

## The Testing Fire.

(1 Corinthians iii).

THE Church at Corinth had gifted teachers, was richly endowed with supernatural gifts, but was at a low spiritual level. Existing in a city famed for its wealth, learning, and licentiousness, many had been beguiled from the simplicity and purity which are in Christ. The wisdom of this world had taken the place of the wisdom of Christ: 'in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge'

When will we learn that, 'the wisdom of this world [its scholarship so-called] is foolishness with God,' and does not deepen spiritual life, but panders to the carnal? Paul's warning to the Colossians is much needed to-day: 'Beware any man spoil you [make spoil of you] through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.'

So Paul tells these Corinthians that with all their so-called wisdom they were carnal, not spiritual, and mere 'babes in Christ.' They were following and glorying in men rather than the Lord Christ.

In this third chapter of his first epistle to them, he insists that the work is God's not man's: 'We are God's fellow-workers . . . God's building.' The work is more important than the workers, though they be Paul or Apollos. 'God buries His workmen, but carries on His work,'

The quality of the work is more important than the quantity. This he illustrates by a building and a testing fire. Paul had well and truly laid the foundation at Corinth. His preaching there is summed up in the phrase: 'Jesus Christ, and him crucified.' This is the foundation truth, and, rightly understood, includes all that is essential. 'Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.' The Christ—Messiah—The Anointed (John i. 41 and margin). The Anointed Prophet, 'Hear ye him.' The Anointed Priest, who by the grace of God 'offered one sacrifice for sins forever,' and now appears before the face of God for His own. The Anointed King, obey Him in all things He has commanded.

. 'Other foundation can no man lay, than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'

'All other ground is sinking sand.'

. But it is possible to put a poor building upon a good foundation. So Paul warns us: 'Let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon'; and he speaks of building with 'gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble.'

Some years before Paul wrote his epistle, fire had swept through the city of Corinth. The substantially built houses of the rich survived the ordeal, the wooden huts of the poor were wiped out. So in the spiritual realm; 'The day shall declare it, be-

cause it shall be revealed by fire ; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.' Will our work stand the testing-fire? Are we building for time or eternity? Are we more concerned about quantity than quality?

It is quite easy, if you come down to a certain level, to work people up into a state of excitement, rush them through the baptismal water, and add their names to the Church roll. But that kind of work is soon found wanting; the supposed converts go out more quickly than they came in, leaving the Churches weaker than before. It is easy by working on the social side, running social clubs, and providing empty entertainment, to hold the attention of a number for a time; but where most of that kind of work has been done the hold of the Church on young people is the weakest. So the experts tell us.

It is quite another matter to win living stones, regenerated souls, for the Lord's living temple; to win those whose hearts are gripped by the foundation fact that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and who act in harmony with all that that implies.

The work is being tested now. How soon many of the plans and schemes of men, laid with best intentions, to speed the work, to produce more highly-trained preachers, come to nought. Time has demonstrated their futility. Since these schemes were put into operation, there has been a continual decline in membership of the Churches, and what is more important, the spiritual life of the Churches was never lower than now

'Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it' 'Every plant,' said Jesus, 'which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up.' From every standpoint it pays to be loyal to the Lord and His Word.

But the real testing time is when Jesus comes. 'The day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire.' 'When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven—in flaming

fire—'—all will be brought to light then, the true character and motive of our work will be manifested. If we have built according to the plan and specifications of the Divine Architect, as found in the New Testament Scriptures, our work will 'be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ.'

But if we have built with the wood, hay and stubble, of human wisdom, doctrines, traditions of men, and science falsely so-called, our work will go up in a blaze and only dust and ashes will remain, all our labour lost. 'Every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour.' Personal rewards for personal service.

'O when the Saviour shall make up His jewels,  
When the bright crowns of rejoicing are won,  
Then shall His weary and faithful, disciples  
All be remembered by what they have done.'

EDITOR.

#### PROPOSED FOOD GIFTS FROM U.S.A. AN EXPLANATION

Dear Editor,

Nearly Six months ago, the Church in St. Louis, Missouri, desired to send bulk food to the brethren in this country, and asked if you would receive the same. Feeling unable to do this, you asked me to deal with the matter. I took up the matter with the Board of Trade, stating that I was prepared to receive bulk food-stuffs and distribute in consultation with other churches. After five months the Board of Trade refused an Import Licence.

The Churches in St. Louis and Mexico had purchased a considerable quantity of food stuffs which they were unable to send. That they and others in U.S.A. may understand the position here in this matter, the following is quoted from the 'Manchester Guardian':

'The limitations which still exist on the import of food parcels into this country are based on the Government's wish to avoid anything which looks like favouritism. As its most grandiose, the argument is that any food which enters the country in private parcels diminishes the total amount of food which could be imported for general distribution as rations. Officials agree that this kind of traffic on a small scale would make no appreciable difference, but suggest that

elaborate organisations might be set up, which in the guise of private transaction, could carry on a large volume of traffic."

In any case, the authorities do not like the idea that individuals who happen to have friends in the United States should be seen to be eating 'lavishly,' when others must content themselves with their normal rations.

This being the background, the following arrangements exist for the importation of food parcels:

Food parcels may be received by private individuals if the parcels do not ex-

ceed 22 lb. in weight. Up to October 14th, the maximum permitted weight 11lb. and the maximum frequency one parcel per month. Within the new weight limit, there is now no bar on frequency. In general, every item imported into this country must be covered by a licence from the Board of Trade, but an exception is made in the case of these parcels. Duty, however, has to be paid, which may be ad valorem or on quantity. The ad valorem duty works out at between 10 per cent, and 15 per cent. A. Jj. FRITH.

## Walter Scott: Eloquent Pioneer.

( *Concluded.* )

**WHEN** in health and vigour, Scott was unremitting and ardent in his labours for the Master. As expressed of another devoted servant of God, he was 'often tired in the work but never tired of the work.' It was not unusual for him, at one period, to speak in the school-house or court room in the morning, address a large assembly in grove or woodland clearing in the afternoon, and explain -Gospel truths to crowded gatherings at night in the home where he was entertained, sometimes continuing until midnight. His efforts were usually climaxed with the baptism of hearers converted by the New Testament teachings he had faithfully presented.

Though subject to fluctuations, influenced by bodily conditions and like circumstances, and occasionally far below his best, Scott's eloquence, in his great moments, was sublime. At such times he rose to superb heights of glowing description and winning appeal. Record says that Alexander Campbell, generally calm and self-possessed, on one occasion was quite lifted beyond himself by Scott's transcendent powers when portraying the glories of the Kingdom still to come, and he cried out" in raptures of heavenly ecstasy, 'Glory to God in the highest' Scott was the Gospel orator of the Restoration Movement's pioneer days.

Among America's early exponents of New Testament principles, Walter Scott was the first to emphasise pub-

licly and practically the Pentecostal conditions of salvation : repentance and baptism for remission of sins. The applicability to-day of Peter's reply (Acts ii. 38), had been previously recognised theoretically by the Campbells and other leaders, but probably through fear of over-stressing baptism and being charged with teaching water salvation, they had not urged it upon their congregations. Scott saw plainly the three-fold requirements for remission of sins, and, putting theory into practice, commenced both their enunciation and their enforcement. Replying as Peter did at Pentecost, he besought his hearers, if truly believing and repenting, not to hesitate, but to 'arise and be baptized.' As narrated above a wave of revival ensued, and, as years passed, multitudes thanked God for the simplicity of acceptance of salvation as explained and urged by Scott in unison with the inspired record.

