

The SCRIPTURE STANDARD

*Pleading for a complete return to Christianity
as it was in the beginning.*

VOL. 16. No. 1.

JANUARY, 1950.

May 1950 be for all the best of all years.

Jesus said:

'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.'

The Best of all Aims.

'WHEREFORE also we make it our aim, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto him' (2 Cor. 5:9, R.V.).

At the beginning of a New Year, most folks make resolutions of amendment. The largest room in the world is the room for improvement. There is room for improvement in individual, home, Church, and national life. We are chiefly concerned with improvement in the spiritual realm.

Paul's life was a chequered one. In 2 Cor. 4, he says: 'We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed.' He could sing the songs of Zion at midnight in a Philippian dungeon, with back torn and bleeding, and feet fast in the stocks. He could well exhort his brethren to 'Rejoice in the Lord alway.'

One reason for this cheerfulness was

His strong confidence concerning the Future.

'For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle [margin, bodily frame] be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.' He knew that the body was but the tent in which the real person dwells, and that one day the perishable body would be changed into an incorruptible one. He wrote: 'Our citizenship is in heaven, from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory; according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself.'

'Here in the body pent absent from Him I roam,
Yet nightly pitch my moving tent a day's march nearer home.'

Another reason for Paul's cheerfulness was that in all things

He aimed to be well-pleasing unto the Lord Jesus.

Many fail because they aim to do too many things, and cannot attend to them all. Others fail because of wrong aims. The creed of some seems to be:

'I live for myself, I think for myself, for myself and none beside,
Just as if Jesus had never lived; as if Jesus had never died.'

Such self-centred folks are miserable, and go to the grave unregretted. Those held in grateful remembrance sacrificed self in the service of the Lord and their fellows.

Some aim to please and stand well with the world. They are pushed to the front, and for a time shine in the limelight. When they have served the purpose of their pushers they are thrown on the scrap heap. Think of the names that during the first world war (1914-1918) were on everybody's tongues. If they are named to-day it is with very different feelings. Many have had to say, as Cardinal Wolsey did: 'Had I but served God as diligently as I have served the King, He would not have given me over in my grey hairs. But this is my just reward.'

Think on these words: 'They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever' (Daniel 12:3).

Jesus can be pleased.

The Lord we worship and serve is not like the gods of the heathen, which have eyes that see not, and ears which hear not. We serve an ever-living Lord, who, 'in the days of his flesh,' was 'in all things made like unto his brethren.' We read that 'He looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts.' When the disciples rebuked those who brought young children unto Him, Jesus 'was much displeased,' 'He was moved with indignation' (R.V.) How often He spoke of 'my joy'; 'the joy of thy Lord.' He prayed for the disciples 'that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves.'

What better aim could we have than to give pleasure to Him whose face was marred, and whose heart was broken because of our sins?

Some things that please Him.

1. *Faith.* 'Without faith it is impossible to please him' (Heb. 11:6). 'Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.' What the Lord has revealed in His Word is the limit of our faith in spiritual matters. There is no evidence of faith in doing things for which no authority can be found in His Word. The faith that pleases Him obeys fully, and rests on His Word and promises. The faith that is confident, come what may, that 'All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to his purpose.'

2. *Obedience.* When Jesus to fulfil all righteousness was buried and rose from beneath Jordan's wave, God's voice declared: 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' We are owned as God's children when we do God's will, and have then the assurance that we are 'well-pleasing unto him.' It would make our obedience much easier if we thought of it thus: Jesus will be pleased if I do this; He will be displeased if I fail to do it. 'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.'

3. *Walking with God.* 'Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him' (Gen. 5:24). We read in Hebrews 11:5, 'Enoch was translated that he should not see death.. for before his translation he had this testimony,

that he pleased God.' 'Can two walk together except they be agreed?' 'He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk as he walked' (1 John 2:6). If we are walking with the Lord there will be an ever-widening gulf between us and the things that are not in harmony with His will.

*'Not for ease or worldly pleasure, nor for fame my prayer shall be;
Gladly will I toil and suffer, only let me walk with Thee.'*

Paul wrote: 'Ye have received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God.' The New Testament Scriptures contained all that the Lord requires of us. Shall we make it our aim in all things to be well-pleasing unto Him; and to fear only to grieve Him? If we do, then 1950 will be a truly happy year.

EDITOR.

The Mission to the Fisherfolk.

THE East Anglia fishing season is an outstanding event in the life of the Scottish fisherfolk. More than three thousand fishermen and nine hundred fisher girls this year made the trip to Yarmouth and Lowestoft, to provide food for man from among the sandbanks off the east coast of England.

Many years ago, a scheme was inaugurated whereby the members of the Churches could hold meetings during the season in the port of Yarmouth. I believe that meetings have also been held in Lowestoft. Owing to the difficulty in securing suitable premises in which to meet, these meetings have been discontinued since the recent war. This year, I was requested by the Committee to go to Yarmouth, and get in touch with the brethren and try to help them. As a result I arrived in Yarmouth on October 8th. I did not know many of the brethren and was a stranger to the customs of the fisherfolk. In a remarkable way, I was put in touch with Bro. Geo. Reid (from Buckie) within two hours of arriving in Yarmouth. Bro. Reid rallied the brethren, while I set out to look for a suitable hall. This was a very difficult task. In all, we applied for about twenty different places, finally securing a room in the Labour Club. On Lord's Day, October 16th, we met for the first time to break bread. Thirty were present. At the Gospel meeting that night forty were present. The next Lord's Day fifty attended the Gospel meeting. For the next four Sundays the average attendances were thirty to break bread, and rather more to hear the Gospel. Our highest attendance at the Gospel service was sixty-nine on October 30th.

I want to pay tribute to the unstinted support given by the brethren to the meetings. Their enthusiasm did a very great deal to make the meetings a real success. Their zeal for the Church did much to inspire me. The singing in the meetings was grand. Before the Gospel meeting, the brethren would start to sing as soon as they sat down in their places, and as a result the meetings started on a fine plane.

