may be received by men who are prepared to wink at its denial in fellowship; and in such a case, a full basis of fellowship does not exist for faithful men; for the basis of our union in Christ is not only a concurrent reception of the truth, but a concurrent resolution to recognise and maintain that truth as the basis of our relation to him and one another. There is the truth, and our duty in relation to the truth; here are two things, and on both there must be agreement before there can be communion. It is not enough for a man to believe the truth if he remain in association with the church-and-chapel denial of the truth (for example). He must come out and “be separate.” He must “not receive” any man coming in the name of the truth who denies the truth. This is a very inconvenient, and to the natural mind, a very uncongenial course of action; but it is the course prescribed by apostolic law; and if we are to have anything to do with apostolic law, we must submit to it in its entirety. This was the battle that had to be fought twenty years ago on another question: the question of immortality. Granted that man was mortal were we to insist upon the recognition of that truth in our basis of fellowship? Some were disposed to be easy on the point: some were disposed to waive it altogether, and to be content with a “scriptural form of words,” and not to enquire too closely what they thought about the immortality of the soul.

If there is to be any re-union on the question of inspiration, there must be a common resolution to maintain the wholly-inspired character of the Bible as a first principle as well as a truth. It is here where our difficulty may lie. One newly-formed small community issues a manifesto proposing that the question should be considered “an open one.” “We do not,” say they, “hold it essential that we should be all of one mind in reference thereto . . . and will allow full liberty of conscience.” This sounds very well in the popular ear, but it is by no means a scriptural attitude, and marks the difference between two sections that have come into variance. The one is prepared to leave as “an open question” that which the other regards as the most momentous truth upon earth in this age—the truth upon which all other truth hangs for them. If those who are exerting themselves in the interests of peace can produce unanimity here, their success will be complete and a cause of much thanksgiving; but if the “open question” way of looking at the matter is to be pressed, there is no hope. God prosper the efforts to a right result.

*(September 1885)*

We have received only one contribution to the discussion of the question of ecclesial management: and it is not sufficiently to the point to be useful. Brother Jas. U. Robertson offers a letter which, we doubt, will be of a different character in this respect. Brother Robertson has, otherwise, been much occupied in the affairs of the truth, or, doubtless, the letter would have been in time for the present number.

A number of other ecclesias have proclaimed their adhesion to the complete inspiration of the Bible as a first principle in their fellowship, which they are prepared to maintain inviolate. One or two, while believing in a wholly-inspired Bible, hesitate to make it a first principle. It is to be hoped that calm reflection will enable them to retire from an illogical position; and admit of a return to that hearty co-operation which is desirable and valuable. The prejudice created by untruthful reports has doubtless made it difficult for some: but time will help to rectify this. Slander cannot prevail for ever. Its true character becomes known at last.

Some give us permission to modify the form of their intelligence communications. Some thank us for doing it without having given us permission. One or two begrudge us the liberty. It is a liberty we are most reluctant to use; but it is necessary sometimes. It is not in questions of grammar and construction, though these, of course, are attended to. It is questions of apostolic sentiment that call for revision. When a correspondent, for example, (with the best intentions, perhaps) writes in extravagant commendation of

work done for the truth, or reports a testimonial or vote of thanks to a brother who has been doing his duty to Christ, he is expressing a laudable gratitude: but he is copying the bad model of the Gentile school, which reeks in the columns of the newspaper press with fulsome adulation. If this sort of thing is suppressed in the *Christadelphian*, we trust discerning readers to understand the meaning of it. We aim to cultivate the apostolic spirit, which is a constant deprecation of the style of those of whom John speaks in his day, who “loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.”

We direct attention to the first article in this number of the *Christadelphian*. It deals with a subject on which a clear and Scriptural understanding is essential to ecclesial peace. As a brother there remarks, very lax ideas with respect to it are prevalent among those who have recently submitted to the truth—say within the last ten years—such as have not known the early struggle for purity in the basis of fellowship. Even among some of those of whom a more advanced spiritual understanding might have been expected, astonishing sentiments are entertained, to the effect that error of any kind is not only not to be objected to in fellowship, but rather encouraged as a useful counterfoil and provocative of truth, and that the only thing justifying separation is immorality of conduct! This would be a very convenient doctrine to hold; but it is impossible for anyone in harmony with the apostolic writings to receive it. The truth is the root of ecclesial existence; and the whole spirit of apostolic precept is to be jealous of any departure from it, and to contend for it earnestly against the corruptions of all who creep in unawares, to the extent of turning away from the corrupters if they cannot be won over to the right way.

The effort to restore fellowship in Birmingham has not yet succeeded. There is hope, it may. All depends upon whether the New Street brethren finally consent to make the doctrine of complete inspiration a first principle in their midst. If they do, we may work together as two separate bodies in harmony. If not, we must wait as we are. An unfortunate impression prevails to the effect that the question is an affair of personal emulation and not of principle. Let reasonable men among them discard this surmise (which is absolutely unfounded as regards the Editor of the *Christadelphian*), and there will be no difficulty. If they hold to it, they are victimised by a delusion that will not be to their honour in the day of account. Of course, we do not insinuate that it will be a knowing victimisation on their part: but that will not alter the fact. We hope all may yet be well.

The work of the truth will recover itself after the present crisis has passed away—and no crisis can last for ever. A severe check will be followed by renewed and accelerated activity. It must be so from the nature of things. Mown grass springs again. It is not as if there had been any change of base among those who have been faithful to the truth from the beginning. They remain as they were, strongly re-built on the original foundation: and they cannot be dismayed by any eruption of hostility that may take place. The truth is a perennial thing. It does not depend upon the limited interests or the personal supports of a particular generation. It rests upon no man. It does not depend upon a particular phase of the signs of the times, or a particular construction of the prophetic periods. It is for all time till the Lord come—as powerful to engage the affection and arouse the enterprise of men in our day as in the days of Paul. True it is that only a few find it, and fewer appreciate it at its true value. Still, in the hands of that few it is indestructible. The rains may descend: the floods may come: the beating against the house may be severe, but only where it has been built on the sands of a disobedient life can catastrophe ensue. In the hands of true disciples, the work of the truth will not—cannot—die. It will revive again with the beauty and freshness and fragrance of the cut grass after a shower.

A member of “the small, newly-formed community,” which, with its manifesto, was referred to last month, writes to complain of misrepresentation. He does not sign his name. He ought to do so. In strict editorial propriety, we ought to take no notice of anonymous communications: but for love’s sake—and love is a wider, bigger thing than some people seem to reckon—we stretch a point. We say to him, we have not misrepresented the said community. The words we used were its own words—quoted from its

own manifesto—viz., that it would treat the question that had been raised concerning inspiration as “an open question,” as they did not think it necessary they should all be of one mind on the subject. Our friend, whoever he is, says it is the theory of inspiration, and not inspiration itself, that they make an open question. We can only say our friend is not a breast of the controversy, if he imagine that the strife that has been raised is any question as to how the Spirit of God operated in producing a wholly-inspired Bible. The question does not relate to any theory of the thing, but to *the fact of the thing*. What has been contended for has been “a human element” in the Bible,—an uninspired and fallible element,—as accounting for supposed mistakes in the Bible. This has been explained, illustrated, and proved over and over again; and it has been shown that such a doctrine logically goes far to destroy the divinity of the Bible altogether. Our friend evidently has not followed the matter, or does not discern it, and so thinks he sees misrepresentation where none exists, except in his own criticism of it.