Two of the remarkable decisions for New Testament Christianity in Scott's earliest period as evangelist were particularly striking. On the first occasion, Scott gave the Gospel conditions just as in Acts ii. and in response to his invitations a well-known citizen pressed forward to confess and obey. To William Amend, a pious Presbyterian, an Israelite without guile, the Scriptures were the one, sole guide. Plainly, he, now saw what the New Testament taught, equally plainly

his duty and privilege. Deferring to no human authority, he confessed his faith, stated his repentance, and was baptized the same day in the pellucid waters of an adjacent stream. The next Sunday, fifteen others did likewise. Very similar was the decision of John Tait, another exemplary but insufficiently informed servant of God. Misled by opponents of Scott, he was incensed when his wife attended the former's services, but was nevertheless induced to hear for himself. Tait listened intently. Scott preached powerfully, and Tait could not possibly gainsay the New Testament teaching so impressingly presented. His heart, however, was hard as stone. 'We walk by faith,' urged Scott. Tait thereupon confessed his faith and was baptized the same, almost midnight, hour. Meeting his former pastor a little later, Tait pressed him to be baptized for remission of sins. 'What!' exclaimed the pastor, 'would you have me baptized, contrary to my conscience?' 'Yes,' replied Tait, 'I was. My conscience told me sprinkling in infancy would do, but the Word of God said: "Be baptized for remission of sins," and I thought it better to tear my conscience than to tear a leaf out of my Bible.'

Ever supremely loyal to the Saviour, Scott was willing, Paul-like, to use all means consistent with New Testament practice to win souls, his methods sometimes eccentric. Once meeting children returning from school, he marked off on their fingers the Gospel terms—faith, repentance, baptism, remission of sins, and gift of the Holy Spirit. Asking them to repeat these again and again, he sent them to tell their parents a preacher would that night preach just as on their fingers. Hours later, the meeting place was filled to hear the strange preacher, not a few receiving a spiritual vision never forgotten. Another time, the audience, small and apparently stolidly indifferent, he requested those on the Lord's side to stand. No response. Then all on the Devil's side to rise. No response. He told them that if they had been definitely either for God or for the

Devil he would have understood what to do, but their extraordinary condition would need hours of thought to fathom, but next evening he would reveal his conclusions. The following night, a big crowd assembled, and the Cross gained a notable victory. During his latter years, Scott delighted in house-to-house effort, selling or giving the sacred volume, and 'button-holing' the people individually with the 'old, old story.'

Under the signature of 'Philip,' Scott contributed many well-appreciated articles to Alexander Campbell's master periodical, 'The Christian Baptist.' It was he who suggested this title for the magazine. In 1936, he wrote 'The Gospel Restored,' a systematic view of the Christian religion which helped greatly to explode popular errors regarding the terms of salvation. 'It was you, Bro. Scott,' said Moses Lard, the distinguished Restoration expositor of subsequent decades, affectionately embracing him, 'who first taught me the Gospel by your "Gospel Restored"'. Of a tract by Scott on 'The Union of Christians on Christian principles,' Alexander Campbell, saying he had known the author through all the intimacies of over a quarter century's co-operation in forest, in pulpit, and by fireside, declared it 'one of the best tracts of the age, and the best on the Divinity of Christ in forty years' reading, he had seen.' A British writer, commending its contents, classed it amongst the best specimens of English of the time, 'occasionally rising into eloquence of the most polished and delicate type.' A year before his death, Scott published his invaluable comprehensive work, 'The Messiahship or the Great Demonstration,' which wrought most effectively then and after towards acceptance of New Testament doctrine. It was the theme throughout all Scott's consecrated career. 'The Messiahship is the summit of revealed knowledge—the key that unlocks all Scripture. It is the true exegesis. Over the door of his academy, soon after his conversion, indelibly to impress his'

pupils, he. had written: 'Jesus is the Christ

A true man, like the other reformer leaders of his association, Walter Scott stood almost without peer as Gospel proclaimer and fisher for souls in the American Republic's pioneer days. Gifted with a voice of marvellous, sweet persuasiveness, his cultured mind filled with Bible lore and truth, and his will bound by the intensity of his sacred purpose, his appeals oftentimes proved resistless. Emphatically, Scott was a man of the Word. 'Making the apostles his model, he went before the world with the same message, in the same order, with the same conditions and inviting instant compliance with its claims.' To study and

picture, the Saviour was his delight, and for twenty-two months consecutively, twice a week, it is said he discoursed on Matthew's Gospel record alone. Richly did God bestow favour and blessing, honouring him with a truly great part in the New Testament Restoration crusade. The secret of his spiritual strength and success was unreserved consecration. In his own words, in early manhood, 'he solemnly promised God that, if He would, for Christ's sake, grant him just and comprehensive views of His religion, he would subordinate all his present and future attainments to the glory of His Son and His religion.'

May the same apostolic spirit animate us!

CHARLES BAILEY.

## What kind of Bread.

THE article in last issue, by Bro. A. E. Winstanley, under the above heading, calls for a reply. He writes: 'Some maintain . . . that, in our observance of the Lord's Supper, we may justifiably use whatever is commonly called bread. But . . . that contention cannot be sustained.' I, 'for one, believe that it can.

There were some things at the institution of the Feast that were peculiar to that one occasion. That it was instituted in 'the days of unleavened bread' is one of those things. When first partaken of, the Lord's Supper was not Christian at all. It was an anticipation of a Feast which was to be, but the 'time for which was not yet. It was held within the Jewish economy, and was conditioned by Jewish custom and law. Those who partook of it were of the Jewish faith, and they remained within that faith when the Feast was over.

The Passover, with its days of unleavened bread, was fulfilled soon afterwards, and made obsolete. Unleavened bread, in its religious use, was abolished at the same time. As I see it, this insistence on the use of unleavened bread is an attempt to fasten on a Christian ordinance, one

of those Jewish customs from which, in the early days, it was freed only with the greatest difficulty. What was it that Paul meant in 1 Cor. v. 6-8? Is not the following a fair interpretation? Our Passover is not that of the Jews, but Christ, and our unleavened bread is not theirs, material, but 'sincerity and truth.' The Passover and its bread have gone, but Christ and truth remain.

It can properly be said, I believe, that, at a later date, the Feast was instituted for a second time. Writing to Corinthians, Paul stated: 'I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord . . . took bread.' No mention is made there of unleavened bread, and unless it can be shown that unleavened is implicit in the term Paul uses, then Bro. Winstanley's contention would seem to avail nothing. As he writes: 'In whatsoever He has ordained in worship, God has been consistently careful of details.' Paul was writing to a Gentile community, and if it was the Divine intention that unleavened bread should be used, that was the time and place for it to be plainly stated. As far as I can discover, there is not a single line of testimony in the N.T. suggesting that

unleavened bread was ever used at any celebration of the Lord's Supper after the Lord's body had been broken on the Cross. And His body was broken. It was pierced at hands and feet, and side, and 'his face was marred more than the face of any man.' To say that His body was not broken because no bone of Him was broken is an abuse of language, and goes to show how far an idea will lead one to see what one looks for and be blind to the obvious. The Lord's body was so broken as to become lifeless— 'This is my body, which is for you.'

