

The **SCRIPTURE STANDARD**

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

VOL. 31. No. 11.

NOVEMBER, 1964

Progress towards Unity of the Churches

IN 1948 the Lund (Sweden) Conference of the World Council of Churches called upon the Churches to "act together in all matters except those in which deep differences of conviction compel them to act separately." In 1960, twelve years later, "this just had not been done," to quote a writer in the "Guardian." But in the last four years the movement for the uniting of the many denominations into one Church has rapidly gained momentum.

This statement may sound exaggerated in the light of the setting of the date 1980 as the target for the bringing together of the various Churches comprising the Ecumenical Movement. This target was fixed at the recent Faith and Order Conference of the British Churches at Nottingham. Some church leaders think this goal too cautious and unimaginative, and are impatient for more vigorous activity towards an earlier union. Others think the date too optimistic and unrealistic.

Problems and Difficulties

We think the latter view more likely to be right. For, while there is the general desire for union, it is being found that more and more obstacles are arising and likely still to arise. Desires and hopes are now having to be translated into discussions and action upon doctrinal matters. These problems, it is realised, will be impossible of solution through common aims and fellow-feelings. For they are doctrinal and vital. Treasured traditions and tenaciously held beliefs will have to go if unity is to be not only outward but in heart. A writer in the "British Weekly" of October 1st puts it thus:—

"It is good that the first Resolution from the Nottingham Faith and Order Conference should call for a recognition of the overwhelming importance of those doctrines of the Christian Faith upon which we are united. There are those who say: Doctrine divides; let us not consider it. How foolish this is. There can be no real unity except in the truth. It is false doctrine which divides.

"The Resolutions recognise this for they go on to affirm that standards of belief are an essential element in the life of the Church.

Foundations

"Here, however, a difficulty arises, for we are not told how we are to agree just what it is that in the Christian faith unites us, or how to determine these essential standards of belief. The two orthodox grounds of agreement, Scripture and tradition, are to be denied us it would seem for, the Resolutions state, any discussion of the relation between the two is of secondary importance and may be left to be explored within the united Church.

"This is tantamount to saying: First we'll build the house. And then we'll decide how to agree upon the foundations."

What are the foundations upon which this agreement is to be built? All, even the Roman Catholic Church, which takes no part in the Ecumenical Movement—except within its own body—would reply, "The Scriptures." The R.C. Church would, of course, also make tradition of the Church of equal authority with scripture.

Thus almost all the denominations cling to the Bible as the authority for the existence and guidance of the church. But we fear that much of this testimony to the Bible is lip-service, for, in reading reports of these Ecumenical meetings one is struck by the almost complete absence of reference to the Bible, especially the

New Testament. And no wonder: for in the light of scripture few of their traditions and beliefs would stand examination. This makes it apparent that such union as is striven for will be on insecure and human foundations, not on the foundation "which has been laid, which is Jesus Christ." Nor will the oneness be that of the seven Ones in Ephesians 4, especially the "one body, one faith, one baptism."

The Answer to the Problems

Already one sees the insoluble problems of, for example, baptism and the ministry being raised; insoluble, that is to say, apart from the full acceptance of N.T. authority on these matters. The insistence of certain Churches on Episcopacy (in the traditional, not the Biblical sense) has already been seen as a great barrier to the union of the Church of England and the Methodist Church. And it will be even more of a stumbling-block to other bodies than the Methodists. This is not our own view merely, but the view of many deeply interested and involved in the movement for union. A letter in the "British Weekly" of October 1st, says on this topic:

"I see the report of the opening of the Faith and Order Conference at Nottingham quotes a question posed by the Bishop of Bristol: Why do Christians not unite? and suggests there are relatively few theological disagreements which justify continued separation.

"The Bishop must surely know the answer to his question. The principal doctrine which makes Church Unity—as the Ecumenical Movement is seeking to attain it—impossible is Episcopacy and the Anglican insistence upon it. This is a question upon which it appears the Anglican Church itself is divided. Some, a minority, interpret it in a way which would be acceptable to many non-episcopalians while others insist upon a sacerdotal emphasis which is and must be intolerable to any real Freechurchman. The valuable contribution the Anglicans could make is a definition of episcopacy which is agreed and accepted by all the factions within the establishment. Those invited to introduce episcopacy into their systems would then know to what it is they are expected to submit."

As regards baptism, all can see, although they do not admit it, that the only true form and purpose of baptism are set out in the N.T. This question has hardly been faced as yet. But it is looming ever larger and more inevitable. Compromises are being explored and suggested. Questions are being asked, and left unanswered. Thus, in the "Guardian" of September 24th, Wilfred Whittle writes:

"Since the Reformation baptism has divided the Churches. Is it necessary at all (Quakers say no) and if it is, can children be thus admitted to membership of the Church, or should it be for adults only? Here again the section on Membership said these issues would be resolved as the Churches grew together; in a united Church the different practices could coexist. (One small united Free Church in Stockholm expresses baptismal coexistence by incorporating a retractable font, which reveals when slid back a baptistery underneath)."