Bro. W. G. Burd, of Collins, Mo., has the following remarks on a subject which our relation to the matter has compelled us to be silent about: “This idea of a plurality of periodicals is very detrimental to the working of the Truth. I do hope and pray that the brethren and friends of the truth may re-unite on behalf of the *Christadelphian*. The reasons for this course are numerous and evident to the most casual observation.’ The unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace,’ is liable to be broken if we have more than one channel of communication between the various ecclesias throughout the world. We are commanded to all speak the same thing; but if we run a number of papers, we shall not only weaken, instead of strengthening, the hands of the *Christadelphian*, which since, and even before, the decease of our beloved sleeping brother has been providentially placed as the defender of the ancient Gospel, but we shall be in danger of dividing up on forbidden issues, saying, ‘I am of Paul, and I am of Apollos.’”

[These remarks will be derided; but their wisdom has been brought home in bitter experience to many. What strife and anguish have resulted from the attempt to introduce plurality of operation. It has been made a matter of deep reproach to us that we have never encouraged a plurality of magazines. We have had to be content in silence to have our policy in the matter misunderstood and misconstrued. It has been a deliberate policy with clear reasons. Events have proved the wisdom of it. It was enjoined by Dr. Thomas, as a matter of spiritual expediency; and it has been proved wise, by its beneficial results, when in full operation, and by the frightful havoc that has come from interference with it. Unity of operation is essential to effectual and harmonious work in all systems, but more especially in the truth, which is in so much more danger of being compromised by the incomplete qualification of new adherents, who are being constantly drawn in from the outer darkness, and who, while they may be useful as adjuncts to a work in common, are liable to become dangerous in separate action. The age to come is an age of success because an age of unity centralised and enforced. There is no basis for such a form of things now; but in so far as we act on divine models, we act in the way likely to ensure success.]

(October 1885)

A letter in the *Visitor* department will enable our readers to understand the nature of the proposed Advisory Council, concerning which, an endeavour has been made to raise an evil report.

The first Sunday in December was the day agreed to by a number of ecclesias for an annual collection in aid of the Jewish Colonies. Presumably, we shall not allow the distresses of the moment (which will pass away), to interfere with a good work. Additional communications from Mr. Oliphant will be found in the present number.

The question of exemption from military service (it will be seen from the Intelligence department) is exercising the brethren in New Zealand. No wonder, in view of the military ferment in that country. The petition presented to the Legislature has been laid on the table—that is, virtually refused. There is nothing

for it but for brethren, if conscripted, to refuse to act the part of soldiers, while willing to serve in a non-combatant capacity. Military coercion may be a trial permitted to finish the work of God in these latter days.

We have been made acquainted, through the printer, with brother Ashcroft's desire that we should no more refer to him in any way, in the pages of the *Christadelphian* or otherwise. We promise compliance after the appearance of the present number of the *Christadelphian*.<sup>3</sup> We meanwhile, deem it a duty to the brethren to report to them that it was publicly announced in the Exchange Assembly Rooms, Birmingham, on Sunday, Sept. 13<sup>th</sup>, that brother Ashcroft had quitted connection with the Christadelphians, and had resumed association with the Congregationalists under an arrangement by which he will occupy a pulpit in connection with them in the neighbourhood of Liverpool. We have information from other sources of the truth of this announcement. Any other allusions in the present number were written before the knowledge of his letter.

"There would soon be no truth." Such was the remark of a sister a few days ago, in reference to the effect of complying with a proposal that had been made to the ecclesia with which she was associated. The remark embodies a thought well worth the consideration of all who favour the lax theory of fellowship which some are disposed to advocate. If it be true that we are not responsible for the doctrines of those with whom we helpfully assemble, why should we come away from the churches and chapels? Why sacrifice the advantages and comforts of popular communions if it is the Father only we fellowship, and not those with whom we may identify ourselves? The theory is a mischievous one, and it will work mischievous results in the long run if it obtain currency. There can be no reason, if it be true, why we should not all return to the several religious bodies from which we have separated ourselves; and what would the effect of that be? The truth would soon disappear, and a few bubbles of opinion (soon to collapse) would be all that would be left floating on the turgid waters of an ecclesiastical world rapidly becoming atheistic. It is not a question for earnest men to toy with. The question of fellowship has become as imperative as the question of inspiration. Any man consenting to a principle that leads to association with the Balaamites and Jezebels of the powerful Apostacy so long and so prosperously established in the earth, will incur the displeasure of God, and a share in the plagues that will ultimately abolish the system from the earth.

---

<sup>3</sup> We shall hold ourselves absolved from this promise should bro. Ashcroft take the course proposed in his letter to the printers.—ED.

*(The Christadelphian 1886 pg 37)*

In Brother J. J. Andrew's "Letter to the Editor," the first installment of which appeared last month, the brethren will find some views and aspects of the inspiration agitation, which will commend themselves to spiritual minds, however much they may be scouted by such as have not been enabled to acquire divine views of present life in the truth. It has been from no lack of appreciation of the bearings of the matter that Brother Andrew has not spoken sooner. At the very commencement, he assured us of his sympathy as to the question itself, though declaring his inability to take an active part in the controversy in the midst of the onerous duties of his position, Circumstances in London have now forced him (at the peril of health), to enter upon the active canvass of the matter: And he declares that "the more he considers the question, the more important in all its aspects does it appear to be." This may help to mollify the feelings of those who dislike the prominence given to the subject during the past year and who wish no more to be said about it. We had purposed letting it subside henceforth To this purpose we shall give effect as soon as practicable; but God reigus, and by His providence, sometimes sets aside human intentions. The lengthy and important communication from Brother Andrew necessitates a continuation of the subject beyond

editorial wishes or intentions. The ultimate benefit of “those who love God and are called according to His purpose,” will doubtless be the result.

The disposition to repudiate the name “Christadelphian” that is evinced in some quarters on both sides of the Atlantic, is not a healthy symptom. The feeling at its root originates in a desire to be on friendly terms with the rest of the community, which is a commendable enough desire, in a certain form, but is a bad inspiration in divine things. The community is not friendly to God’s ways. Consequently friendship with the community is dangerous. James’ words are still applicable that “the friendship of the world is 518arass with God.” The world is called “Christian,” but the word has lost its meaning, from which it comes to pass that for a believer to call himself a Christian, is to utter a lie so far as the sense it conveys to neighbours is concerned. Names represent things. The name Christadelphian represents the recovered faith of Christ, with its testimony that men are without hope apart from the gospel and obedience of Christ. This is the offensive part of the testimony of the truth: and this is what is represented to the public by the name Christadelphian. It was the cross that was the great offence in Paul’s day: but he did not avoid it on that account. In our day, it is the mortal and hopeless state of man apart from the hope of Israel (conventionally represented by the name “Christadelphian”) that is the offence. And a faithful soldier of Christ will not pull the flag down because it is odious.

*(Exerpt from March 1886)*

It is difficult to walk wisely in the midst of the antagonisms generated by controversy. The subject of inspiration is no exception. Impulsive minds of limited view push strongly one way or other, and think it treason to stop sh rt of their extremes. While some cannot open their eyes to the need of action at all, others are for acting where there is no need for action; and are ready to curse and impute evil motives to those who cannot unite in their movements. There is a time for action and a time for patience. We must beware of importing a partizan spirit into a fight for principle.

The division on inspiration has created a situation which perplexes some minds. The mist of this perplexity may vanish. The “other side,” as some speak of them declare they believe in inspiration as much as those who have left them. A sister, the other day, put the matter to a perplexed one in a form coming within the grasp of the simplest capacity—“The doctrine of partial inspiration has been brought in; and there are two parties: one will tolerate it, and the other will not. You must choose which you will belong to.” This is putting the issue in a nutshell. It requires but one addition: that those who tolerate partial inspiration, while protesting there is no such thing, and that they believe in a wholly-inspired Bible, are in association with those everywhere who, by speech, in print, and by profession proclaim their belief in an inspiration that results in a Bible partly divine and partly human and erring. Not only so, but there are those among them who, in conversation, speak of parts of the Bible with an irreverence that devout minds could not sanction without sin.