Bro. Winstanley lays stress on the symbolism of leaven as 'sin,' but one word of the Lord nullifies that contention. He said: 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven.' I remember reading a statement somewhere that if the word leaven there is used in a good sense, it was the only Biblical occasion. Be that as it may, that one use of it is enough to destroy its supposed mystical meaning of 'sin.' It is properly understood as a gradual transforming power. When the Lord used it, saying: 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal,' it is figurative of good. When He speaks of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees, it is of evil. But note: the 'leaven' is only a figure. The Lord was not warning His disciples to beware of leaven, but of the self-righteousness and worldly wisdom which characterised the people to whom he refers.

That symbolism has its place in religion it would be foolish to deny. I see it in the unleavened bread used on that first occasion of the Supper, but not that insisted on by Bro. Winstanley. The bread the Lord and His disciples partook of was of the same kind as that every Jew would be eating. At that time and under those circumstances, unleavened would be the only bread readily available; that is, it would be 'common' bread. The Lord took that which lay ready to hand, was common, and devoted it to a sacred purpose. It represented that body which

linked Him, not only with those who were at the table with Him and the Jews as a nation, but with all humanity. And common bread, of any sort, of any time and place, better represents His flesh which He shared with all men and was given for all, 'than does the unleavened bread of a small nation; or so I think.

To sum up. The Editor, in last issue of the 'S.S.' condemned—rightly so, I believe—those who would speak where the Scriptures are silent; and the Scriptures are silent—completely silent—about the use of unleavened bread at the Lord's Table. An inference—even a fair one—and a questionable symbolism are not sufficient grounds upon which to establish any principle whatsoever, 'If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.'

W. BARKER.

## Correspondence.

Dear Bro. Crosthwaite,—I would like to offer one or two criticisms of certain items in the January issue of the 'Standard.'

First of all, our new title: 'Independent Churches of Christ.' I have always been given to understand that we abhorred anything in the nature of additions to Bible names for the Christian Church, and as such think our new name is a distinct departure from 'things most surely believed amongst us.'

I well remember, in 1930, at a conference, held in Leeds, raising the question of a name for us who were differing from the official Co-operation, and actually mentioned the very title you have adopted, viz., 'Independent' Churches of Christ, and was promptly informed—brethren went to great lengths to explain—that such a procedure was creating a sect, was un-Scriptural, and totally unworthy of those who were contending earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. You will understand my surprise, therefore, at seeing our new name in print. I appreciate the need for some form of differentiation between us and Co-operation Churches, but I think the following would have sufficed: Churches of Christ not in the Co-operation.

My second criticism is of Bro. A. E. Winstanley's article on "'Vyhat Kind of Bread.'" I make this criticism very kindly, for I hold him in very great respect, but I do think that our young brother, in common with other young

brethren of my acquaintance, is allowing his zeal for Scriptural exactitude to run away with his *sense* of proportion.

In my young days, we were taught emphatically that the bread was a symbol of the Bread of Life which came down from heaven, and as bread was food for the body, so this was food for the soul, and furthermore, that such things as unleavened bread, in common with other Jewish practices, belonged to the Old Testament and not to the New.

Granted our Lord used unleavened bread at the Table, He could not do any other. He was living under the Law, and as such had to obey the Law. We live under grace, and I cannot find a single instance in the New Testament where we are instructed to use unleavened bread. It is always bread. Furthermore, it is rather surprising that many of our pioneers failed to notice this question, seeing it is apparently so important; such men as Alexander Campbell, David King, Bartley Ellis, and T. E. Entwistle, to name but a few. Possibly, they were more concerned with the spiritual leaven in the Church than to bother about the physical leaven in the bread.

One further point. Has our good brother noticed our Lord did not have a collection box at the institution of the feast? Nor are we informed that he used silver cups and white table covers. Are we to classify these as 'un-Scriptural' because they are not in the New Testament?

I regret to have to differ with our brother, but, knowing Albert, I feel he will take this in the kindest spirit, appreciating that we all are desirous of offering to the Lord only that which is acceptable in His sight.

HAROLD BAINES.

[REPLY].

Surely the words, 'not in the Co-operation,' are as much, nay more, an addition than the word 'Independent.' This latter word was not of our choosing. We think it was first used by Bro. R. Hill in his 'Christian News.' It was adopted by the compiler of the list. Bro. B. says there is 'need for some form of differentiation.' Can he suggest any form that will not be an addition?

Re 'Kind of Bread,' we have read most of what our pioneers have written, some of them we knew personally, and we do not think Bro. B. can produce a statement from any of them favouring the use of leavened bread at the Lord's Supper. The Churches in the district where we are now located, some of them started by the pioneers, one of them over a century ago, have from their earliest days used unleavened bread. When we went into Yorkshire, forty-six years ago, it was a shock to us to find Churches using leavened bread.

In a paper on the Lord's Supper, read at annual conference in the Lord 1900, Bro. John

McCartney, after showing that the Lord used unleavened bread, and that 'leaven and ferment are identical,' said: "Then as leaven was generally regarded by Jew and heathen alike as the symbol of corruption, and Jesus Himself had employed it to represent the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees, the fitness of things seems to require that the selected symbol of Christ's precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, should be free from fermentation." (Year Book, 1900, p. 25.)

It seems fitting, too, that the selected symbol of Christ's sinless body should be free from *it*. Answering a question concerning a brother who conscientiously refused to partake of leavened bread at the Lord's Table, Bro. L. Oliver said: 'In such matters as these, the convictions of brethren should be carefully regarded. We take it that the Church in this case does not conscientiously hold that the bread should be leavened; and if that is the case, it would be a matter of a little trouble in getting unleavened bread, and, in our opinion it would be gracious to use the unleavened bread. Then, in this case, we can understand the brother to have some strength of conviction, for there can be no doubt the bread used at the Passover, when Jesus "took bread," was unleavened-bread.' ('Bible Advocate,' September 15th, 1905, p. 604.)

The use of unleavened bread can surely give offence to none; the use of leavened bread is an offence to many. Please read Romans xiv. and 1 Corinthians viii.

EDITOR.

Dear Editor,—I like this subject that Bro. Winstanley has brought to our notice: 'What Kind of Bread,' because there is something for us all to think about here. But\* the latter part of his article I cannot agree with: 'The broken body.'

o He admits that Jesus said: 'This is my body which is broken for you.' but refers us to the Revised Version, where the word 'broken' is omitted, and thus reads: 'This is my body, which is for you.' He says this harmonises with Matt. xxvi. 26, Mark xiv. 22, and Luke xxii. 19, while Matt. xxvi. 26, Mark xiv. 22, reads: 'Take, eat; this is my body.' Both authorised and revised are the same, so it is only Luke, that justifies his statement.

We are told by Bro. W. that the actual breaking of the bread cannot be meant to indicate what happened to the physical body of Jesus, for 'that body was not so broken. It was bruised and wounded, but not broken in any sense comparable with the breaking of the Passover biscuit. The Passover biscuit was broken in pieces, the body of Jesus was not.' Can it be proved from Scripture that the Passover bread (biscuit) was broken in pieces? We read in these Scriptures which have been quoted, that Jesus took

bread, and blessed it, and brake it and gave it to them, and said: 'Take, eat; this is my body.' If Jesus took bread and said: 'This is my body' (the emblem of His body), why did He break it before giving it to His disciples, if it did not signify something?