To such ridiculous shifts do men prefer to be put rather than acting upon the clear, simple doctrine of the word of God.

That is the answer to all the problems. They are made to appear vast because men are evading the perfectly obvious answers to them. Again we repeat that union on any other ground than the N.T. is not worth striving for. It is to build a house upon sand: the greater the building the more dangerous, if it be not upon a solid and safe foundation. And that foundation has already been laid. Once we obey scripture teaching we are one, without gigantic efforts at enormous cost being made to bring about unity.

EDITOR.

The Lord's Supper How should it be observed?

(Reprint of a booklet sent from the United States).

ORIGIN OF INDIVIDUAL CUPS

IN the year 1872, botanist Julius Cohn laid the foundation for bacteriology. This resulted in an acute awareness and fear of microbes. Because of this, J. G. Thomas, a medical doctor and Presbyterian preacher, became greatly concerned about his congregation being endangered by drinking after one another in their observance of the Lord's Supper. At first he had each communicant bring his own cup, which was first scraped with carbolic acid and then examined under a powerful microscope to be certain all microbes had been killed. One can easily imagine the confusion which resulted from these extreme measures.

By and by, Dr. Thomas conceived the idea of small individual communion cups which would better fit his distressing need. Thus, Dr. Thomas invented the individual communion cups and was granted a patent on them. The Market Street Presbyterian Church of Lima, Ohio was the first to use individual communion cups in 1894. For all the years previous to this, back to that night in the upper room, those who partook of the Lord's Supper had shared a drinking vessel. But fear of little unseen microbes put an end to this ancient and Biblical practice.

Opposition in America

Most denominations were slow to accept this new practice, and no church of Christ did for over 25 years. Many of our older people can remember when this was not a practice generally among the churches. Hear what brother David Lipscomb wrote in the "Gospel Advocate," May 22nd, 1913, in an article entitled "Individual Communion":

"Communion is a joint participation of two or more in one work or service. The communion of the Lord's supper is the joint participation of the members in the loaf and cup. Paul says: 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.' (1 Cor. 10:16). This shows the communion of the many in one cup and one bread. To divide the cup and bread into many parts and for each to partake of his own bread and cup destroys the idea of communion. It is certain the bread and cup were not divided into many parts in the days of Jesus and the apostles.

"The motives that prompt a change in the services of Christians speak much for their loyalty and fidelity to God. The most earthly, and sensual spirit is that which changes merely to be like the world. The disposition to be like the world in its curses and follies drags Christians down to the fellowship of the world. What is the motive that leads to the adoption of the individual cups in the Lord's supper? It is usually said to be for the health of the partakers. Is this true? In the church house there are hundreds of people breathing and interbreathing the atmosphere of the room. It thus becomes infected and impregnated with all the diseases of the body, the stomach, the catarrhal phlegm of the nose, the mouth, the throat, with all the fetid effluvia from all parts of these changing and decaying bodies. This impregnated atmosphere is re-poisoned and interbreathed hundreds of times in the house where all are congregated; and some, while doing this, complain and find fault and change the appointments of God to avoid taking a crumb of bread or a sup of wine because others have partaken of the same. Certainly these persons are doing worse than straining out gnats and swallowing camels. An element of faith enters into all services. The Bible tells us that in doing the will of God with fidelity the blessings of God will come upon us. (Ps. 84:11).

"No-one ever heard of an affliction coming on a child of God for partaking of the memorials of his love to a lost and ruined world. The desire to change the order established by Jesus and the apostles indicates a willingness to turn from the appointments of God in order to go with the ways of the world. Such a spirit does not fit us to serve God here or to live with him in the world to come. It is safe to both bodily and spiritual health to continue in the ways in which Jesus and the apostles walked."

The Original Practice of the Church

Alexander Campbell, 64 years before the germ scare brought about a change in the Lord's supper, wrote in the "Millennial Harbinger," December, 1830, in an article entitled, "On the Lord's Table, Proposition III," the following: "On the Lord's Table there is of necessity one loaf. The necessity is not that of a positive law enjoining one loaf and only one as a ritual of Moses enjoined 12 loaves. But it is a necessity arising from the meaning of the institution as explained by the apostles. As there is but one literal body and but one mystical and one figurative body having many members; so there must be but one loaf. The apostles insist upon this (1 Cor. 10:17). Because there is but one loaf we the many are one body, for we are all partakers of the one loaf."