During the week, I had ample opportunity to visit the boats. Always, I was greeted with a cheery word and a smile. How pleasing it was when I went aboard the boats to be welcomed with the words, 'Come awa' doon, mannie, and get a suppie o' tae.' The homely brotherliness of the boat's cabin seemed to me to be a near approach to the real spirit of the Christ. We could learn much from the cordiality of this simple way of life.

The season ended as it had begun. The fish just vanished overnight. So I left Yarmouth with many happy memories, and an urgent request to the Committee that I should be allowed to return next year. I pray that God will protect those brave souls in their hazardous task. Brethren who

are thinking of taking a late holiday next year should consider the possibility of making Great Yarmouth their rendezvous in the month of October.

My best thanks are due to Bren. Reid (Buckle) Mair (Portknockie) and Brown (Peterhead), for their assistance as the 'Oversight' of the Church, and to the Church in Fleetwood and Bro. W. Steele, for their help in other ways, to Bro. and Sis. R. McDonald, Bro. and Sis. F. Hardy, and to Bro. Eric McDonald for their visits to us, and to many other brethren for their interest and support.

ANDREW GARDENER, Jr.

The Appalling Sin of Sectarianism.

THE sects and parties in the religious world are legion; but they have one thing in common, they have absolutely no Scriptural authority for their existence. Of this fact they are well aware. In their condemnation of sectarianism, as a disgrace to Christianity, and a positive sin against God, do they not proclaim themselves guilty?

Were they sincere, did they really mean what they say, sectarianism would have received its death blow long ago. The root of the trouble is that not one sect will surrender the human elements around which their particular party is built. 'This people honoureth me with their lips, but their hearts are from me.' 'In vain do they worship me teaching for doctrine the commandments of men.' These words are as true to-day as when they were first spoken by our Lord Jesus Christ. He and His apostles strongly and sternly condemn this sin.

The apostle Paul, writing to the Churches in Galatia, mentions among other sins, factions, division, parties, adding that those who do and practise these things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. The apostle John says: 'Every one that taketh a lead and abideth not in the teaching of Christ hath not God. . . If any one cometh unto you, and this teaching bring not, be not receiving him home, and "Joy to thee" do not say, for he that biddeth him rejoice, hath fellowship with his wicked works.'

We believe and accept this sure word of teaching. We recognise this word condemns the sin of sectarianism completely. Therefore, we can have neither part nor lot in this matter. To do so would be to surrender the right of the Church of Christ to exist. Knowing these Scriptures, and knowing also that they unreservedly condemn parties and sects, the Co-operating Churches of Christ have joined themselves to this unholy alliance, and are working with it. Never did our Lord encourage evil, much less temporise with it. Is the Saviour's prayer likely to be the sooner answered by this action? Let the reader *think*—then answer.

When asked to explain or justify their action what reply is given? Certainly not a Scriptural one, for not one word is to be found in the Scriptures to justify or support their action.

But let Mr. Robinson, editor of the *Christian Advocate*, explain. In reply to a query on this subject, put by the writer in December, 1944, he says: 'I agree with you, of course, that sects and parties are condemned in the Scriptures, and what I am trying to do is to heal them.' The reader is left to form his own judgment as to the wisdom of associating, in a friendly way, with this evil in order to cure it. Its chances of success are surely very meagre.

Men in their wisdom are trying new methods of dealing with this sin, and all the time God is calling for better, more consistent, faithful men to carry out His will in His own way—men and women who are not afraid to expose and denounce this sin and its terrible results to humanity.

If ever the Saviour's prayer for oneness is to be realised, it will not be by recognising, associating, and working with those who defend and

maintain such divisions. The enormity of this sin is that it is a continued, deliberate, wilful disobedience of the Divine will, and the party leaders well know it. Can God pardon any individual who deliberately continues in a known sin? Your humble scribe thinks not.

It is ours to contend earnestly, lovingly for the faith once for all (time) delivered to the saints. We cannot be wrong in condemning what our Saviour condemned; we cannot be right in associating with the evil of sectarianism. To do evil that good may come is a vicious and self-destructive argument. To the law and to the testimony—there alone shall we find safety and unity.

A. H. ODD.

Christian Science Self-Explained.

RESPECTING some of the miracles which Christ did, which no Christian Scientist has ever had the rashness to try to do—though claiming to do what Jesus did—Mrs. Eddy says, 'Because you cannot walk on the water and raise the dead, you have no right to question the great might of Divine Science in this direction.'

Why not, Mrs. Eddy? The most conspicuous words of your whole book are on the outside, on your front cover, and read thus: 'Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out demons.'

Now if these words apply to you, and you can heal the sick on their authority, why cannot you raise the dead? What right have you to chop in two a command of Christ in that way? Raising the dead and walking on the water are no more miracles than instantly healing a real sick man. But, Mrs. Eddy, you can fool us on sick folks, for sometimes they think they are sicker than they really are. But you cannot fool us when a man is dead or when one walks on the water. Give us an unquestionable example of your miracles.

In speaking of broken bones and dislocations, Mrs. Eddy says: 'Until the advancing age admits the efficacy and supremacy of mind, it is better to leave surgery and the adjustment of broken bones and dislocations to the fingers of a surgeon, while you confine yourself chiefly to mental reconstruction and the prevention of inflammation.'

Madam, your reason for leaving broken bones and dislocations to the fingers of a surgeon may satisfy your followers, but we sceptics hold our fingers over our mouths to prevent laughing. If sin, sickness and death are only in the mind, as you teach, then broken bones and dislocations are in the mind too. And you should try to get such error out.

What does the age have to do with it? We think the real reason you advise your disciples to confine themselves to mental diseases and inflammation is that you may be able to stimulate the minds of the hysterical woman and the imaginative man, that they may be able to throw their troubles into the background till nature restores them. While a man with an arm broken or dislocated, even though he is a Christian Scientist, may think as long as he pleases, and it will never be set. In other words, you choose the "mental reconstruction" and "inflammation" because you can fool people there. But you can't fool people as to broken bones and dislocations!

Footprints of Time (U.S.A.)

TO-DAY

Lord, for to-morrow and its needs

I do not pray,

Keep me, my God, from stain of sin

Just for to-day.

Let me be slow to do my will,

Prompt to obey;

Help me to sacrifice myself

Just for to-day.