The Scriptures do not say that His body shall not be broken, but 'a bone of him shall not be broken'; therefore I would say His body was broken when it was pierced. (John xix. 36, 1 Corinthians x. 16, 17.)

In 1 Cor xl. 23, 24, Paul says: 'For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread. And when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, Take, eat: this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.'

When we look back to the time of the Passover under the law, there were animal sacrifices made which could not give remission of sins, but only reminded them of their sins. Some of the sacrifices had to be eaten and there had to be none left over to the next day, nor had they to break a bone of it: according to all the ordinances of the Passover they shall keep it. (Numbers ix. 12.)

A type of the anti-type—Christ Jesus.

DAVID CHALMERS.

Dear Brother,—What was written in Bro. Winstanley's article, and what I shall write is inference and not commandment. We should be careful not to teach Inference as commandment in the Churches. With point (a) we are in agreement, and I trust that I shall attach no un-Scriptural ideas to words used in the Bible.

Regarding point (b), the punishment of Nadab, Abihu and Uzzah was because a definite commandment in each case had been broken, and the Scriptures referred to (Levit. x. 1, 2; 2 Sam. vi. 6, 7) together with Numbers iv. and xv. plainly tell us so. The way God cares about His worship is to give definite command for the details He desires us, to take note of.

In 1 Cor. v., the Apostle speaks of leaven and unleavened in relation to the Church; leaven referring to sin in the Church (verse 1), unleavened to the Church having purged itself of the sin. Let us consider the glorious truth stated in verse 7 of this chapter: 'Ye are unleavened.' This is how how God sees those whose hearts were deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked. How did God see Christ in this matter? Verse 7: 'Even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.' John pointed to this, saying: 'Behold, the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.'

I suggest that as we become the unleavened then Christ became the leaven

for us. He came only in the likeness of sinful flesh, but being who He was, though tempted in all points like as we are knew no sin. Yet He not only died 'for sin according to the scriptures'; but an additional truth is, 'He [God] hath made him [Jesus] to be sin for us.' He died then for sin, and He died as sin, to the end that 'we might be made the righteousness of God in him.'

There was a moment on Calvary when the Saviour became sin—or more accurately was made, to be sin. (1 Peter ii. 22, 24.) 'Who knew no sin, who his own self bare our sins in his own body.' Truly, it was His own self, for the cry was: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' None were to see this enacted, for 'there was darkness over all the land,' and God Himself had turned from the scene where the 'princes of this world' were slaying the Lord of Glory.

Paul tells us not to remember any particular incident in the life of Christ that we might apply its truth to ourselves, but 'as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death—until he come.' If we wish to concern ourselves as to the right kind of bread, would we really say then that unleavened represented the Lord Jesus In His death? In His death He was made to be sin.

'With desire,' said Jesus, 'I have desired to eat this passover with you.' Which, passover? The very last one. In the upper room was the One 'greater than the temple.' (See Matt. xii. 6 and context.) The law came by Moses, grace and truth by Jesus Christ. He was not perpetuating an old feast, but Initiating a new one. His was the Divine right to do so. He was with God when the law was given. He completely met the demands of the law and then on Calvary 'gave his flesh' for the life of the world.'

If we would be certain about pattern, shall we gather around the Table in the same manner as those in the upper room, or shall we persist in the practice of 'president and helps' facing a row of forms? There are other doubtful procedures that we might examine.

The Apostle says, however: 'Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.' The thing that can hinder remembrance first of all is ourselves. Let us so eat that we discern the Lord's body; living in constant endeavour to look unto Jesus the 'author and finisher' of our faith.

FRANK MURPHY.

#### QUERY

WOULD some brother answer the following passage of Scripture in the 'S.S.', 1 Tim. v. 1: 'Rebuke not an elder, but exhort him as a father.' Does 'elder in the above-mentioned passage mean that he was an overseer in the Church, or is it a contrast between the elder brother and the younger men. PERPLEXED. -



## MODERNISM IN 'S.S.'

Dear Sir,

Just a note to say that I am extremely grateful to R.B.S. for his very adequate answers to the queries I raised in the December issue of the 'S.S.' I want to say, further, that his answers more than satisfy me; but I feel just a little anxious as to whether they will satisfy you or the majority of your readers. R.B.S. is certainly not a fundamentalist, nor a verbal inspirationist, nor yet a believer in the infallibility of the Bible (that is to say if I understand these terms aright?) and I would suggest, Mr. Editor, that he is more worthy of your commendations than I am for the way he dealt with the questions I raised. Again, I should just like to underline the suggestion that R.B.S. makes at the end of his letter: 'For any interested in the question of translating,' etc., 'How we got our Bible,' by J. Paterson Smith, would be a useful book, as it does seem to me a pity that it is not one of the text books (or it wasn't until recently) used by the Old Paths group in training students of the Bible. Some of us used it over twenty-five years ago, under John McCartney.

Seeing you mentioned in your note, Mr. Editor, that you had written to me, and so far had not heard anything from me, I shall deal with that point first. You seem to have been long enough in Scotland to have learned the Scotsman's trick of answering a question by asking another one.

I challenged you to do something and you refuse to do it, but challenge me to do something else, and feel a little self-righteous because I will not do it. I am still waiting to know why you will not publish Campbell's section on the Bible, 'After You,' Mr. Editor.

Another quotation from your letter to me, and a few comments. You say, 'You use the term "Modernism,"' but your letter fully demonstrates that you do not know the meaning of that term, and what is covered by it. Your criticism is about something which is no part of the inspired word, and is really 'much ado about nothing.' Certainly there is no man who should be able to 'define Modernism any better than you; no one has used it more than you have done in the last twenty years or so; but it would have been generous of you to have allowed your readers to judge whether the term was used right or not. The only way out that I can see is this: I know what I mean by Modernism, but I don't know -what you mean by Modernism, and I must confess that your acceptance (or seeming acceptance) of R.B.S.'s statements, leaves me in a bigger quandary than ever. On the face of it, then, those words of yours, 'Much ado about nothing,' seem to sum up the sham fight that you have been waging for over twenty years in the Churches, a fight which has

Issued in the breaking up of many Churches, and the severing of many friendships. It only remains now to sign the peace treaty, but perhaps the making of the peace will be more difficult than we imagine. J. R. JENKINS.

## [REPLY.]

J.R.J. is much concerned about our readers, but we can assure him that they are not so dense as he imagines, and judging by the many letters we have received they can see through his criticism of us.

J.R.J. says the replies of R.B.S. 'more than satisfy' him. If he really means it, he should be pleased that we are publishing these views. In his letter in December 'S.S.', he said he 'whole-heartedly' agreed with our quotation from Campbell's 'Christian System': 'The Bible alone is the Bible only, in word and deed, in profession and practice, and this alone can reform the world and save the Church.' (Preface p. 8.) Yet J.R.J. insinuates that we have misrepresented Campbell. We challenge him to make good his assertions by quoting anything from the 'Christian System' which is out of harmony with that. His reference to a 'Scotch trick'—of which we never heard until we read his letters is no answer to our challenge. If he 'whole-heartedly' agrees with what we did quote, why does he want us to quote more?

'He regrets that 'How we got our Bible,' by J. P. Smyth, has not been used by us. Some of us used that book before J.R.J. was born; and it has always been recommended by us.