*(April 1886)*

A number of other ecclesias have taken a faithful attitude in defence of the Scriptures and against the doctrine of partial and erring inspiration. It is only such as are not in sympathy with that attitude that will begrudge the publication of their decision.

Brother J. J. Andrews’s exhaustive letter on the question of inspiration, and its bearings on fellowship, is completed in this number. A letter from the Editor of the *Christadelphian*, to brother Andrew, in the way of rejoinder, will in all probability appear next month.

A poor brother, lecturing at his own expense, to two people! Nothing but a faith like Noah's could produce a picture like this. It has been witnessed in varied proportions many times since the work began; and it will continue to be seen in various parts of the world till the very hour when the death-knell of the present evil world strikes in the announcement that the Lord has come.

The brethren and sisters will read, with pleasure, brother Vredenburg's vindication (in an early part of this number), of Dr. Thomas's professional status from the ungenerous surmises of men who before time, knew no words emphatic enough to express their admiration of the man who has been used by God in our age to give us the truth.

An ecclesia professing to believe that the Bible is wholly the work of inspiration, but passes a resolution so loose in its terms as to admit believers in partial inspiration, has itself to blame, if, instead of excluding partial inspiration, the effect of its resolution is to exclude those who can make no compromise with the evil thing. A resolution of this character, instead of creating confidence, destroys it in spite of the utmost desire of faithful brethren to cultivate it.

The preparation of a Christadelphian Sunday School Catechism is well advanced. It will contain 144 questions and Scripture-attested answers on the whole system of the truth, embracing history, as well as doctrine and prophecy. The Scripture proofs are set out in full. There is material for three years' Sunday lessons, in the course of which the children ought to become instructed in the first principles of the oracles of God. There will probably be an addition of some hints on the best way of conducting a Sunday School.

When men are in a wrong course, it is very natural for them to impute evil motives to those who oppose them; for the granting of right motives would be a fatal weakening of their own position. On this principle, we are accustomed to behold ourselves held up to view in the most villainous of portraits—public and private. The caricature is painful, but tolerable, because false, and therefore destined shortly to perish. Such is the tradition referred to in brother Edwards's letter from Lanesville.

*(May 1886)*

We are nearing the end of inspiration troubles, and may hope to settle down again in peace and love to the work for which the word of inspiration was given—to comfort the saints and enlighten the devout stranger.

Brother Andrew's letter being now finished, we publish this month a rejoinder which may meet the needs of some who are yet making enquiries. Both the letter and rejoinder will now be published under one cover as a pamphlet, under the title "Bible Authorship and Fraternal Fellowship."

We should "speak the truth love." Now, love spares the feelings of its objects as much as possible. Some brethren seem to forget this. They are brusque while honest; irritating while faithful; disrespectful to their neighbours while zealous for their God. It is not thus that peace and love prevail.

A presiding brother should take the part of servant of the congregation for the time being, and never as master. He should not use the position as one of authority, but as one of ministration, for the comfort and

benefit of all, kindly and deferential to all, ready if need be to open a window or close a door or hand round the bread and wine. Christ going round with the basin is the model.

It is well to be zealous for ecclesial purity; but if we are to abstain from ecclesial association till we find an ecclesia that is perfect, we shall never have ecclesial association at all. We must have compassion as well as zeal. We are all imperfect, and unless we practice some of the charity that “hides a multitude of sins,” we shall hinder and destroy instead of helping one another.

“Covering a multitude of sins” is not winking at them. To wink at them in the sense of conniving is to be a partaker in guilt. To cover them is to conceal them instead of either whispering or blazoning them; and to conceal them is lawful when they are the infirmities of the flesh which a brother would not defend.

The catechism referred to last month is now finished, and in the printer’s hands. It is to be called THE CHRISTADELPHIAN INSTRUCTOR, and will be useful in the general work of the truth as well as in the instruction of children. In addition to the 144 questions (now become 150) spoken of last month, there are 100 simple questions for very young children; and some remarks on the best mode of conducting Sunday Schools. It is a larger affair than at first contemplated. We shall be able to speak of price next month.

Those will have the sympathy of the spiritually-minded who decide that membership in Gentile brotherhoods is inconsistent with brotherhood with Christ; and who at the same time recognise freedom of contract with Gentiles or Gentile societies in matters of finance. This is what the Stockport brethren have done as will be seen. A man who has given himself to Christ cannot give himself to rival organisations which ignore Christ and propose objects that he alone can provide for. At the same time, he may buy and sell and exchange equivalents with the world in any lawful shape so long as he reserves his own control over his own actions and the results that may come of his traffic with them. The line that divides “may” and “must not” is discoverable with study of the Scriptures. We must not join in brotherhood with the world; but we may deal with the world.

*(June 1886)*

The individual result of ecclesial experience will not be manifest till the last stage of the work. It often feels more trying than edifying. Its benefit to the character is not to be estimated by feeling. When the result is approved at the judgment seat, we shall look back and see what has been accomplished in us by a process comparable only at present to sandpapering.

There is no good to be done by staying in the corrupt communions of the apostacy after a knowledge of the truth has been received. The organization is too strong for the individual. The truth in his mind is far more likely to be weakened and overborne by the current of unscriptural thought running all round him, than that he will check that current in the least degree. Besides, such a course is not a permissible one. A study of the apostolic law will show that it is incumbent on such, to come out from the association of error, and that therefore it is sinful to remain.



Inviting a promiscuous audience “yet in their sins,” to worship God, is not in harmony with apostolic teaching or principle. A brother may “give thanks to God in the presence of them all,” for the bread of life, as Paul did in the presence of the ship’s company for food partaken of after a prolonged fast; but he may not invite them to draw near as reconciled children to offer the spiritual sacrifices of the lips which are acceptable only in Christ Jesus. When a man, lay or clerical, asks the unjustified public to “sing to the praise and glory of God,” he deceives the public and mocks God, for the unjustified public cannot do what he asks, and “God heareth not sinners.” The restrictions and reservations and insulations of the truth are inconvenient in the present Gentile age, but they are as binding as the laws of nature on all who would call on God in sincerity and truth.

It is sometimes said by the sectarian stranger that the Christadelphians are not a spiritually minded people. Those who make the complaint are not, as a rule, qualified to judge. They do not know what true spiritual mindedness is. Nevertheless, there is enough truth in the accusation to cause the brethren everywhere to ponder. Without spiritual mindedness, an acquaintance with the theoretical elements of the truth will be found at last not only to have no value, but to be worse than ignorance. Spiritual mindedness is that state of mind in a man in which God finds pleasure; for He takes pleasure in some mental states, while He holds others in abomination. It is called Spiritual-mindedness because it is a state of mind according to the spirit. It is a state of mind engendered by contact with the mind of the spirit as expressed in the word written by that Spirit’s inspiration. Its leading feature is a recognition of God’s supreme place, not only in the fabrication of the universe, but in the economy of our lives. From this flows sympathy with God’s objects in the making and conducting of the world as manifested in His work with Israel and His word to them since the day He called them from Egypt till He scattered them by the Roman power. Out of this comes such a love to God as Moses had; such a love for Christ as constrained Paul; such a love for men as God shows and asks; and such an interest in God’s purpose, founded upon all these, as Daniel exhibited subordinate fruits will follow in sympathetic obedience to all the commandments. The whole combination will unite as to the mind of the Spirit, and show forth a true illustration of that spiritual mindedness of which there is much talk and many false versions, but of which the whole earth is at present so barren. If the brethren partake of this barrenness, it is not in the degree that prevails in the outside wastes of Gentile life at all events. It is the day of draught everywhere just now. Much fructification is not to be looked for anywhere. But what fruitfulness of the spirit is discoverable in the arid desolation ought to be found in those spring-watered nooks and corners of the desert where God is known, His word delighted in, and his commandments gladly obeyed, in other words, where the mind of the Spirit and not the mind of the flesh is the ruling inspiration.