So for to-morrow and its needs

I do not pray;

But keep me, guide me, hold me, Lord,

Just for to-day.

The Cup of the Lord.

I HAVE been somewhat reluctant to put in writing my cogitations about this controversial subject, because I feel that an abler disciple would be proper to discuss this important part of the Lord's Feast.

It is my purpose to deal with this question in the spirit of the ordinance in which it is set. Stated simply, the issue is, shall we use a common cup or individual cups? Do the Scriptures indicate which, or is it an indifferent matter?

Some try to make the issue appear to be a choice between 'one cup' and 'any number of cups.' Those who contend for 'any number of cups' really mean individual cups. Those who object to 'individual cups' hold that when the Lord instituted the Feast, all the disciples used the same cup. This writer is among the last mentioned, yet does not subscribe to the contention of 'one cup' for 'one congregation.' This will become evident as we proceed in this study.

The facts relative to our study are confined to the accounts given by Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul. For illustrative purposes, we may resort to any other Scriptures suitable. These four writers are reliable and what they tell us is all that the Lord wants us to know—indeed, all that we need know. We shall here observe, that Luke makes a claim which none of the other Gospel writers make, namely, that he writes his history, 'in order.' We take it, he means, that the incidents, or facts which he tells us, are in the order of their happening. According to Matthew, Mark and Luke, it was at the end of the Passover Supper our Lord instituted His Feast.

Because Jesus was born and lived a Jew and His disciples were Jews, we should not assume that the Lord's feast was partly Jewish. We mean, that we are not now considering any Jewish custom, but rather something distinct and apart from the Jewish tradition. This is a custom of the Church of God (1 Cor. xi. 16). In studying the four accounts of the Feast institution, we have not found anything to suggest that individual cups were used by the disciples. We do notice that Luke, in his relation of the observance of the Passover Supper, speaks of a cup which our Lord tells His disciples to divide among themselves (xxii. 17). It is this cup, upon which the 'individual cup' brethren hang their contention. Observe that our Lord says nothing as to this cup having any particular significance. It appears to be part of the Passover Feast, and so, Jewish. Contrast what Luke says in verse 20: 'Likewise also the cup after supper,' saying, 'this cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.' Note: 'Likewise' refers to what the Lord said and did in respect to giving the bread to His disciples. We read: 'the Lord took the bread and gave thanks.' That He gave thanks for this cup is inferred from the word 'likewise.' In Paul's account (1 Cor. xi. 25) it says: after the same manner also.' Undoubtedly, the Lord gave thanks for this cup, mentioned in Luke xxii. 20. The cup mentioned in Luke xxii. 17 cannot be confounded with that of xxii. 20. They belong to different institutions and dispensations. From verses 14-18 is the account of the last Passover Supper, and verses 19-20 is the account of the institution of the Lord's Feast.

The one is in contrast to the other. The setting in such close proximity of these two ordinances—the old covenant and the new covenant—has the effect of accentuating the contrast between them; not only in regard to the respective purpose which they subserve, but also in the manner of their observance. From the foregoing considerations, we can eliminate the cup mentioned in Luke xxii. 17 from this study.

That the cup used at the institution of the Lord's Feast was a common cup seems evident from all accounts. First, Matthew says: 'He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it. Second,

Mark's narration is the same as Matthew's except that he omits the Lord's command, 'Drink ye all of it.' Instead Mark tells us that 'they all drank of it.' The testimony of these two writers fits harmoniously. The word 'of' used in the Lord's command, and also used in stating that they all drank 'of' it, is in Young's concordance given the meaning 'out of.' He says, the Greek original is *ex* or *ek*, and the English equivalent is 'out of.' The cup of the Passover, the disciples were commanded to divide among themselves. The cup of the Lord's Feast, the disciples were commanded to drink 'out of' it, and they were obedient, for they all drank 'out of' it. This seems clear.

The Church at Corinth was disorderly. Paul wrote to correct these disorders. One of the disorders was the manner in which they partook of the Lord's Feast. They stressed more what they ate and drank, than the manner of partaking. The Apostle impresses upon them the holy character of the ordinance. Their present way prevented them from receiving a blessing; they brought condemnation upon themselves. He solemnly tells them that the ordinance he gave them he had received from the Lord Jesus. Paul, by the Holy Spirit, tells them how they ought to partake of the Lord's Feast. He uses the words given to him by the Spirit. As the Lord Jesus at the institution of His Feast made a contrast with the Passover Supper, so now, the Apostle makes a contrast between the manner of heathen feasts and the manner of the Lord's Feast. He seems not to be concerned about the contents of the cup; for he does not say what it contains. This does not mean that its contents matter nothing. We know from the gospel writers that it contained the fruit of the vine. Notice the idiom of the Apostle: He speaks of 'the cup,' 'this cup,' 'the cup of blessing,' and 'the cup of the Lord.' This is no Jewish or heathen custom, but a custom of the Church of God. When the Holy Spirit purposes to fix a thought or idea in the heart and mind of the disciples we note that He repeats frequently the word or term conveying His meaning. We can cite such as 1 Cor. i., where the Apostle Paul, exhorting the Corinthians to unity, rings the changes of the holy name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and again to the same purpose he refers to the Church as 'one body' in Chap. xii. The Apostle says (1 Cor. xi. 2), 'keep the ordinances, as I delivered them unto you,' and in verse 23 he says, 'For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you.' What Paul taught, all the Apostles taught. They were all careful to teach only 'all things commanded them by the Lord Jesus.'

We have learned from the writers Matthew, Mark and Luke that the Lord gave a cup to His disciples and commanded them to drink 'out of' it, and obediently they all drank 'out of' it. This would be the manner delivered to Paul and which in turn he gave to the Corinthians and all other Churches everywhere. There is no suggestion in the New Testament that the ordinances of the Church varied in different countries because of social customs, or national prejudices, or climate conditions. The Lord in His wisdom only ordains something simple, suited to the whole human race. We note that converted Jews tried to bring over into the Church part of the Mosaic order, but were rebuked for doing so. Corrupt organisations claiming to be Churches of God have 'retained to themselves the right to vary the ordinances somewhat,' and what a sorry caricature they present in contrast to the pure and simple order of the original Church.