In the generation following the apostles, the church of Christ used one loaf and one cup in observing the Lord's supper. Justin Martyr (100-165 A.D.) writes, in chapter 65 of his "Apologist," that in the Lord's supper one loaf of bread and one cup of wine were used in communion by the disciples to remember their crucified Lord and saviour Jesus Christ.

But many are inclined to say, "What difference does that make?" "They didn't know of the existence of germs then; and they had smaller congregations than we do now." We are told that God has just told us to commune and that the details are unimportant, and are therefore left to us. But is this true? Listen to the scrip-

tures on the subject: "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you." (1 Cor. 11:2). By this, Paul demanded that his readers of all ages keep the ordinances as he delivered them. They must be kept, not in some manner, or as they liked, but as he gave them—that is, without addition or subtraction. Now, in the same chapter, he tells how he delivered the Lord's supper. "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. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped saying: This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." (1 Cor. 11:23-25). Notice how careful Paul is that the church get this institution just as he had received it from the Lord, and that they keep it just that way. After he had showed them how the Lord observed both the bread and the cup he said, "THIS DO." By saying this he was simply re-emphasising what he had said in the beginning, that they should hold fast the ordinances as he had delivered them. Thus in the plainest language possible, Inspiration has said, don't change a thing, do it exactly as it was given to you.

One Cup is Right

In reality the church, though we sometimes lose sight of the fact, has never been divided over how many loaves or cups the Lord used in instituting His supper. There is rather virtually complete agreement that he used one loaf and one cup. The only complete set of commentaries written by church of Christ writers is published by the Gospel Advocate Company. In the book on Mark notice the comments on chapter 14, verses 22 and 23: "He took bread—or a loaf. Footnote: One of the thin flat loaves of the country, made without leaven of any kind. A loaf does not mean two or more loaves, but one. The loaf, which was one, points to the body of Christ. Jesus had one body which he offered for the sins of the world and the loaf represents that one body. Two loaves on the Lord's table are out of place and have no divine sanction. One loaf is safe, two are doubtful, to say the least. It is always safe to be on the safe side." Then in the same commentary we read in Mark 14:23, "A cup is one, not two nor a dozen." The question is not HOW the Lord did it, but rather do we have to observe it in the same way the Lord did? The apostle Paul declared we do.

The Bible teaches in four, and only four, ways. They are: (1) statement, (2) command, (3) example, and (4) necessary inference. If a practice is not taught by at least one of these ways, it is not taught at all, and one is going beyond God's word to engage in it. (2 John 9: "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God"). The use of a common communion vessel is taught by all these methods. By command—Matt. 26:27, "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it." The "ye all" is like our southern "you all" and means "all of you." Wilson's translation renders it, "Drink all of you out of it." By example—Mark 14:23, "And he took the cup and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it." Again, Wilson's translation says, "they all drank out of it." Weymouth's translation states, "they all drank from it." By statement (1 Cor. 10:16): "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" By necessary inference (1 Cor. 11:28): "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." This verse, as well as all those discussing the Lord's supper, clearly infers they all ate of one bread and drank of the same cup.

We solemnly ask, where is the statement saying the early Christians used individual communion cups? Where is there a command for their use or an example of it? Where does Biblical language even infer they were used? We are taught by the apostle Peter to make our "calling and election sure." To commune in the manner the Lord did is the safe way.

We send this paper forth in a peaceful spirit, hoping to provoke nothing more than an honest investigation of God's word; and with a prayer that such an investigation will draw Christians into closer unity and us all closer to God.

“ Study ”

WHEN Paul was writing his second epistle to his true child in the faith, he urged him to “give diligence,” or “study,” to show himself approved unto God as a preacher who had no need to be ashamed, “rightly dividing,” or “handling aright,” the word of truth. (2 Tim. 2 : 15).

The great apostle was a student. He had sat at the feet of Gamaliel. He knew what it meant to “give diligence,” or “to study.” He knew that he was not charting an easy course for Timothy’s intellectual activities. “Till I come,” said he, “give heed to reading,” literally keep your mind on your reading—study. (1 Tim. 4:13). H. Leo Boles, for years before his death, read the epistles to Timothy every week to keep before him the duties of a preacher of the gospel. He kept his mind on these things.

There are considerations which make this advice to Timothy significant. Some of these we mention in this connection.