(July 1886)

“There have never been wanting since the world began, false prophets and tempters to assure men that the natural consequences of their actions will not ensue; that they shall not surely die, and that it is idle in them to waste time and trouble in taking precautions against imaginary danger.” So writes the *Standard* on the Irish question; and Bro. W. Robertson, of Arbroath, thinks the words are not inapplicable to those who are tampering with partial inspiration.

There is a time for debate, and a time for abstaining from debate. The time for debate is when stagnation is setting in, or when the holding of debate is likely to arrest a healthy public attention to the truth. The time to abstain is when a question has been thoroughly debated, and people have everywhere made up their minds, and when the continuance of debate is likely to be but a continuance of wrangle, affording no further elucidation of the question in dispute, and tending only to gratify those who love contention. There seem to be some who cannot understand the times.

There are those who love strife and contention, and there are those who love peace at any price. Both are dangerous parties in the work of the truth. The first degrade the truth by their dog-like propensity for mere fighting, and take all usefulness out of it by their want of heart for its comforts, its nobleness, its holiness, its peace and love. The second destroy it another way. Their mere creature sociality leads them to love peace more than duty, man more than God, pleasure more than truth; and in their hands, the truth degenerates into a mass of invertebrate sentimentality in which there is no place for the wisdom of God, as embodied in the plan of salvation.

Singing, when sincerely performed, is as much an act of mental concentration as speaking,—singing to God especially so. The abstracted mind seeks to realise the invisible. In view of this, it seems incongruous for people to be looking about at their neighbours while they are singing to God. It is positively insufferable for one sincerely so engaged to be addressed on some trifle during the very act of singing. How should we like to be interrupted while speaking to a friend? How should we appreciate the conversation of a friend who all the while he was talking to us was inattentive to us—not thinking of us or of what he was saying, and looking all around at anything and everything while addressing us? Is God deserving of less respect than we show to our neighbours? Drawing breath with the lips while the heart is far away, was a sin of Israel under Moses; and it has not ceased to be so under Christ.

(August 1886)

Ecclesias get on best without any constitution when they are small, and mutual forbearance and love prevail. The members know and understand each other better than is possible in a large body.

The *Christadelphian Instructor* is all in type, and partly printed. The printer promises to be ready with a supply along with this number of the *Christadelphian*. On the strength of this, we have said, “Now Ready.” But the printer has been so harassed with work and complications, that it is not impossible there may not be a strict performance. If there is further delay, readers will understand the reason, but it will only be for a few days at the most.

Earnest men desire identification with the class of brethren of whom Paul would have approved in his day. Touching this desire, it was remarked the other day, “we are doing the same things, and hoping the same things: the only difference is, we are not persecuted.” Let us hope this is the only difference. The first generation of believers, if they answered to Paul’s requirements, had a degree of personal sobriety, ardour, consecration, and holiness that is not so generally seen in connection with the truth in the 19<sup>th</sup> century as Paul evidently desired.

Dr. Thomas had a great aversion to the habit in some sects of preaching at particular persons in the course of a general exhortation; still more to the retailing of actual personal reports, ecclesial or individual. Dr. Thomas’s aversion will be shared by every enlightened mind. Exhortation should be in the spirit of love and dignity, both which will keep a man above the personal level, and inspire him to magnify great general truth, and to hide rather than publish the details of personal life, which on all hands are imperfect and unedifying.

The intelligence this month shows one or two further instances of ecclesial action on the subject of inspiration. We shall presently get to the last of this. However regrettable, it is inevitable. There are two camps in the brotherhood; and it is impossible to belong to both. The one, strong in their conviction of the absolutely inspired character of the Bible, will have nothing to do with the doctrine that the Bible is partly human and erring. The other both tolerates and advocates that doctrine, while in words professing to reject it.

It is one of the cruelties of the present age that faithful friends of Christ (who are lovers of God and man) should be charged with the contentions and divisions arising from the oppositions and corruptions of men not subject to the Spirit of God. The atheist says, "Look at the divisions of Christendom—Catholic Church, Greek Church, Anglican Church (High, Low, and Broad), Congregationalist, Baptist, Methodist, &c.: *Fine Christianity!*" The Churchman says, "Look what comes of dissent—divisions and subdivisions—Methodists, and Wesleyan Methodists, and Free Methodists, and Primitive Methodists, Baptists, and General Baptists, and Particular Baptists." The Dissenter says, "Look at what comes of your little sects. Brethren and Christian Brethren, and Plymouth Brethren, Bible Christians, Reformed Bible Christians, &c., &c." We come down to the grain of fine gold in the midst of the mountain of worthless quartz—the unadulterated truth as brought to light by Dr. Thomas; and half-and-half believers say, "Look at your valour for pure doctrine and a wholly inspired Bible! What comes of it? Dowieites and Renunciationists, and No-willists, and Partialists, and Christadelphians; endless divisions and bitterness and confusion." What can a man do who believes in God and knows his way, and is determined, at all hazard, to be found in the path of truth and purity, in the midst of the indifference and corruption that fill the whole so-called Christian world? He can but endure a situation that is not of his seeking or his liking, and patiently wait the issue, which is sure to come. That issue will justify a careful adhesion to divine ways in the midst of pain and opprobrium; and it will condemn the indifferentism and godlessness of a complacent world as much as it did in the days of Noah.

*(Excerpt from September 1886)*

#### Disputes

There ought to be no murmurings and disputings among the brethren of Christ. It is forbidden. Nevertheless, in the mixed state allowed to prevail in all ecclesias during probation, they are sure to arise. Wisdom, therefore, requires that we be prepared to deal with them in a proper manner when they arise. There is a way of dealing with them that heals them, and a way that has just the opposite effect. There is no more dangerous and prolific cause of distress and ruin in an ecclesia than the wrong treatment of causes of dispute. This must be the excuse for giving the subject lengthy attention.

There are two sorts, both different, and yet both related as regards the spirit and aim with which they ought to be treated. 1. Individual offences. 2. Ecclesial differences.

No time ought to be lost in dealing with either one or the other. The longer time that elapses in the application of a remedy, the more difficult does the application of the remedy become. Individual misunderstandings spread coldness beyond the persons affected; and ecclesial differences are liable to settle into chronic alienations, which blight every good work.

[Compiler's Note: Clause 35]

*(Excerpts from September 1886)*

An esteemed correspondent objects to the 35th clause of the new Birmingham constitution, as a concession of the principle of open fellowship contended for by some:—(the clause provides that where two ecclesias differ in judgment as to the facts of a case of withdrawal—one receiving a person that the other cannot receive, they shall not make it a cause of separation from one and another, where a proper

course has been taken). A little consideration ought to alter our correspondent's impression. "Open fellowship" claims the toleration of unscriptural doctrines and principles. The clause objected to does not do this at all. It assumes that scriptural doctrines and principles are received as the basis of fellowship by parties who have the misfortune to disagree as to the personal application of these principles in a given case. There ought to be provision for difference of judgment in such a case, otherwise an impracticable rule of fellowship would be set up. The basis of fellowship ought not to be extended beyond principles. The opinion we may hold of a given person ought never to be a basis of fellowship, so long as we are both agreed what the Scriptures require such a person to be.