Let us now take notice of some objections raised to this order. The 'individual cup' brother says that if the congregation is a big one, and two, or three or more are used we might as well use individual cups. The 'one cup' brother seems to endorse this reasoning. To my mind it savours of what Paul warns against in Col. ii. 8. One cup can serve quite a big congregation, where they have learned of Christ to 'tarry one for another.' There is evidence that brethren are too perfunctory in the observance of

the Feast. Where the congregation is big, I submit that the Scriptures give the Church the necessary instruction. Paul, writing to the Romans, says: 'Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning' (Romans xv. 49. See E odus xii. 3, 4). The Children of Israel were commanded to take 'a lamb for a house, and if the house be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbour next unto his house take it according to the number of the souls; every man *according to his eating shall make your count for the lamb.*' Can we not now hear a familiar and loved voice reasoning? Was this written for their sakes only, or 'saith he it altogether for our sakes?' If the children of Israel were commanded, a lamb for a house, and when the house was too small they called in their neighbours; surely if our house is too big for one cup, we may use two, or three or more, *according to our drinking.* This is good sense. Let everything be done decently and in order.

This should be convincing; but our 'individual cup' brother further objects that we make too much of the cup. The essential thing is its contents. I sometimes suspect that it is this brother who is overmuch troubled about the cup. He says cup is just metonymy for its contents 'the fruit of the vine.' Yes, cup is sometimes used as metonymy for its contents. Luke xxii. 17 is an instance. But cup as used in the Lord's Feast is not simple metonymy; it is truly figurative. It is a figure of speech known as 'metalepsis.' According to the Concise English Dictionary, it is 'a Greek word, meaning participation'—*meta*, with; and *lambano*, to take. Rhetorically, the continuation of a trope or figure in one word through a succession of significations. Our Lord said, 'This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.' He always used suitable words to express His meaning. Agreeably to this, Paul says, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?' Yes, brethren; literally, our Lord gave the disciples a cup containing the fruit of the vine and commanded them all to drink 'out of' it, and obediently they all drank 'out of' it. 'The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.' This has been the general practice of Christians down through the centuries until very recent times.

I have been asked if there is any literature by some of the pioneers in the restoration movement, dealing with this question of 'individual cups.' Not to my knowledge. In my general reading, all allusions to the Lord's Feast indicate that 'the cup' was common to all those who participated. The absence of reference to 'individual cups,' or the expression 'communion tray,' is proof that the latter practice was not then known and is sufficiently strong argument that it is a modern innovation.

I have never heard this disputed. On the contrary, it is generally confessed. There is a saying imputed to one of the early 'fathers,' 'What is new is not true.' Another objection to the use of a common cup is that it is unhygienic. This, sub-consciously, is at the bottom of the desire for individual cups. Some brethren who come to the Lord's Table are addicts to smoking or chewing tobacco, and have possibly been engaged doing so right up until entering the meeting place. To those who are free from this obnoxious practice it is naturally offensive to drink from a vessel in which the tobacco addict has already communed. We can understand this objection, although not agreeing with it. The remedy is **not** to make a change in the Lord's ordinance, but rather to exhort the offending brother to change his habits. In love, Paul says, 'Having therefore these promises dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God (2 Cor. vii. 1, see also 1 John iii. 1-3). Smoking or chewing tobacco is a work of the flesh and ought to be crucified, if a brother would truly discern the body and blood of the Saviour in His Feast. To all who are new creatures in Christ Jesus, let us

see in the cup the death of our Lord and the price of our redemption. Is it not sanctified by the Word of God and prayer?

We plead for a complete and unqualified return to primitive Christianity, then let us keep this ordinance as delivered to the first disciples. The primitive order is simple, appropriate and dignified. It savours nothing of Jewish traditions and customs, nor heathen philosophy and practices, but gives honour and glory to God and to the Lamb slain for sinners.

S. WILSON.

Bro. Wilson is a native of Slamannan, Scotland, and went out to New Zealand about twenty-three years ago. We have advised him that Bro. J. O. Phillips, Editor of 'The Truth,' 2305 East First Street, Austin, Texas, U.S.A., has published 'A Pioneer Master-piece' by J. W. McGarvey on 'Those Individual Cups.'—Editor, 'S.S.'

Words Whisper, Actions Shout.

I'd rather see a sermon than to hear one any day,
I'd rather one would walk with me than merely tell the way;
The better pupil is the eye and more willing than the ear;
Fine counsel is confusing, but examples are always clear.

The best of all the preachers are the ones that live their creeds,
For to see good put in action is what everybody needs.
I can learn to do it, if you let me see it done;
I can watch your hands in action, but your tongue too swift may run.

The lectures you deliver may be very wise and true,
But I'd rather get my lessons by observing what you do;
For I might misunderstand you and the high advice you give,
But there's no misunderstanding how you act and how you live.

When I see an act of kindness, I am eager to be kind;
When a weaker brother stumbles and a stronger stays behind
Just to see if he can help him, then the wish grows strong in me
To become as big and thoughtful as I know that friend to be.

And all travellers can witness that the best of guides to-day
Is not the one that tells them, but the one that shows the way.
One good man teaches many, men believe what they behold;
One deed of kindness noticed is worth forty that are told.

Who stands with men of honour learns to hold his honour dear,
For right living speaks a language that to everyone is clear;
Though an able speaker charms me with his eloquence; I say:
I'd rather see a sermon than just hear one any day.

Edgar A. Guest.

The Light of the World.