He says no one has used the term 'Modernism' more than we have. He must be judging by our writings, for he has not heard us speak during the period he names. Looking over five years' issues of the 'S.S.', we find we have used the term 'Modernism' once, and 'Modernist' twice. He reminds us of one who at the close of a meeting said: 'I have sat on pins all through this meeting; not because of what you said, but what I thought you might say.'

If J.R.J., and others, would keep to what we have said, and try to answer that, they will have quite plenty on without putting words into our mouth. His reference to the use of 'modernism' is an indication of the reliability of his statements. He was the first to use 'modernism' in this correspondence. J.R.J. speaks of the 'sham fight' we have 'been waging for over twenty years in the Churches; a fight which has issued in the breaking up of many Churches,' etc. If such great results follow 'a sham fight,' what is going to happen when we start real fighting?

As to breaking up Churches, some, but not all, are too blind to see that it is those who drive in the wedges who do the splitting, not those who try to prevent them. Leaders in the Co-operation shield

and shelter those who drive in the foreign wedges and malign and misrepresent us; but not one of them dare come out into the open and meet us in a fair fight.

We are quite content to leave the part we have taken in 'the good fight of the faith' to the verdict of history, and of the Righteous Judge of us all.

EDITOR.

Dear Bro editor,

I have read in preparation for printing the letter, from J. R. Jenkins **printed** above, as also its **predecessor**, and, I believe, never have I read two letters so lacking in elementary knowledge and elementary courtesy in all the years I have been **printing** this magazine and its **predecessors**.

The only condition under which I am prepared to pass for publication the one printed above is that this letter repudiating the personal animosity J. R. Jenkins displays as being libellous shall also appear at the same time.

W. BARKER.\*

manded the same, but we are told that 'Christ was the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.' Surely it is obvious that in the O.T. we have the teaching of Jesus in process of evolution. Paul clearly recognises this fact (see Gal. iii. 24-25). It was the function of the law to lead the children of Israel to Him. Hence to go back to the precedents of the O.T. is on the face of it absurd, and by so doing we can justify slavery, bigamy, polygamy, and such like things.

Jesus Christ, I submit did not come into the world in order to introduce a new code of laws which should supplant or supplement the old.. He came rather to offer for our acceptance a spirit of love and universal brotherhood which should under any such code of laws be absolutely unnecessary. I think it was George Fox who said: 'He lived in the virtue of that life and power which took away the occasion of all war.' And truly, to such as live in the virtue of the life and power of Jesus Christ war is, and must be, impossible.

W. B. JEPSON.

---

### CHRISTIAN PACIFISM.

Dear Brother Editor,

Having been in lengthy, private correspondence with Bro. Anderson upon this subject only a year or two ago, I do not think it necessary to go over the same ground again. Quite apart from any Scriptural evidence, it amazes me that he, in the light of all the circumstances that we have passed through in recent wars, should suggest that war is NOT AN EVIL. His further implication that 'supposing war to be evil, God in the past dispensation was guilty of evil,' passes my comprehension. I would assure our brother that my difficulty is a much greater one than any he may have in reconciling God's action regarding war under the past dispensations, namely, to harmonise the plain teaching of the N.T. with war, which I claim is little short of majss murder. Suffice it to say, that I believe the teaching of Christ, found in what is known as His sermon on the mount, makes war impossible to the Christian. Further, I need scarcely point out the fact that the teaching of the Apostles was just as pacific as that of the Master.

Rom. xiii. 16-21, xiii. 8-10, Eph iv. 30-32, 1 Peter iii. 8-9, James iv. 1-2, and other Scriptures will bear out this fact." Turn and twist these Scriptures as you will, in order to make such teaching harmonise with war, you must call white black, and light darkness. I repeat: 'War is the negation of Christianity.'

Regarding war under past dispensations, more than one reason might be given why God permitted, and even corn-

Dear Editor,

We learn from Matt. vi. 21-22, 38-39, 43-44 and the Law of Moses, Exodus xx. 13, etc. that wilful murder is wrong in the sight of God. The crime was punished by death under the law; exceptions being made in cases we would call manslaughter (Exodus xxi. 12-14, Joshua xx. 1-6) as being distinct from premeditated murder, and warfare, when the armies of Israel went into battle at God's command. Note, every battle had to be fought exactly as God commanded. It is true, too, that the requirement in the day of battle in some cases was complete annihilation of the enemy.

The question confronting us is: Is it true that since war was countenanced under past dispensations (if God is to be consistent, the same yesterday, to-day and forever) that it must also be divinely approved to-day?

In giving my answer I wish to make it clear that I do not in any way seek to question the mind and work of our God.

We should note: (1) That the actions and commands of any age are given in relation to the particular needs and circumstances prevailing; (2) The Divine will and purpose.

The God-directed battles were fought by God's people under the dispensation of the law. He was not willing that any should perish; it was resistance to His will that caused agony and suffering; and in every case opportunity was given to the nations to repent and turn from idolatry.

'The law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did' (Heb. vii. 19).

God's people to-day compose the Church of which Paul said: 'The weapons of our warfare' are not carnal' (2 Cor. x. 4). To-day God's people are engaged in a war which was fore-shadowed in the law. 'The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ' (Gal. iii. 24).

Our God is: consistent in this; the war in which we are engaged must be fought just as He has directed by His Son and His Apostles. The result so far as resisting forces are concerned are equally disastrous, nay worse, but the final judgment in all things is still His alone. The Church under God's guidance is waging a spiritual warfare against spiritual forces, and with spiritual weapons. Every true Christian should be engaged in that fight, and he cannot be engaged in two wars, of spirit and of flesh. (Rom. viii. 1-39, note verse 5).

It cannot be said that Jesus Christ or any of His Apostles ever commanded, or inferred by their teaching, that Christians should ever engage in acts of physical warfare.

'Righteousness exalteth a nation' (Proverbs xiv. 34). If war is righteous in the eyes of God, to-day then some nation would be exalted as Israel was in battle. Which nation engaged in the recent death struggle is better for it?

Christian thought and living are the surest way to true progress and security.

JOHN M. WOOD.

Dear Editor,

Bro. Anderson again comes down on the side of war, and seeks to justify it by appealing to the Old Testament, a practice he would condemn generally in this age of grace.

In the light of New Testament teaching, does Bro. Anderson want a plain statement: 'Thou shalt not take part in war?' There is nothing said in that little book in condemnation of slavery, would Bro. Anderson say slavery was not, and is not, an evil?

Bro. Anderson might just as well ask for a Scripture which says Thou shalt not sprinkle an infant with water, or use an instrument in worship, or receive those into the Church who have not been immersed.

We all know, if we will be honest, that war cannot be reconciled with the life, character, and teaching of Jesus, and consequently with the New Testament. Every religious body, from the Church of England downwards, including our own, has said this time and again, but only in peace time. In two wars now, the Churches have been the best and biggest ally the State has had.

When Bro. Anderson's letter appeared, I was reading a new book by Howard Spring who is not a pacifist. This is what he says: 'Whether Christendom cares to face the fact or not, Jesus was a

pacifist and would have had no part or lot in this bloody shambles which be sets us.' I have not kept the reference, but I remember that William Temple, the late Archbishop of Canterbury, publicly declared that a Christian might with a clear conscience take part in war. That may have been the sincere view of William Temple, for whose opinions on the whole I had a deep regard; but there is no getting beyond the fact that it was not the view of Jesus. In another passage he says, 'I shall not here consider the leniency and complacency of the Church's attitude towards men in many of their daily activities, which the teaching of Jesus does not excuse. I speak only of this question of war because it seems to me that in no circumstances whatever, can the warrant of Jesus be found for a Christian's participation in it.'