For example, two ecclesias agree that honesty of dealing ought to characterise the disciples of Christ. But a case arises in which aggrieved parties allege that a certain brother is a swindler. We will suppose that their convictions are so strong and their influence so prevailing, that the brother is withdrawn from. The said brother believing himself to be an honest man does not accept the withdrawal, and applies to a neighbouring ecclesia for fellowship, giving them such an account of transactions as to make them inclined to think a mistake has been made. They do not receive him at first, but communicate with the first ecclesia and ask a joint re-investigation. The re-investigation takes place with the result of convincing them that the charges of swindling, &c., are mere constructive charges, and that the facts of the case are capable of another understanding. What is to be done? Are the two ecclesias to be estranged from one another because of their inability to agree as to the nature of business transacted between two men? No doubt such a disagreement is a misfortune, and an interference with the perfect harmony that ought to subsist among the Lord's brethren, but there are times when we are compelled to put up with disagreements in the spirit of mutual forbearance, and if there ever is such a time it is when there is a difference of judgment as to personal transactions that are so easily liable to be misunderstood. Doubtless, such a situation—one ecclesia fellowshiping another which fellowshiped a brother which the first cannot receive—is theoretically out of square, but, in an age when there is so much out of square, we are obliged to submit to some absence of perfection in our arrangements, choosing the least evil, that we may in some tolerable manner make our journey through this howling wilderness, and not absolutely sit down in a dead halt. In the Lord's absence, we have in many things to be like Carlyle's mason, content with stones "square enough." Absolutely square they cannot at present be made. While you are squaring them at one side, they get wobbly at the other.

Our correspondent asks, "Is it not by reason of 'difference of judgment as to facts merely' that you are separated from those at the Exchange?" Answer: Not altogether. There is a confessed difference of principle, which is the key to the different construction of facts and the different attitude observed. In their publications, they have openly repudiated "verbal" and "plenary" inspiration, and exhibited variations and discrepancies in justification of their view that the Holy Spirit did not dictate the entire writing, and in their personal communications they have declared they "cannot conscientiously say" that they believe everything in the Bible to be inspired; "they once thought so, but they have changed their minds." They have supported the partial inspiration publications from the beginning, and the publishers of these have claimed them as of the same mind,—a claim confirmed by their own sayings, and by their own refusal to repudiate the doctrine introduced by these publications. Per contra, there is merely their declaration that "they believe in inspiration as much as brother Roberts,"—a declaration which naturally can have no weight in view of all the other ingredients of the situation, and especially because the declaration is only made when there is a desire to prevent the conscientious adherent from falling off. There is not in this case the unanimous and hearty endorsement of scripture principles which Clause 35 pre-supposes, but the open and manifest compromise of these principles while verbally endeavouring to obtain the credit of accepting and upholding them. It is in reference to vital and fundamental principles of truth that the remark was made last month, that "the question of fellowship is as vital as the question of the truth itself:" and not in reference to the possibly mistaken personal applications of these principles by those receiving them in sincerity and truth.

(October 1886)

“Divine rules properly applied will keep things square.”—*Esteemed Correspondent*. Nay, my brother,—not in the present state of things. They never have done so. Under both Moses and Christ, things have gone entirely out of square under the divinest rules. The reason lies in the nature of the materials with which they have had to deal, We must have those materials in view, in the application of all rules.

“Square enough” is a good rule. This truly defines the squareness “required.” Absolute squareness—in the sense of mathematical faultlessness—is a practical impossibility in the building trade; so we are informed; and that a mason who keeps “tittivating” his block till it is a faultless square would be considered a finik, and could not get on with his work fast enough for his wages. However this may be, it is a fact that we cannot have things perfect, and that we must be content with some amount of imperfection or else miss the good that is attainable.

“He shall have judgment without mercy that shows no mercy.” Some forget this in their haste to withdraw from a brother who stumbles. Sin acknowledged and repented of is not a justifiable cause of withdrawal. Doubtless, we must “have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness:” but, at the same time, we must be long-suffering towards those who do not defend and try to master the weaknesses of which they may be guilty. It is a different thing when they are champions of error and sin, or with a case where the wrong is defended as a lawful thing. “Wisdom is profitable to direct.”

The bread and the wine stand for the body and blood of the Lord in their sacrificial relations. Consequently, they ought not to be served in a way inconsistent with their significance as such. This is done when a number of biscuits, or broken pieces of bread, are used. “One body” requires one piece of bread divided in the act of distribution, as when the Lord “took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, take, eat” (1 Cor. 11:24). We cannot do wrong in following his example. The brother distributing ought first to break. As to the nature or form of the bread, we have no instructions: and “where there is no law there is no transgression.” A piece of bread, whether baked whole or cut from its place after baking, combines the two ideas of unity and life sustenance, and comes sufficiently near the original memorial.

(December 1886)

Brother J. J. Andrew’s long letter to the Editor, which commenced its appearance in the *Christadelphian*, 12 months ago, has been the subject of much animadversion in hostile quarters. Many of its statements have been challenged and its arguments antagonised. We have a letter just to hand from brother Andrew in which he thoroughly overhauls all the criticisms that have been indulged in. He convincingly shews the Bible to be the Word of God, in a series of arguments whose calm weight will be irresistible with those who have both the capacity to reason correctly and the desire to follow the issues of truth.

(Excerpt from January 1887)

There is a letter of brother J. J. Andrew’s in the *Light-stand* for November 13th which convincingly exhibits some of the evidences of the obliquity that has compelled thoroughgoing believers in the Bible’s inspiration to act decisively in its defence. Writing on the same subject to the editor of the *Christadelphian*, he says:—

“A recent statement of yours that one camp of the brotherhood tolerates and advocates the doctrine of a partly human and erring Bible, while in words professing to reject it, has been publicly challenged. But the evidence in support of it is too explicit to be denied; it emanates from their own

mouth. When the Exchange meeting, Birmingham, was being established, a resolution was passed affirming “belief in the entire inspiration of the Bible,” and repudiating any “sympathy with doctrines of partial or erring inspiration, believing that the original writings were free from error.” This was in effect affirming that the Bible was wholly inspired and infallible. This occurred in June, 1885. What has occurred since? In the following November, the editorial members of the Exchange meeting approved of such resolutions being called “idols,” and in February last, they declared that they would “not defend resolutions for putting in the word infallible where the Holy Spirit has not put it in.” They have also demurred to the Bible’s “absolute infallibility in every detail,” and have stated that its divine perfection does not require it to be “technically infallible;” “infallible in a certain sense, but in some senses not”—“not infallible for all purposes.” There are only two questions arise out of these contradictory statements: 1. Did the authors, when in June, 1885, affirming that the Bible autographs were “free from error,” maintain a mental reserve? or, 2. Have they since changed their minds?” (See also remarks in connection with intelligence from Bristol.)

Brother Macdougall makes the following remarks on the advisability of cancelling section 35 of Birmingham constitution. It relates to the case of two ecclesias dealing with a person or persons out of the fellowship of one of them. The clause proposes that the ecclesia G. will respect or maintain the withdrawal of C. from an alleged offender until the cause has been investigated; and withdrawal shall be maintained until it has been shown to be an error. With a view to this investigation, it proposes that both G. and C. shall take part, but that if C. refuse to co-operate, G. will investigate without them. If they agree to investigate the matter in the presence of each, both shall have equal voting power, and then they shall vote together as one ecclesia, and the decision of the majority shall stand.

“To this,” says brother Macdougall, “I think no reasonable person could object, as it leaves clear ground for procedure either in maintaining or disannulling the withdrawal; but the introduction of 35 (namely, liberty of one ecclesia to disregard this decision) is in our mind most unfortunate, as we consider it a provision of an unwarrantable character and makes of none effect the laws of fellowship. Why should one of the ecclesias disannul a withdrawal which had been investigated and made valid by both? The clause says, “We shall be content in that case to maintain our own withdrawal.” Why maintain your withdrawal and then fellowship those who would not? If you would fellowship another ecclesia who fellowships said brother or sister why not fellowship the brother or sister? It gives us the absurd idea of fellowshipping a brother at another ecclesia which you would not do at home. You say there ought to be provision for difference of judgment, but here you would make provision to join hand in hand with the ecclesia who is of the same mind as the withdrawn from person, and yet do not give the person the benefit of such provision but maintain your withdrawal. Surely this is not as it should be. To say the very least, the clause admits of confusion and looseness. The basis of our fellowship is not only principles admitted but principles acted upon. To you it seems ‘square enough’ is a good rule: to my mind it is not a safe rule. It is good for us in our dealings with one another to exercise mutual forbearance where it can be admitted, but it is another thing to frame a rule which deteriorates from the divine standard. In this we may encroach upon the divine prerogative, and say ‘square enough’ to that which would not be sanctioned by the Judge. Let us contend for a perfect law, though we should have to confess our weakness in keeping it. It would have been more to my mind had no such article as 35 been seen in your constitution.”