WHEN good old Simeon beheld the infant Jesus, and taking Him in his arms, exclaimed, 'Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation, which Thou hast prepared before the face of all people: a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of Thy people Israel.' He thus announced that the Child born of the Virgin would bring the needed light both to Gentiles and Jews. Accordingly, the Gospel by John tells of Him as the light. 'God is light,' and He is the Word that was with God and was God. 'In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came to bear witness of the Light that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but came to bear

witness of that Light. That was the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' The latter words are not the best possible translation, the idea to be conveyed being, that His coming into the world lighteth every man, not by some inherent, inborn light, but by the Gospel as heard, understood, and received. But John is not left alone thus to testify. Jesus, Himself, said, 'I am the light of the world. He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.' Now let us hear the Apostle Paul, who, writing of the Gospel, says—'Who has saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.' We read in place of 'abolished,' 'made ineffectual,' so as to be no more permanently able to hold the Church of Christ than to hold its everlasting head. 'Brought life and immortality to light,' fails to express the full thought, and is often taken as indicating that resurrection was not revealed before Christ. We get nearer the idea by reading, 'hath illumined life and incorruptibility by the Gospel'—brought into clearer light, as though only dimly discernible under former dispensations but now made distinctly clear by the intense light of the Sun of Righteousness. Christ, the light of the world, shines in full resplendency only through the Cross. The Cross is brilliant to the true believer all through life, but when face to face with death, then its glory is effulgent. Some men, calling themselves Agnostics, declare they know nothing! What a terrible affliction to meet death in such darkness! How precious to the dying Christian the glorious light of the Cross of Christ. Its light is His light, because in that light we see what He is, how He loves, and what He has done for us. Just here will you suffer a word of exhortation—

'Don't shut out the light of the cross!'

The light is shut out in many ways—by worldliness, by neglect of the great salvation, by disregard of the Saviour's precepts and ordinances. See to it *now*, or on dying bed you may wish for the light, but find only darkness. Let us live the life of the righteous, that we may die their death.

DAVID KING.

King David and the Instruments of Music.

MANY brethren who speak and write about the use of instrumental music in the worship, as being unscriptural, make wrongful charges against David. They allege that when he introduced instrumental music into the worship of Jehovah, that he did so of his own wisdom and will. It is customary to refer to two texts in Amos to give colour to their assertions. The citations Amos 5:23 and 6:5 are not condemnatory of instrumental music in the worship of Jehovah, as a careful reading of the context will show. God was displeased with the evil ways of Israel, and so their whole worship was nauseous to Him. Their animal sacrifices, their songs, as well as the sound of their viols, were unbearable to a holy and righteous God.

'Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; Who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity or sworn deceitfully. He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of his salvation' (Psalm 24:3-5).

Isaiah 1 teaches this lesson very emphatically. No worship, however correct in form and order, is acceptable to God, unless it comes from a pure and obedient spirit; such is only found in those whose lives are good and holy. David was a lover of God and His ways.

The scriptures positively assert that David introduced instrumental music by the express command of God. Let us note first the character of David. God said, 'I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfil all my will' (Acts 13:22). Again it is written of him, 'David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside from anything that he commanded him all the days of his life, save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite' (1 Kings 15:5).

God would not have thought so highly of David if he had been so presumptuous as to devise any innovation of his own wisdom, taste, inclination or will. It is well to remember that David, besides being king of Israel, was a prophet of God and that the Holy Spirit spake by him (Acts 2:30; 2 Sam. 23:2).

David longed to build a stable and permanent house, wherein God should presence Himself, and where all Israel should worship Him. God was pleased with David's desire, yet would not permit him to build the house of the Most High God. David was a man of war; God's house must be built by a man of peace. Although David was denied the privilege of building the temple, God gave to him the pattern of it, and of everything pertaining thereto, even to the order of His worship (1 Chron. 28:11, 12, and 19).

When Solomon had finished building the temple, he set forth the worship of God, and all things being faithfully observed according to the pattern given by David from God. 'It came to pass, as the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord and when they lifted up their voice with trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, "For he is good; for his mercy endureth for ever": that *then* the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord. So that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud; for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God' (2 Chron. 5:13-14). From this citation, we see that God was pleased with this worship, which included instrumental music.

After the days of King Solomon, Israel apostatized from God's laws and worship. A later king, Hezekiah, sought to restore the pure worship of God, so he gave commandment to cleanse the house of the Lord and called on the priests and Levites to render to God the service to which they were appointed. Among other ministries, we read, 'And he set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet; for so was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets' (2 Chron. 29:25). Surely this is a plain statement that instrumental music in the worship of Jehovah was His expressed command, not only by David but by other prophets also.

At a still later date, we learn from the book of Nehemiah, that instrumental music was a part in the worship of God. After the restoration of Israel from the Babylonian captivity, the temple was rebuilt and the worship of God revived. This worship was 'with the musical instruments of David, the man of God' (Neh. 12:36).

All this testimony (more could be given) proves that, far from displeasing God, David was a faithful prophet and a man after God's own heart.

This is not written to encourage the use of instrumental music by the Churches of Christ in their worship of God. The brethren who say that David was an innovator and will-worshipper are not dividing the Word of God aright, and so are failing as good workmen. Further, they are unconsciously encouraging the use of instruments, for those who desire

their use conclude thus: If David could, of his own will, offer such worship and be called 'a man after God's own heart,' and find acceptance, why may we not do likewise—why may we not offer what we think is good? Thus, the will-worshiper is strengthened in his unspiritual practice.

Brethren, will-worship was condemned by God under every dispensation. Instrumental music in the worship of God belonged to the old dispensation; which also included animal sacrifices, the sabbath, circumcision, etc. These were all done away with when the Lord Jesus died on the Cross and a new and better order was instituted when He ascended to the right hand of God and sent down the Holy Spirit from heaven.

S. WILSON (New Zealand).

CORRESPONDENCE

REPLY TO BRO. CHAFFER

To the Editor of the 'Scripture Standard'

In the October number of the 'Scripture Standard,' a brother, Ambrose G. Chaffer, of Australia, criticises A. Campbell, and the Churches of Christ in America, England and Australia.

As to his charge against A. Campbell, that he, by his "We neither invite nor debar, surely placed the American Church on a false footing": Campbell's approval of the practice and order in certain congregations in his day is a sufficient answer. Campbell, quoting from his memorandum, says, 'I observed that the table was furnished before the disciples met in the morning. And that the disciples occupied a few benches on each side of it. But the strangers occupied seats more remote.' Then he states that the bread and wine were passed to the disciples. Note his contrast, 'disciples' but 'strangers' (Campbell's 'Christian System'). If Bro. Chaffer thinks that Campbell, by that statement, meant either to invite or encourage sectarians to participate in the Supper with us, he has read Campbell with no profit. No intelligent Christian, and but few, if any, sectarians in this country think that A. Campbell meant any such. For no one has taught any stronger than he that the Lord's Table was in His Kingdom, and that one must be born of water and the Spirit (immersed) in order to become a citizen of the Kingdom, and to enjoy its privileges and blessings.