More could be quoted, but I forbear. Romans xii. and xiii. should be more than enough to convince anyone that war is wrong for the Christian. Pacifism may not be a practical policy in the world to-day. I don't think it is. But surely a man has not to wait until others become non-smokers or non-drinkers before he abstains. For the help of our young brethren I say categorically, that if another war comes I am against it now before I know what it is about, and I shall refuse to sign on the dotted line for anything to do with war. Christianity is constructive, war is destructive, wasteful, and wrong from every point of view. Man must now either outlaw it or perish.

A. FRITH.

## The Bible and the Church.

Lectures and Messages given at the Bible School, Hindley, June, 1946.

Subjects	Writers
'The Bible' . . . . .	W. Crosthwaite
'The Church' . . . . .	F. C. Day
'The Apostle's' Doctrine' . . . .	W. Steele
'The Fellowship' . . . . .	A. E. Winstanley
'The Breaking of Bread' . . . . .	F. Worgan
'The Prayers' . . . . .	L. Channing

Orders in advance solicited—price 2/- per copy. Write immediately to:

L. MORGAN, 'Glen-Iris,' 44 Lord Street, Hindley, Wigan; or order from your Church Secretary.

A book for every member of the Church of Christ.

Don't fail to add 'The Bible and the Church' to your Library.

Evangelise through Literature.

# SCRIPTURE READINGS

## THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS

### I. The Perfect Priesthood and Sacrifice (iv. 14 to v. 10)

REVERTING to this subject upon which the writer has already touched in ii. 17 and iii. 1, he now considers it in some detail. The words of encouragement in this section are at the beginning:

1. Let us hold fast our confession.

2. Let us Come boldly to the throne of grace.

These points arise from the prior consideration of, the all-seeing and all-powerful Word, which might tend to remove hope of final salvation for sinful beings, because of its searching nature.

Courage is required to stand by our confession or profession of Christ—our practical duty. It is also required to approach a throne where perfection reigns—our devotional or private duty.

Men often require mediators in their relations with one another, how much greater must the need be in our relationship with our Creator. The Mosaic economy provided one tribe out of thirteen for this function. The high priest or chief mediator in particular required certain qualifications:

1. He must offer sacrifice for sins.

2. He must have compassion on erring fellows.

3., He must be appointed by God.

For proof of Christ's appointment to the office, we have Ps. ii. 7 and ex. 4. His answered prayers, His obedience, and His calling by God are quoted as showing that He was compassed with infirmity, heard by God and called by God.

### II. The Spiritual Condition of the Hebrews (v. 11 to vi. 20)

We must bear in mind the religious background of the original readers. Then-great need was the removal of all lingering desires for the Old Covenant, with its elaborate ritual and display. They must be persuaded of its complete abrogation in favour of the New, and the prophetic and practical superiority of the New. One step of the argument—perhaps very hard to impress on such minds—was the cessation and supercession of the Levitical priesthood. They might argue that the Christ could not replace the high priest because he was not of Aaronic lineage. The point is settled by the naming of the Messiah as a high priest of the order of Mechizedek.

Before continuing this line of argument; blame, warning and encouragement are offered to stimulate careful thought. The readers have not made that development of the spiritual faculties which is essential to true Christian

living. Many never do get beyond the elementary grasp of the truth and defective practice of it. 'Solid food' is essential for maintenance of mature life—'milk' suffices for the very young.

No disparagement of the first principles is intended in our passage. The foundation remains essential always. In fact, its importance increases as the building grows, but it is purposeless without the building. 'The teaching of baptisms' could be 'washings' equally well, which would have special significance to Jews—the 'washings' under the Law having typical significance, besides the baptisms of John and Jesus. The 'laying on of hands' was practised with similar significance under the Law also, but assuredly teaches under the New Covenant the authority of the Apostles, and the necessity of obedience to their word.

Words of most solemn warning follow, which may well cause much misgiving. The obvious meaning is that it is quite possible for those who have experienced the divine grace to fall away. A possible rendering of 'seeing they crucify' (vi. 6, see R.V. margin), is 'the while they crucify,' which would mean that while the apostasy continues renewal to grace is impossible, rather than an absolute impossibility. How fitting is the figure of the earth receiving the needful, yet becoming unfruitful—'nigh to cursing'; and this is contrasted with 'nigh to salvation.'

But those addressed have been showing great effort in giving service to the saints. Why should they not now show great diligence in spiritual perception? (vi. 11.) Examples of endurance, and assurances of the absolute dependability of God are brought forward in conclusion as the subject of Melchizedek is resumed.

### III. Christ and Melchizedek (vii.)

Those similarities which bear so clearly upon the position of our Saviour as High Priest, are dwelt upon at some length in this passage. We ought to read carefully Genesis xiv., and note the words of that ancient Scripture. Melchizedek was a King as well as a priest. He was more over a worshipper of the Most High God in a heathen land. There is no record of his forbears or descendants. He did not derive his priesthood from another, nor pass it on. We think this is the significance of the language, it being here idiomatic or figurative rather than literal. His righteousness and his peaceful character, with his worship of the true God, assured his position in the land. Abraham's respect assures us of these matters if we did not have the assurance in Psalm ex. (a psalm of Messianic significance. (See Matt. xxii. 44 also.)

As a suggestion we would think that Melchizedek derived his position from his character, rising to priestly eminence in heathen surroundings. It is that order

which, both preceded and now finally supersedes the Levitical priesthood, which depended upon lineage. Its permanence is derived from God's appointment of Christ to the same order by the Holy Spirit through the mouth of David. The conclusion for those believers in the Scriptures is inevitable that law as well as priesthood should be changed.

The oath of God is quoted as giving additional force to the appointment of Christ as Priest, and His eternal existence as indicated in the same passage. 'He ever liveth to make intercession!'

Finally, the perfect life and character of our great High Priest are presented to us (more particularly to those Hebrew Christians) in strong contrast to the sinful, defective, and short-lived human priests appointed by the Law. His offering, was not for His own sin, but for 'the people's,' and it was final and complete.

R. B. SCOTT.

## Conference at Belfast.

5th April, 1947

.. Morning service, 11.30 a.m. Chairman, Bro. W. J. Hendren (Belfast). Dinner. Afternoon: Conference. Tea. Evening: Service at 6.30. Speaker: Bro. W. Carl Ketcherside (St. Louis, U.S.A.). Name of second speaker later.

### PASSPORTS AND TRAVEL PERMITS

Forms of application for these may be obtained from railway stations. These forms, duly completed, should be sent to (England): 36 Dale Street, Liverpool, 2, or to the London Passport and Permit Office; (Scotland): 10 Bothwell Street, Glasgow, C.2., together with two passport photographs.

Application may now be made as early as desired but photos must be included. No money is now necessary.

### ACCOMMODATION.

. An address must be given when applying for a permit, and for this purpose use either C. I. Hendren, 27 Langford Street, Belfast; or J. Hamilton, 42 Jaffa Street, Belfast. Applications for board should also be made to either of these two brethren.