[There is much force in brother Macdougall’s contention. We have already admitted a want of perfect squareness in the arrangement objected to: and we feel this strongly enough not to insist upon it. We proposed it in the interests of peace, but would not object to the joint decision of two ecclesias being mutually binding in the case supposed.—EDITOR.]

(April 1887)

It is not wise to have the exercises of a meeting in such an order that they are needlessly tiring. When prayer follows a long hymn, some have to sit down, and all feel it to be a strain on mortal power, when two standing exercises follow each other. The best way is to have reading after singing. This gives rest, and prepares every one to rise with comfort and fervour to prayer.

The Birmingham ecclesia has borrowed more than one good thing from other places—such, for example, as adopting the readings of the day by *The Bible Companion* for the public readings. It has been governed simply by the appreciation of what is excellent. It grieves them, therefore, to hear of anyone elsewhere refusing to adopt a good thing because it is done in Birmingham. When a man says: “If a thing is done at Birmingham, that is a reason why we should not do it,” he speaks not as a brother, or even as a man, but as a petty school lad, or as a Gentile boor. Wisdom and love should reign. A thing should be done for its own sake, and not because it is done or not done by others. This is the rule now more than it has been in times past. But the spirit of Cain will linger till the day of Abel’s unquestionable and irresistible power.

Some complain of what they conceive of as a growing emasculation in the style of advocating the truth. They would like the clergy denounced a little more vigorously “as at the beginning,” say they. One man actually interrupted a lecture recently to tell the lecturer to “wire into the parsons” a little more decidedly. Different people will take this differently. The man who aims only to make the Bible influential has no relish for the democratic pugilism that delights in tearing and rending and scorning. “Railers shall not inherit the Kingdom of God,” and the thing that delights the dogs of an audience comes very near the crime of railing. Let us be as firm as possible in contending for the faith delivered to the saints; but if, with no diminution of strong principle, there has been a softening down of strong language, it is a change that will be welcomed by good men as an improvement.

“Rule 35” of the Birmingham ecclesial constitution has no reference to cases where first principles are in question. Two ecclesias differing in judgment as to first principles, have no basis of approximation. The Rule relates solely to disputed questions of personal action and character, as to which, it is possible for even two men to be righteously disagreed in their opinion concerning a third person. The suggestion of the rule was that in such a question, those divided in opinion might agree to differ without any compromise of principle, and that the interests of peace should lead us as far as we can in this direction. It is a misapplication to bring it to bear when the question is whether we are or are not to tolerate the doctrine of a partly human and erring Bible.

Sin is bad company—the pleasanter, the more dangerous.

There are different roads to destruction. Avoid them all. Wisdom, and that only, will guide to life.

You must reap as you sow. It is a universal law—you cannot avoid it—in natural and spiritual things alike. They must hunger in summer who sleep in the winter. Be up and doing.

(June 1887)

Punctuality is a form of faithfulness. It is the keeping of a covenant. Unpunctuality will generally be found associated with looseness in other matters. God is punctual in the execution of all His works, whether in the movement of the heavenly bodies or the fulfilment of His plans and promises; and His children are commanded to be like Him. They can only be so on a small scale. All the more important it is that their punctuality should be seen in small matters. Presence at the hour of meeting is one of them.

Paul's words ("tarry one for another"—1 Cor. 11:33) which have been quoted as a plea for waiting for late comers before commencing were never written with this meaning. The context is clear as to this. It was a question of the mode of attending to the breaking of bread when they had actually come together,—not of the time at which they should assemble. The question was whether they bring food and eat simultaneously, as at a feast, or whether, passing the bread, they should "tarry one for another."

The other day, a brother called on the editor to ask explanations concerning personal matters he had been told of privately by those separated from us on the subject of inspiration. The representations made to him had distressed him, and had greatly interfered with his own decision as to the course he ought to take, notwithstanding which, however, he had come to the decision, that the truth and the spirit thereof were on the side assailed by the evil speakers, and that duty required him to identify himself with that side. He had come to this decision some months ago. Still, he thought the law of Christ required him to privately tell what he had heard, that the editor might receive the rebuke the case called for, or that he might have the opportunity of giving such explanations as might shew he did not deserve it. The editor told him that he was aware that evil speaking had been going on for a long time, but he was powerless to hinder it and could only submit in silence. Nothing would please him better than a public trial in which charges should be formulated, evidence submitted, and explanations heard, before a competent and impartial tribunal. But in the absence of this, there was no alternative but silence, which he had carefully observed, leaving all the cursing to those who choose. The brother then rehearsed his matters, and put his questions and received his explanations with the result that he expressed himself much relieved and entirely satisfied.

The intelligence from Kidderminster and Mumbles may help some to see the reasons that perpetuate the division that exists on the subject of inspiration. There can be no union without the frank acknowledgment of the completely inspired and unerring character of the Scriptures; for this is the first foundation of faith in a day that is without revelation. The absence of this, combined with the presence of a contrary attitude, caused the division in the first instance, and the continuance of the same state of things continues the division. Nothing would be easier than re-union (as nothing would be more welcome), if those who are in a doubtful attitude would abandon it. It is said we do not believe what they say. This is a mistake. We do believe what they say—only we believe *all* they say, and not a part. When they say they believe in a wholly-inspired Bible, we believe them in the sense necessitated by their other assertions, that it is not inspired "in every jot and tittle": that "they cannot conscientiously say they believe it is all inspired": that there are mistakes in it: that the variations in the reports of the inscriptions on the cross, the voice on the banks of the Jordan, and other matters are proof to them that they are not "verbally" inspired. And so on in an almost endless number of instances. The men who make these reservations to their declaration of belief in a wholly-inspired Bible, do not believe in a wholly-inspired Bible in the same way as those who have separated from them, and there is no reflection on their moral probity in recognizing this. But it may be said, "if they believe it in some other way, is not that enough?" The answer is, no, not if that other way be not a way, but a professed way only, that leaves the door open for the idea that in reading the Scriptures, we are reading what may not be reliable—what may be erroneous. It is not a form of words we are insisting on, but on a fact, a truth, a first principle, which it is not possible for common sense—not to speak of faithfulness—to surrender by a hairs breadth. If it was words we were fighting for, we would be in the wide, popular, easy "church," for the church, in words, believes and preaches "the Gospel," and accepts the Bible wholly. What do we do in regard to such professions of the church? What do our partialist friends do? They "try" the professions by the application of tests. Under the operation of these, they discover that while in words they claim to preach the gospel and believe in the Bible, in fact they do not do so. And so they disregard the general profession without intending to impute falsehood in the moral sense to upholders of the church. So, when men say they believe in a wholly-inspired Bible, but contend for reservations which make it not wholly-inspired, but only partly-inspired, and, therefore, wholly unreliable, we do them no injustice in refusing to admit their claims. So also when they say they would not fellowship those who believe in a partly-inspired Bible, but all the while are in fellowship with



men every where who blaspheme God's word by imputing error to it, their actual attitude erects a barrier that no faithful friend of God can disregard, however naturally inclined he may be to take men at their professions. The cure lies with those from whom, it seems, it cannot come. The only thing to be done, is patiently to accept the disagreeable situation, waiting the Lord's arbitrement, which will be given without respect of person, and with an infallible knowledge of motives on all sides.