Bro. Chaffer accuses Campbell of 'placing the American Churches on a false footing.' But, unintentionally, Bro. Chaffer places them in a false light before his readers. For, from his article, one would be led to think that it is a general practice, with our approval, for sectarians to meet with us and partake of the Supper. The truth is that they, if at all, very seldom do so. I have, this year, been a member of the Church for forty years, but through all those years,

with but two or three exceptions, I have never seen a sectarian eat the Supper in one of our meetings. Through preaching brethren and gospel papers, I have heard of a few scattered instances of such. I have never known a preacher, elder, or teacher to invite or even encourage a sectarian to eat the Supper in our meetings. In most congregations, if one should encourage or invite one to do so, why, some faithful brother would invite him to the proverbial woodshed too quick. The teaching of God's Word concerning the Lord's Table and the Kingdom to the sectarians present, no more and no less, makes it unnecessary for us to have to snatch the emblems from sectarian hands, or to lock the door in his face. He understands and respects our convictions. So, by teaching the truth to the sectarian, we accomplish scripturally what Bro. Chaffer would accomplish otherwise.

David Lipscomb, who edited the 'Gospel Advocate' for about fifty years, sets forth our position in the matter. He says, 'We have repeatedly stated our conviction that no one save obedient children of our Father has any rights in the Lord's House. God has told us who are His children, and has instituted His Supper for their participation. It is destroying the significance of the ordinance, as well as usurping authority not granted us, to invite or encourage others to participate. Besides it destroys the strength of our protest against those who set aside God's appointments.' ('Questions Answered,' by Lipscomb and Sewell, published by the 'Gospel Advocate'.)

But, doubtlessly, by allowing and encouraging the sectarians and unbelievers to come to our meetings, many of them, through hearing a lesson from God's Holy Word and listening to the gospel taught in song, and by observing the beauty and simplicity of the New Testament worship and the reverence of the saints, have been turned away from sectarianism to obey the gospel of the Christ.

If I understand the brother, he contends that it is wrong to allow them to participate in the song service. I am

willing to admit, that as a matter of praise and service to God, their singing is worthless. And generally they know that we so believe. They sing on their own responsibility. And I know of no Scriptural authority for us to forbid by saying 'thou shalt not,' or for us to lock the door to keep them out. If Bro. Chaffer knows of any Bible authority for us to run our worship service on the order of a Masonic Lodge, then I would like to have it. Their singing, if orderly, does not effect our singing, nor its being accepted by our Father. Nor does their kneeling with us in prayer, out of respect for us, have anything to do with God hearing us; no more so than the prisoners' listening to Paul and Silas's praying and singing hymns unto God in the Phillipian jail. The singing of the truth in true gospel songs by sectarians and unbelievers cannot but help to bring them to obedience of the gospel.

But, he says, it is 'incongruous' for him to sing an invitation to himself. Then I suppose it would be 'incongruous' for him to read the second chapter of Acts together with a Christian, or alone? And it would be 'incongruous' for him to read together with a Christian, 'And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come: he that will, let him take of the water of life freely' (Rev. xxii. 17). That is, if the Christian is reading in a worshipful attitude—with reverence. Maybe the notes make the difference?

The 11th, 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters of First Corinthians have reference to the conduct in the regular assemblies. In these they sang, prayed, gave thanks, and taught (xiv. 15-19). 'If therefore the whole church be assembled together, and all speak with tongues, and there come one unlearned or unbelieving, will they not say that ye are mad? But if all prophesy and there come in one unbelieving and unlearned, he is reproved by all, he is judged by all; the secrets of his heart are made manifest; so that he will fall down on his face and worship God; declaring that God is among you indeed' (vv. 23-25). Note the words 'unlearned'—without the gift of tongues; 'unbelieving'—a non-Christian (see Thayer).

(1) In their regular assemblies for worship, they sang, prayed, and taught. (2) The apostle approved of the presence of the non-Christian. (3) He admonishes the Corinthian Christians to conduct themselves in their meetings so as to convert the unbeliever; cause him to fall down on his face and worship God. (4) Therefore, the apostle approves of singing and prayer in meetings where the alien is to be converted.

Pliny, in his Epistles, book x; Justin Martyr, in his 2nd Apology; and Tertullian, *De Ora*, p. 135, testify that it was the universal custom in all their meetings for worship to open the meeting with singing and prayer (from the

'Christian System,' Campbell). Then, since the apostle approved of the conversion of the unbeliever in the regular assembly for worship which was opened by singing and prayer, it would be more than interesting for Bro. Chaffer to show why the apostle (Paul) would not approve of opening a gospel meeting with singing and prayer.

In contending that it is unscriptural to open gospel meetings with singing and prayer, the brother is making a law where God has made none. If not, then he should have given us chapter and verse.

'But the prophet, that shall speak a word presumptuously in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, that same prophet shall die' (Deut. xviii. 20).

M. S. WHITEHEAD.

SCRIPTURE READINGS

Acts of Apostles 1:1 to 3:18

Introduction.—We identify the writer of this book with the writer of the gospel by Luke by consideration of the first words of each book. How naturally the sequel follows the narrative of the life of Christ, setting forth what Jesus "began" by telling what he *continued* to do and teach (see Luke 24:19). In these verses Luke recapitulates the manifestations of the resurrected Lord, and His ascension. We observe the apostles received proofs enabling them to know beyond doubt that the Jesus with whom they had been in immediate touch for three years, really had risen. He appeared again and again to them during forty days, enlightening their minds by showing the application of the Old Testament teaching to Himself. The kingdom of God (verse 3) must be the Church. There can be no doubt that the promise of baptism in the Holy Spirit was to be fulfilled to those apostles, and is the promise of the Father. Verses 6 to 8 reveal a misunderstanding, corrected almost by a "mind your own business." The "power" of verse 8 is "authority." The programme of work, so effectively described in the book, is set out by the Master. A witness is one who describes what he has seen. These had all seen the resurrected Son of Man. Read Luke 24:50-53 to get the feelings experienced as they witnessed the departure into heaven, and received the promise of return. We rejoice to know that the Saviour's own brothers, and His mother are now identified with His chosen apostles.