Please apply early to allow for catering arrangements and for adequate notice to hotels or boarding houses, who also require B.U.s and points supplied.

When possible, brethren will of course be placed in members' houses, but due to housing shortage this will be insufficient.

Please state definitely—Number of men in your party, number of women in your party, number of children in your party, number of days you will stay, number of meals you will desire to arrange to have in your, hotel or boarding house, .

Terms range from 5/6 to 12/6 each (bed and breakfast), or from 10/- to 15/- each (full board) per day. Weekly terms or other information as required.

C. I. HENDREN.

### LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE.

Dear Brother,

I notice in the January issue that hearty congratulations are offered to Bro. J. Breakell, a member of the Town Council' of Shrewsbury, because that Council has decided against opening the public playgrounds on the Lord's Day.

Whilst we are in agreement on the non-application of Sabbath observance to Christians, in that the Sabbath—a part of the Old Covenant—has been abrogated by the New, there are two questions I would like to ask you:

(1) In what passage of the N.T. is the Christian and the Church instructed not to do certain things (including work and the playing of games) on the Lord's Day?

(2) By what authority can Christians or the Church enforce upon the world and non-believers', the observance of what are essentially Christian privileges, and, by a bye-law made by a town council, impose upon worldlings (an entire town) the doubtful observance of certain theories, which are, even if true, the sole right, privilege and prerogative of the Church, the Body of Christ?

H. ARDRON.

[This letter suggests a larger question:

Is it right for Christians to help prevent wrong being done, or should they stand idly by and let the Devil have all his own way?—Editor]

I have spent nearly half a century on matters connected with war, and have arrived at the conclusion that war is a futile thing, for it neither ensures peace nor composes differences.—'Fleld Marshal Sir W. Robertson.

'Shall Christians assist the Prince of Hell, who was a murderer from the beginning, by telling the world of the benefit or the need of war?'—John Wesley.

'God is forgotten in War; every principle of Christianity is trampled upon.'—Sydney Smith.

'War cannot be reconciled with Christianity: there is no such thing as a Christian war.'—H. R. L. Sheppard.

'War is a gamble, with the lives of the multitude at stake. It is immoral: it is not Christian: it is useless. The results are barren.'—Sir Ben Turner,

## Sceptical Teaching in Schools.

Dear Bro. Crosthwaite,

I have just listened in to 'Rev.' Norman Snaith, tutor at Wesley College, Leeds, giving a talk to school children on the myths of the Old Testament. He told in plausible and fanoiful language of the so-called myth stories of the Garden of Eden as recorded in Genesis. I would like to appeal to the Brethren who have children attending schools, and probably listening to these talks, to protest and have their children withdrawn from hearing such perverted teaching, remembering that children's minds are being formed and who knows the consequences of such talks ?

J. BBEAKELL.

### COMING EVENT

TRANENT, East Lothian, Annual Social, February 22nd, at 5 p.m. Chairman: Bro. W. Wilson; speakers: Bren. A. E. Winstanley and J. Richardson (Fauldhouse).

### COMING EVENT

MORLEY \_ Anniversary, Saturday and Sunday, February 22nd and 23rd, 1947. Tea on the tables at 4.30 p.m.; evening meeting at 6.30 p.m.; "chairman: Bro. Charles Bailey (Doncaster); speakers: Fred C. Day (Birmingham) and James Ballard (Hull). Speaker on the Lord's Day: Bro. Day. A hearty invitation given to all brethren to attend.

### MARRIAGE

BRO. ROBERT HARGREAVES and SISTER ELSIE WOODCOCK were married on Saturday, December 21st, in the meeting room of the Church of Christ, Argyle Street, Hindley. Bro. L. Morgan officiated.

## NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES

Blackburn, Hamilton St. We had a rich spiritual time during the holiday season, with Bro. David Dougal of Wallacestone, Scotland; He had experience of meetings quite new to him, such as Watchnight Service on New Year's Eve, and Gospel cottage meetings, on Saturday evenings, which are quite common this side of the Border. He gave of his best at the Gospel meetings, both by the Word and in song. The two week-ends will live long in our minds and hearts. Ho can sing right from the heart. On New Year's Day, he presented over sixty books

to meritorious S.S. scholars. He, too, came in for a surprise, as the Church, in appreciation of his valuable services, and in view of his probably entering the evangelistic field, presented him with a Bible. We pray God will bless his labours wherever he goes for Him.

H. WILSON.

Blackridge. Rejoice with us for we have found that which had strayed away from the fold. After a period, part of which had been spent in the Army, we rejoice to announce the restoration of our Bro. Tom Whittaker. He was welcomed back on Lord's Day, 5th January, 1947, and we pray that his fellowship and ours will be well pleasing in the sight of our 'Great Shepherd.'

It was with some regret that we said good-bye to our Bro. A. E. Winstanley. Bro. Albert did much to further the cause of Christ while serving the Church here. He has given of his services unstintingly and with good heart, and was ever ready to discourse with, and help clarify, the problems of all. He will be long remembered by the children with whom he made contact at Lord's Day School, and children's meeting on Thursdays.

On Lord's Day, 28th December, 1946, he gave a rousing and inspiring farewell address on Philippians i. 27. He is still in the district and we look forward to having him labour with us again at Blackridge.

J. KERR.

Bristol, Bedminster. On Lord's Day, 15th December, 1946, Frances Rita Sweet was immersed and was welcomed to fellowship on December 22nd. Bro. T. Kemp is working with the Church here and D.V. will continue until the end of April, 1947. May our united labours be abundantly blessed.

Dewsbury. The Church has been re-formed here. The Society of Friends have very kindly granted us part of their premises in which to meet. At present, we are meeting on Lord's Days for the Breaking of Bread at 2.30 p.m., and for the proclamation of the Gospel at 6 p.m. Local obstacles are gradually being overcome, and we are planning for greater activity.

R. MCDONALD.

East Grinstead!. The Annual Lord's Day School Party took place on Saturday the 11th inst. Our meeting place not being large enough we hired the British Legion Hall. The scholars, together, with their parents, numbering eighty altogether, sat down to a good tea; followed by games for the first part of the evening. The second part consisted of hymns sung by the girls and boys separately, and solos sung by Sis, Biaggi,

of Bristol, and Mr. Cyril Hillman, of East Grinstead.

Bro. L. Daniell, of Bristol, gave a short message and presented the prizes to the scholars.

An invitation was given to the parents and elder scholars to attend the Gospel Service on Lord's Day, to which a few responded.

Bro. Daniell served the Church on the Lord's Day and altogether we had a week-end of spiritual uplift. We appeal for Gospel preachers to serve the Church here. Any willing to serve please communicate with W. Hillman, 'Angorfa,' Queens Road, East Grinstead, Sussex. **W.H.**

**Slamannan District.** On Wednesday, 1st January, 1947, with the meeting place of the Church at Blackridge, West Lothian, as the Mecca, brethren, sisters and friends poured in from all corners of the district to hold their annual social. The gathering was the largest on such an occasion ever recorded in this district.

It was a day that will live in the memories of all, for great was the wealth of fellowship experienced. We earnestly pray that it will be an instigator of a glorious revival in our efforts to work harder and win more souls for our Lord Jesus.

Bro. W. Steele, Tranent, occupied the chair. Bro. L. Channing, Kentish Town, and Bro. A. E. Winstanley, gave of their best in uplifting and inspiring addresses. Brethren and sisters from all parts of the district provided a varied and most enjoyable programme.