*(July 1887)*

A brother laments the frivolity of some conversations he hears at tea-gatherings of brethren and sisters. He would like it altered. He would like every assembly to be pervaded by the spirit of wisdom and sobriety. Every true brother of Christ will sympathise with his wish in the matter. But how is a change to be brought about? It is best not to expect much as regards others, but for every brother and sister who sees the evil and desires what ought to be to determine that, so far as they are concerned, they will contribute none of the nonsense, but will conform always to the apostolic injunction which requires us to let our speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt. It is very certain that none but those who so conform will be found suitable for the Lord's work when he comes, and none but the suitable will be accepted. The root of the matter lies in the mind. What is in will come out. If minds are empty and in sympathy only with the trivialities of life, the open mouth will give accordingly. If the heart is stored with wisdom, there is a chance of the mouth speaking the same. The true cure therefore is to be found in the daily and private cultivation of the heart in the direction of wisdom, and this is best accomplished by continuous reading and prayer.

Some inaccurate ideas appear to be entertained by some on the subject of fellowship. They think they are not in fellowship with a meeting or ecclesia if they do not pay or receive a visit from it, and that they are only in fellowship with those actually in their midst. If this were correct, there would be no fellowship "one with another" in personal absence, whereas John declares this to have been the case with those from whom he was personally absent. Fellowship is that recognised mutual relation of harmony that only waits the opportunity of personal intercourse for its fullest enjoyment. This harmony exists or does not exist quite irrespective of the opportunity of its practical illustration. If, therefore, when an ecclesia is asked, "are you in fellowship with the Mormons?" it answers they cannot settle the question as to the Mormons as a body, but must wait for individual Mormons to apply for each individual case to be decided on its own merits, such an answer is an evasion of the question. What holds true concerning the Mormons, is true of the Church of England or of those who will not avow their faith in the infallibility of the Scriptures. An ecclesia that is not able to say whether they are in fellowship with such, but must wait for individual applications, is evidently in such a doubtful relation to the question as to prevent confidence on the part of men of straight purpose. Men do not require to come within so many yards of each other to know whether they are friends. Friendship of this circumscribed order would be a relapse to barbarism. And so a body of men professing to receive the truth in its uncompromised fulness and integrity, do not require to pay or receive visits from another body or members of it, (who are in a doubtful attitude) to say whether they are or are not in fellowship with it. A little reflection on this ought to clear honest men of all difficulty in defining their position—a process which had become necessary before the apostle John closed his eyes.

*(September 1887)*

It is a thought with some that the present form of things amongst the brethren does not provide for the permanence of the work of the truth: there is no authority for the decision of disputes, and no arrangement for producing qualified advocates or administrators of edification. True, what then? The relief that intelligence will find from this depressing because undoubtedly true thought, is to be found under two heads: 1. All experience shows that a system of paid officialship in divine things tends to

corruption by drawing to it idle minds who lack the purity and benevolent fervour in which all true work at first originates. The increment of mercenary mediocrity soon destroys the vigour and nobility of a genuine work of truth and intellect, by dragging it into the debasing shallows of man-pleasing conventionalism, and lack-lustre denominationalism. What better should we be with the apparatus at the command of the sects? We are badly enough off now; we should be worse then. A rough loyalty to the hope of Israel is better than the abomination of professional piety which puts on tones and sentiments behind the desk, and acts the devil and the buffoon in private. Look at the present state of Christendom; consider the hideous fossilism of the Roman and Anglican communions and the invertebrate flaccidity of Nonconformity. This is what has come with 1,500 years of endowment and organization. We need not long for a cure that brings such a tremendous other disease. But the principal relief (*here most people open their eyes in expectant interest*) lies in the reflection that whatever drawbacks are associated with the work of the truth in our day, are all adaptations in the divine adjustment of things to limit and modify results in accordance with the aims of the divine purpose. (*Here most people drop their eyelids with an expression of intellectual vacuity as if you had spoken about the man in the moon! Alas!*)

The Bible, like nature, is so constructed, that if a man does not use his senses, he may easily break his bones. There are plenty of occasions for stumbling, if a man is not anxious about true and careful walking. "Not of works, lest any man should boast," gives the libertine excuse for any sinful indulgence to which he may be prone. "Not every one that saith, Lord, Lord," gives another occasion to justify his disregard of doctrinal truth. "God, the Saviour of all men," helps a third to believe it is a wide gate that leads to salvation.

And so another class finds in the words, "Not that which goeth into a man defileth a man," a ground for defending habits and practices that stand related to spheres of the lowest defilement, and drown men in perdition. Look at men boozy in liquor, and steeping their senses in tobacco fumes; it is a case of "that which goeth into a man." Therefore say some, it is not a case of defilement, but of excess. Only a defiled person, whose healthy sensibilities have been blunted by the sin they defend, could maintain such a contention against self-evident natural truth. Wherever there is the extremest disregard for holiness and truth, *there* do you find the extremest indulgence in the glass and the pipe. This ought to be enough. If it is any good arguing, we might ask whether smoking and drinking are among things "that are lovely and of good report?" whether they are not darling practices with the vilest of mankind? whether it is not the most characteristic feature of assemblies of sinners the earth over, that they sit in clouds of smoke, and feed the inspiration of their wickedness with the alcoholic stimulus of their steaming glasses?

To make a parallel case against tea or coffee is an affront to reason. The perpetrators of such a shallow *tu quoque* must be aware that the scum of mankind of whom they make themselves the apologists, would rebel against the substitution of these drinks. The best of mankind, when they hear tea or coffee is to be served on an occasion regard the fact as a pledge of decorum. Their favour is propitiated, and fear disarmed by these beverages. The one is a guarantee of decency and righteousness, just as much as the other is a corollary of every evil of thought and action. On the principle of the apologist, drunkenness ought not to be a sin excluding from the kingdom of God. It is a case of something going into the mouth. It is truly a case of something more than a going into the mouth. It is a case of affecting the mind in an evil manner. As soon as this is recognised, the whole contention is surrendered. What God requires is an acceptable frame of mind in a pure body—holiness both in body and in spirit. In this, we have a principle of easy application to the question in hand. Smoking and drinking besides being evil in their associations, are debasing in their effects upon the mind. Smoking may tranquilise the senses, but it sluggifies as well. It is a cowardly relief in this respect. Its specific action cerebrally is to obstruct normal nerve action, and to disincline the mind for those moral conflicts which belong pre-eminently to the truth in which men are called upon to crucify the old man and put on the new man. The smoker becomes insensible to his cleanly

neighbour, to whom his breath is as a deadly emetic. A body exhalant of poison cannot be a body in a state of holiness. The whole morality of Christ's commandments is against it.

It is one of the lamentable features of the schism caused by partial inspiration that whereas many had escaped from the corruption that is in the world through this lust, many may now be found slinking back into their old habits, offending God and man by their unholiness, and aggravating their sin by speaking evil behind the backs of those whose only offence is their insistence on the right ways of God. It is for each man to save himself from a generation that is sunk in the stupefactions of every form of iniquity: and in this effort, we must needs throw off the incubus of professed friends of the truth, who would bring us into bondage again to the world.

(May 1889)

A brother writes:—"I should be so glad if you would, in the next number of the *Christadelphian*, point out the inconsistency of brethren declaring themselves to be at one with us on the inspiration question, and yet fellowshipping those who do not so declare themselves," and who, therefore, in view of the introduction and favourable reception of partial inspiration, leave their position open to a doubtfulness and uncertainty that interfere with that hearty fellowship that is based on identical submission to the ways of God.