The Appointment of Matthias.—Some have thought the apostles were in error in appointing one to take Judas' place. We believe it accords with the scriptures quoted, and that the lot in a case like this does indicate the will of God. The humble approach with desire to do God's will harmonises with other "acts of the apostles," and we learn what the qualifications of an apostle were—to be with Jesus throughout His ministry, and to have seen Him after His resurrection. The number of disciples in this gathering were 120, but there were more elsewhere (see 1 Cor. 15:6). There is difficulty in reconciling the two accounts of Judas' fate, and the purchase of the field (Matt. 27:5).

The Descent of the Holy Spirit.—Seven weeks had passed since the crucifixion, and again Jews from all over the world were gathered in Jerusalem to observe the Feast of Weeks when loaves made from the wheat harvest were offered, and other sacrifices (Lev. 23:15-21). The noise from heaven drew the people together, and the miraculous gift of tongues compelled them to admit a divine visitation. In most cases the Jews from foreign parts would know their own language best, but would understand the Aramaic usually spoken in Palestine at that time. Moreover the subjects spoken of were sacred not secular. The mockers had a very poor case.

Peter explains the Miracle.—It seems possible from verse 1 that all the disciples gathered together shared in the distribution of those tongues of fire, though the strictly grammatical construction limits it to the apostles themselves. In any case the authority given to the apostles was unique and gave them complete divine authority over the Church as the further narratives show. Moreover we now read "Peter, standing with the eleven." His quotation from the prophet Joel (2:28-32) explained the manifestation of power. The signs are indicated in Matt. 27:51-54, and by the darkness from midday to three o'clock at the crucifixion. Many of those now listening to the apostle had been present and been awed by them.

Peter's Gospel Address.—We may summarise as follows: (1) An appeal to the knowledge of his hearers of what Jesus had been in His life; (2) An accusation of their share in the wicked murder; (3) An assurance that what they had so wickedly done had fulfilled God's purpose as plainly set forth in prophecy (with which they would be familiar); (4) A declaration of what those who had now received the miraculous approval of God could bear witness to, namely that He had been raised from the dead in accordance with the divinely inspired David; (5) The exaltation to Lordship

and Christhood of the One they had put to death.

The Results.—Conviction of sin, and fear of the consequences of incurring the divine wrath, filled the hearts of many. They knew to whom they should apply for help, and were given immediate instruction. They had already believed, and repentance and immersion in water were commanded. How any can now defy these instructions is quite difficult to see and yet the bulk of the professing Christian world does not accept the apostolic word to-day. Evidently Peter further urged upon his hearers their duty to God, calling upon each individual soul to "separate" himself from a crooked generation—how crooked it was is demonstrated by the attitude of the majority to Christ's gospel, and the testimony of history, culminating in the siege of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the nation. Having been brought into a condition of guilty fear, and longing for forgiveness, three thousand made the great decision. The same truth and the same instructions accepted with the same glad willingness, will assure men to-day of the same salvation.

The Behaviour of the Disciples. There followed immediately upon the addition of so many to the few disciples who were bound together by a great spiritual love and power (they had been ten days at least in prayers with one accord (1:14) the institution of a new society. It came quite naturally. The apostles had received their Lord's instruction, and the Holy Spirit brought to their remembrance all that they needed to carry on His work. Thus there came the four observances—the apostles' teaching, the fellowship, the breaking of the bread, and the prayers. Those outside the Church were awed by the power manifested at Pentecost, and continued by the apostles. Their teaching and the presence of the Holy Spirit resulted in a wonderful mutual love and an outpouring of material possessions for those in need. Moreover, they had great joy in one another's company, and in offering the worship of their hearts to God in the place of worship—the Temple. They often ate together. There was an overflow of true love. Praise ascended to God continually. The people were pleased with their goodness and generosity. Better still, God increased their numbers daily. It was a growing cause.

The Healing of the Cripple.—Many signs and wonders were being wrought among the people, but this one through its startling public nature is particularly recorded. We can scarcely realise what the sudden cure meant to the cripple. He was so well known a figure that his appearance in the Temple walking, leaping and praising God, brought the multi-

tude together, and presented a great opportunity for witness.

Peter's Second Recorded Speech.—The inclination of the crowd was to praise Peter and John for the cure. It was quickly refuted and refused. The Man they had crucified is again presented to them as the One whose power is being exercised. Ignorance could hardly be a good excuse for murdering a good man, but God's mercy is wonderfully set forth when those who had done the vile deed are offered salvation upon the simple conditions of belief, repentance and immersion.

R. B. SCOTT.

THE SUN

To me, the sun is like the door of heaven
 Thrown open wide, shedding God's
 glory forth,
 Showing the dazzling light of true
 perfection,
 Showing how much a perfect life is
 worth.
 But when the day is cloudy, dull and
 dreary,
 Are not the clouds our own imperfect
 hearts?
 Showing a Father troubled by our folly,
 Showing the truth more glorious when
 they pass.
 And when we feel that all the world's
 against us,
 Let us remember what the Lord has
 done,
 For He has shown us Heaven in His
 bounty.
 Let us look up and see the sun: the Son.
 —Isobel Robinson.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES

Blackridge—On the evening of November 23rd, a young married woman, Mrs. Emily Whittaker, accepted Jesus as her Saviour and was baptised before many witnesses. We pray that she may be faithful to her Lord.

J. KERR.

Blackridge, West Lothian.—Rally Observations. An idea fostered in the minds of some of the brethren for some considerable time began to take shape and grow, until on Saturday, November 26th, 1949, it was made manifest.

Special outdoor meetings were scheduled to begin at 3 p.m., but brethren were indeed slow in arriving, thus retarding the commencement of these. The Blackridge brethren, however, were determined to carry on in spite of difficulty, as they feel that a great deal can be achieved by such

meetings. The success of this meeting was due to the support of visiting brethren.