Bro. W. Stewart, Pauldhouse, thanked and commended all on their whole-hearted support and co-operation in making the time spent together most profitable. **J. B. STEELE.**

## Obituary.

**Birmingham, Charles Henry Street.** We regret to report the passing of our deeply beloved Sister S. Bryden, wife of our late esteemed Elder James Johnstone Bryden. After a short illness she passed away peacefully on January. 2nd in her eighty-fifth year.

She was laid to rest in Brandwood End Cemetery, on January 6th, Brother R. Cross officiating. A goodly number of Brethren and relatives were present.

**Charles Henry Street, Birmingham.** We learn that the Lord has called our aged Sister, Mrs. S. Bryden, to Himself. We render our tribute of praise and gratitude to our loved Sister's memory. A few years past, during some weeks labours with Charles Henry Street Brethren, we came in close association with her, and my wife and I greatly enjoyed our Christian communion and

happy experience of the very kind hospitality and attention received in her home then. She was baptised amongst the Baptists probably 60 to 60 years ago, and has ever been a faithful follower of the Saviour. She loved the Saviour, revered His Word, valued highly in the privileges of the Lord's House, and delighted to hear and converse of the progress of His Kingdom. In latter years, a fall made walking most difficult, but despite her crippled condition she was present at the Lord's Table whenever practicable, and was present there but three weeks prior to her death, hastened by another fall. She sympathised fully (With her husband, the late Bro. J. J. Bryden, of stalwart memory, and his son, in their inflexible stand for Old Path, principles, and in the comparative isolatedness of Charles Henry Street Church\* during many recent years. We express our deep sympathy with Bro. J. R. Bryden and family, and the fellow members. "Granny," as she was affectionately termed, was greatly esteemed and beloved. Her Christlikeness and devotedness will long be an inspiring remembrance. **.CHARLES BAILEY.**

**East Kirkby (Beulah Road).**—The Church here has suffered a further loss, by the death of our oldest member, Bro. John Peach, who departed this life on December 27th, 1946, at the ripe age of eighty-nine years. He first, came under the sound of the Gospel fifteen years ago, and after attending the meetings consistently for some time, became strongly convicted. So much so, that the writer had the unbounded pleasure of immersing him into the ever-blessed name, almost the same hour of the night. His dear wife, now eighty-four years of age followed in his steps, some two years after. Our hearts go out to our dear sister in this severance of fleshly ties, after so long unbroken union in their married life. Also we earnestly commend to God a grown-up family who are not members with us.

**W. B. JEPSON.**

**Hindley, Argyle Street.**—Obituary: The Church mourns the loss of Sister Lizzie Robinson, aged fifty-nine, who died on Friday morning, December 13th. The funeral service was held in the meeting room on Wednesday, December 18th. The writer officiated, and paid, a tribute to her unstinted devotion, for she followed the Master's glorious example, living a life of self-denial and service.

Sometimes, it is difficult to clothe one's thoughts adequately to describe the self-sacrificial life of a sister, whose life stands out against the darkness with clear and radiant light. It is hot possible to pay too high a tribute to her life, for she was constantly thinking of others, hence she became a friend to all,

and was affectionately known to many as Auntie Lizzie.

We shall not, at least this side Jordan, hear that welcome voice, or feel the warmth of that handshake, but the memory of her life will ever remain with us, for she truly has shown us how to live. We thank God for the years it has been our privilege to share fellowship—a worthy daughter of a crucified King. She not only taught us how to live, but by her patience, fortitude, and steadfast faith, she taught us how to die. 'Behold I have refined thee, but not as silver, I have tried thee in the furnace of affliction.'

When the day dawns and the shadows flee away, we feel sure that Sister Robinson will be amongst those with white robes before the throne of God, serving Him there, as she sought to serve Him below. The star that shined so brightly in Hindley, will shine with radiant splendour before the throne. We commend the loved ones left behind to her Lord and Saviour and may her life be an inspiration and example to all.

L. MORGAN.

THANKS FOR SYMPATHY. •

The family of the late Sister E. Robinson desire to express their very sincere thanks to all the Brethren who so willingly volunteered to assist in a true Christian manner during the trying illness of our sister; and also to the many brethren for their messages of sympathy. We deeply appreciate the loving kindness shown towards us.

S. WINSTANLEY.

Saughall and Mollington. With very deep regret we record the great loss to the above Churches and the New Testament cause by the passing onward of our esteemed Brother, James Emil Stephen, for many years pillar of the Church at Saughall and closely connected with the adjacent Church at Mollington, both near Chester.

During my residence and work at Chester, 1901-6, I knew Bro. Stephen intimately, and bear witness to his loyalty, reliability, and devotedness in the Master's service, and his fidelity to the fundamentals of our New Testament position and plea.

Bro. Stephen was eldest son of Peter Stephen and was deeply interested of recent decades in Sunday School efforts. It is peculiarly noteworthy that Bro. James Stephen was grandson of Peter Stephen, secretary of the first Annual Meeting of our associated Churches in 1842, and one of the earliest converts of our first evangelist, the revered George Reid. Bro. J. E. Stephen had, therefore, a special historical connection with the Brotherhood's 'early days in this country.'

Bro. James Stephen's father and mother, and Bros. and Sisters W. Stephen, W. Davies and John Mason, of uncle and aunt relationship, were the embodiment of Christian kindness. So, too, his grandmother, widow of the earlier Peter Stephen, a veritable 'mother in Israel.' We knew her well at Mollington, and I also, at Whitehaven, when staying with her daughter and son-in-law (Bro. and Sister W. Ferguson). My wife and I were again and again recipients of the kindnesses of the Stephen family. Many were the occasions of our sweet hallowed fellowship with them at the Lord's Table and in their homes. We cannot speak too highly of their brotherliness and their interest in the Restoration Movement's principles and progress.

Bro. James Stephen inherited a noble heritage, and earnestly he strove to fulfil the obligations and responsibilities therefrom.

We express our very deep sympathy with Sister J. Stephen and her daughter and relatives in their bereavement, sorrow, and loneliness. May they receive richly of the Divine consolation and sustaining grace, realising indeed the Saviour's presence and blessing.

CHARLES BAILEY.

**THE SCRIPTURE STANDARD** is published monthly. Prices: Home: One copy, 3s.; two copies, 5s.; three copies, 7s. Abroad: One copy, 2s. 6d.; two copies, 4s. 6d.; three copies, 6s. 6d. All post free. Agents' parcels are. all post free.

All matter for insertion must be sent before the 10th of the month (News items, the 15th) to the Editor: W. CROSTHWAITE, Ford Villa, Hart Street, Uiverston, Lanes. All orders and payments to the Treasurer: A. L. FRITH, 12 Poulton Street, Fleetwood, Lancashire.

**EVANGELIST FUND.** Contributions to R. McDONALD, Lumley House, 4 Clark Street, Westbora, Dewsbury, Yorks.

**NYASALAND MISSION.** Contributions to W. STEELE, Atholl Dene, Longniddry, East Lothian.

Secretary of Conference Committee: F. C. DAY, Holmleigh, 69b Stamford Road, Handsworth, Birmingham.

**THE SCRIPTURE STANDARD** is printed for the Publishers by Walter Barker, Langley Mill, Nottm,