We cannot better comply with this request than by reproducing the substance of a letter written a considerable time ago to a sister who was in a hesitating attitude:

You say our basis of fellowship ought to be 'our mutual fellowship with Christ and acceptance with him.' If we could be sure of such a basis, there would certainly be no cause for dispute, but how can this be? Who knows whom Christ regards as acceptable? Who can tell whom he accepts as in fellowship with him? He has not yet spoken on these questions, which he expressly reserves till our meeting in judgment. It would be a delightful rule of fellowship; but it does not exist, in the absence of a knowledge that Christ only possesses. The only practicable rule of fellowship is a common attitude of fealty to the truth as based upon, and including the fact, that the Bible is in our age the only source of knowledge as to what that truth is; and that it constitutes this source through being a writing wholly given by inspiration of God, and that such inspiration cannot err. If the friends you refer to will declare their faith in this, and their readiness to require its acceptance in their basis of fellowship, they will remove the obstacle that is in the way. If they will not, the responsibility of the breach rests with them. If they cannot, the fault is not with those who are unable to compromise the one truth which is the foundation of all other divine truth in our age. When, instead of gladly saying they believe the Bible to be wholly and unerringly divine, and that they will not receive in fellowship those who doubt it, they act the part of apologists and defenders of those who have sought to undermine its authority by teaching it is only partly inspired and characterised in many parts by error, what alternative have we but to stand aside? Actions are louder than words. Instead of uniting with the friends of the Bible, who contend for its truth against the whole Laodicean community from John O' Groats to Land's End, [Compiler's Note: the traversal of the whole length of the island of Great Britain between two extremities; in the southwest and northeast] they try to thwart the efforts they have made to extract the leaven that has been placed in our midst, and employ every artifice and every opportunity of damaging their influence. It is for every man and woman to read the situation for themselves. It is a question on which there can be no compromise. If your friends hold the truth on this most vital matter, and are prepared to be faithful to it in fellowship, let them restore union by allowing the fact to be known. The remedy lies with them. If you identify yourself with them under present circumstances, you identify yourself with spiritual ambiguities that strike at the root of all spiritual health. You will not take us with you, but will leave us behind. Two cannot walk together, except they be agreed on fundamental principles. Those who occupy our position cannot be satisfied with anything short of divine certainties

heartily endorsed. It is an evil thing to lessen the divinity of the Bible in any degree. If we say “Godspeed” to such a work, you know John’s declaration that we are partakers of the evil. It is not pleasant to be thus particular; but we have no choice. Paul commands us to hold fast what he taught, whether by word or epistle (2 Thess. 2:15). The complete inspiration of the scriptures is one of the things he taught (2 Tim. 3:15). He commands withdrawal from those who do not submit (2 Thess. 3:14). We must, therefore, act the disagreeable obligation of the present hour, or act in opposition to apostolic rule to which we profess to be subject.

You can easily settle the question of duty by proposing these interrogatories to your friends:—1. Do you believe the Bible to be wholly inspired of God? 2. Do you believe the Bible so inspired of God to be infallible? 3. Are you prepared to renounce the fellowship of all who teach or believe, or fellowship the doctrine, that it is only partly the work of inspiration; or who, believing it to be wholly the work of inspiration, believe that it is characterised by error? Right answers to these questions would remove not only your difficulty, but that of thousands of others.

*(The Christadelphian April, 1891 pg 149)*

God has been pleased to subject those who desire to conform to His word to what sometimes amounts to painful embarrassment, by having required of them things that at first sight are incompatible with one another. They are to do good to all men, and yet to be not unequally yoked with unbelievers. They are to be “in the world” and yet to “come out from among them and be separate.” They are to love their enemies and yet to love not the world. They are to be **patient** with the **erring** and yet to abhor **[loathe]** that which is evil, and not to bear with men that are evil. They are to think no evil and yet to try professors. They are to submit to wrong and yet to refuse even to eat with men called brethren who espouse wrong doing, or error. They are to show hospitality and yet to receive not into their houses those who bring not the doctrine of Christ.

There is, doubtless, an object in prescribing these apparently conflicting duties. It sets up contrary mental currents that at last bring about a fine equilibrium of character which would not be attainable if duty lay all in one direction. But often the effort to conform brings distress, and it is impossible not to feel pity for men sacrificing one duty in their endeavour to conform to another.

These thoughts are suggested by an effort in Lincoln, which may be well meant enough in some directions, but which cannot receive favour from a complete enlightenment. It is an effort that tacitly invites us to repudiate the policy of insisting upon a wholly-inspired and infallible Bible as the basis of fellowship, by adopting a “basis of fellowship” that omits it. This document is most plausible in its wording, as all efforts in a wrong direction are; but in its meanings and implications, it is far worse than its promulgators probably intend or have any idea of.

It formulates an impossible rule of withdrawal, which turns the ecclesia into a judgment seat of the Papistical order. The apostolic rule is to “withdraw from every brother who walks disorderly,” and from those who teach heresy, without reference to the question of what the Lord may finally think of them. And this rule is defensive in its bearing, not offensive. It means that we are not to be partakers of other men’s sins. John lays down the axiom that He that receives the holder of wrong doctrine or practices partakes of their evil deeds.

In withdrawing, we wash our own hands. We leave to God those whom we withdraw from. We are **not authorised to judge or condemn them.** But this document lays it down that we must not withdraw, unless we are prepared to maintain that the cause of withdrawal will make salvation impossible. This

would erect an ecclesia into a spiritual judicature [body of judges], deciding questions which the Lord has reserved for himself.

The document proposes “union” with all who have not forfeited their right to the fully assured salvation.” How can such rule be carried out? How can we know who have and who have not forfeited the said right? It is calling upon us to pronounce on a matter beyond our jurisdiction, and that has been placed beyond it by the express command to “judge not,” “condemn not.”

The time for withdrawal is when men drift into unscriptural attitudes of faith or practice. These we note and separate ourselves from, without reference to the question of whether the offenders can be saved, which we cannot decide. And the withdrawal is not putting them out but going out ourselves, as the term implies. We simply go away, saying we cannot be responsible. The attitude prescribed by this “basis” would place the ecclesia in a chair of authority, with power of excommunication, arrogating the right to “cut off” or say the excommunicated cannot be saved.

Faithful men are more truly modest, while more uncompromising towards departure from the faith than the sentiments that inspire this basis. Faithful men say, “we have no power to cut off: Christ will do that. But we have power to withdraw; and this we will do with however much reluctance and pain, when the Word of God and its obligations are tampered with by whomsoever.” We will exercise this liberty unhampered by any assumptions as to the position of those who have technically “responded to the Gospel call.” The basis declares that all such are “in union and fellowship with the Father.” This is not true. There were many in the apostolic age who had “obeyed the Gospel call,” whom the Apostles repudiated as “enemies of the cross of Christ” (Phil. 3:18)—spots in their feasts of charity (Jude 12); who claimed to be Jews but were not, but lied (Rev. 3:9).

It is a fundamental principle as to the operations of the gospel, that “many are called but few are chosen,” and that “all are not Israel that are of Israel.” This is a principle which we cannot apply, and which we are not called upon to apply. We do not know who will be chosen of those who have been called. We have nothing to do with saying who will and who will not be saved, as regards profession of the truth. The thing we have to do is to take care of our own standing in relation to the prevailing corruptions. We refuse to be implicated in these, while entertaining the very best wishes concerning all men. We mingle with Bible charity the most decisive resolution not to be compromised by any class of men, whether they have gone through “the waters of baptism” or no.

Unless we observed this apostolically prescribed scrupulosity, the truth would soon be suffocated and disappear. Men who decline it are the enemies of the truth without intending it perhaps—all which will appear in a very plain light when the expedencies of the passing mortal hour are at an end in the manifested presence of the author of the seven messages to the ecclesias.

## COMPILER’S NOTE

Compiler’s Note: I am sure that there are some Intelligence reports that either got overlooked or didn’t get addressed but this is reasonably complete and demonstrative of Christadelphian practices prior to the formation of unions, confederations, or societies of ecclesias a.k.a. Fellowships. I invite you check on your own; and if you see any you think apply or were missed please email it to Bro. Dennis at [denddavis@roadrunner.com](mailto:denddavis@roadrunner.com); or me directly at [jdgenger@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jdgenger@sbcglobal.net).