At the outdoor meetings, twenty-one brethren attended, and the West End of Blackridge was taken as the area. Three such meetings were held in all, at which Bren. F. Worgan, T. Kemp, and J. B. Steele were the speakers. Approximately fifty sat down to tea.

After tea, the congregation assembled in the main hall of the meeting-house and the evening session began under the able chairmanship of Bro. T. Kemp. Bro. J. B. Steele was called upon to give a welcome on behalf of the Blackridge brethren. Bro. Len Morgan was the first speaker and gave a most impressive survey of "World Evangelisation." Bro. W. Steele used the "Penitent Robber on the Cross" as an illustration to preach the gospel, and Bro. F. Worgan showed clearly the importance, the identity, and the induction into "The Church."

Almost every assembly in the Slamanan district was represented. Several who attended expressed that they had had a mountain-top experience, and had been fed abundantly with spiritual food.

J. B. STEELE.

Blackpool (Gadsby Street).—The Church celebrated its thirtieth Anniversary, on December 3rd and 4th, and although the weather was not too kind, inspiring meetings were held. On Saturday, a good number of visitors from Nelson, Fleetwood, and Blackburn sat down to tea, and the evening service will long be remembered by all. Bro. Alec Carson, of Nelson, ably presided, and various items of song and recitation were given by our own and visiting members, after which we rejoiced to hear once again our beloved and esteemed Brother, Walter Crosthwaite. He gave an inspiring address on the 'Model Church,' and an uncompromising appeal to keep to the Word of Truth at all costs. We could not feel anything but strengthened in the knowledge that the 'old paths' are the right ones and as long as we keep to them we are on and in 'the way.'

The Lord's Day morning service was indeed a time of uplift and refreshment. Bro. Crosthwaite's exhortation on 'Peter's Fall' gave all a deep well of thought to draw on.

The brethren from Fleetwood came along in full force for the evening service. Bro. A. L. Frith presiding. In a few homely remarks, he outlined the early years of the Blackpool Church, after which Bro. Crosthwaite addressed the meeting on the 'Second Coming of Christ,' showing how the promises of God are always kept to the last letter.

We are deeply indebted to Bro. Crosthwaite for his services and exhortations, and pray that he will be spared for many years to come, and that Sister Crosthwaite will soon be restored to health,

We sincerely thank those who came along to help us from inland Churches, for only those who reside in a coast town, especially a holiday resort, know of the hard struggle it is during the season to carry on, and both the Blackpool and Fleetwood Churches would be helped and encouraged if more visitors would assist by their presence and help during their stay on holiday.

E. WINTER.

Kentish Town.—We rejoice to record a further addition to our membership through the decision of Leslie Venn to render willing obedience to His Lord. He was immersed on Wednesday, November 30th. May he be greatly blessed and much used in Christ's service.

R.B.S.

OBITUARY

Portknockie.—On Tuesday, November 22nd, at the age of eighty-six years, a beloved and greatly esteemed sister in Christ, Barbara Robertson (Findochty) passed peacefully to her rest. Baptised seventy years ago, at a time of great opposition and criticism in her small village to any who obeyed their Lord in his own appointed way, though young she was always able to give a reason of the hope within her. She had been a most devoted member of the Church and although bedridden for the last five years her interest in the Church never waned. It was a joy to visit her and to witness her gentle disposition and her faith in her Lord. To know and converse with her made one extremely conscious of her nearness to her Saviour. We regret the loss, but rejoice in her release from suffering, to join that great cloud of witnesses who have gone on before and who will receive that 'well done.' A well-deserved tribute was paid by Bro. John Mair, who conducted the funeral service both in the house and at the graveside. Our sympathy goes out to her family, and especially her daughter, Sister McKay, who is isolated in Grimsby.

M. MAIR.

GOLDEN WEDDING

On December 9th, 1949, Bro. and Sis. H. Winter, of Blackpool, celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of their wedding. For some years, they were in fellowship with the Church at Mansfield. On removing to Blackpool, they sought out some members residing there, and a Church of Christ was formed in October, 1919. Bro. and Sis. Winter worked hard, and, with the help of others, have kept the Church going until now. Seaside towns (especially Blackpool) are not easy places for spiritual work. However, Bro. and Sis. Winter have seen many pass

through the Church, some of whom are now meeting with Churches of Christ in other towns, and some have gone to be with Christ. They have the joy of seeing their two sons and their wives in the Church, and also a grandson and his wife.

On a recent visit to Blackpool, it was very pleasing to see their grandson ably presiding at the Lord's Table.

Many will join us in heartiest congratulations to Bro. and Sis. Winter, and in best wishes for their future years.

—EDITOR.

LEAN HARD

Lean hard, lean hard, on Jesus,
Only He can show the way,
The cares of life so baffle one,
Perplex and lead astray.

The fight gets harder every day
And Satan presses sore;
The winds are often contrary;
We need Christ more and more.

Then lean, dear soul, on Jesus,
Thus, girded by His strength,
We yet shall be triumphant
And victory own at length.

—S. Jackson.

MISSING LETTERS

We have heard of letters sent to us which have not been delivered. If any have not received replies to their letters (within reasonable time) please write again.—Editor.

COMING EVENT

The Annual Social Gathering of the Churches of Christ in the Slamannan district will be held (D.V.) on Monday, January 2nd, 1950 in the Meeting Hall, Blackridge at 1 p.m. Chairman, Bro. D. Dougall. Speakers: Bren. Tom Kemp and Frank Worgan.

Glasgow (Hospital Street).—Annual Social Meeting, Saturday, February 11th, 1950. Tea at 4.30 p.m., St. Mungo's Halls, 466 Ballater Street. Chairman: Bro. A. H. Odd; speakers: Brethren D. Dougall and A. Gardiner, Junr. Please inform Bro. A. B. Morton, 183 Pollok Street, Glasgow, C.5., of your intention to come. A hearty invitation to all.

Morley.—Preliminary announcement. Church Anniversary, Saturday and Sunday, February 25th, and 26th, 1950. Tea and public meeting. Speakers (D.V.): Bren. Frank Worgan and Andrew Gardiner.