1. Timothy had enjoyed the early privileges which are the inalienable right of every child. He had been taught the Scriptures from childhood. Said Paul: “From a babe thou hast known the sacred writings which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.” (2 Tim. 3:15). Eunice, despite the fact that her husband was a Greek—and may not have co-operated with her in the training of their child—saw to it that the boy was thoroughly grounded in the sacred writings. She could have neglected the teaching and rearing of her child, while busied in the giddy whirl of society in the first century, but she did not. If we may judge from her works, she accounted the proper upbringing of her son as one of the most important opportunities and responsibilities of her life. A child is most fortunate to have a mother like Eunice. Yet the fine instruction Timothy received in childhood did not dispense with the necessity for study in his young manhood.

2. This young man Timothy had been converted by Paul on his first missionary journey. He joined Paul on the second missionary journey. He was with Paul in Troas when the call of the Macedonian was heard. Together with Paul, Silas and Luke he crossed the Hellespont for the shores of Europe. With these men he helped plant the gospel in Philippi. He was with Paul off and on to the time of his last imprisonment. He had enjoyed the very greatest advantages in being associated so much with Paul. Yet this long association with Paul did not relieve Timothy of the need to study.

3. During the apostolic labours of Paul, many men had come under his influence and had learned from his teaching. Such men as Barnabas, Aquila, Philemon, Epaphroditus, Silas, Titus and Luke had been his associates; and at times the association involved suffering and persecution. Yet when Paul reviewed his long life and his many companions in labour, travel and suffering, he said: “I hope in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy shortly unto you, that I also may be of good comfort, when I know your state. For I have no man likeminded, who will care truly for your state.” (Phil. 2: 19, 20). Of the then available men, no other was like-minded as Timothy. This is a high commendation from one who was never guilty of flattery. It puts Timothy, in some respects, in a class by himself. But this rare distinction does not set Timothy above the necessity for study.

4. Finally, Timothy had received some unusual gift or gifts by the laying on of hands and prophecy. “Neglect not the gift that is in thee,” said Paul, “which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.” (1 Tim. 4:14). Again, “Stir up the gift of God, which is in thee through the laying on of hands and prophecy. “Neglect not the gift that is in thee,” said Paul, “which that had been bestowed on Timothy by the laying on of hands. It was a gift that would better qualify him for the work of an evangelist. It was a distinct asset to him as a preacher of the gospel. It should be remembered, however, that, regardless of the nature of the gift, it was not such as to give him qualifications that would render study unnecessary. Even inspired men had to study. Luke, the writer of the Gospel of Luke and Acts of Apostles, said: “It seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus.” (Luke 1:3). Luke was inspired; yet, he

"traced the course of all things accurately." He made investigation under inspiration. He has given us the result of his research. His example shows that inspiration did not impart omniscience.

If, under the circumstances, it was necessary then for Timothy to study and Luke to investigate in order to discharge their respective tasks, surely we should not allow ourselves to conclude that we can discharge our duties now as ministers of the word without diligent study. It is the price levied on the possessor of knowledge. The old geometer Euclid was right when he said to the proud young prince, "There is no royal road to geometry." There is no royal road to a knowledge of God's word.

Young man, learn all you can as soon as you can. The sooner you learn it the longer you can use it.

"Gospel Advocate."

A Christian and a Christian only

WHEN one who hears the gospel of Christ, believes it and then is led to repentance and baptism upon a confession of faith in Christ, he becomes a Christian and a Christian only. (Acts 2:38; 8:26-39; 22:8-16) It requires more than obedience to the Lord's way to be more than a Christian. In the divided state of Christendom people claim to be Christians but then a label is worn to identify the particular "brand" of Christian they propose to be. They claim the name Christian but "plus" another name that is human in origin. The "plus" religious name may be designated after a man, a Bible doctrine, or a form of church government.

Why not wear the name "Christian" without adding any other designation? Please consider these three Bible reasons for being a Christian only:

1. **We honour Christ.** By wearing the name Christian we honour Christ. Each time we pronounce the name we of necessity speak the name of Christ. A Christian is a follower or disciple of Christ. Since Christ is Saviour, Son of God and founder of Christianity, it is reasonable that men should honour him by wearing his name. He is to be pre-eminent in all things (Col. 1:18) and this includes the name we wear.

His name is "above every name." (Phil. 2:9). No religious name should be worn in preference to the name Christian. Is it not better to wear Christ's name than that of one who is a mere man? His name is a "worthy name" for we read, "Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called?" (James 2:7).

The church is the bride of Christ. (Rom. 7:4; 2 Cor. 11:2). It is inconceivable that any thoughtful person married to Christ would really consider wearing the name of another. In human affairs it is understood that the bride takes her husband's name and she does it with joy and with the desire to honour him.

"Nothing in a name," we are advised. How can this be? Luke records, "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts 4:12).

2. **It is undenominational.** The "ecumenical" idea has an appeal to some who declare they are tired of division. One barrier to unity is the name by which men are called. Names with much tradition attached to them as well as any other human names are responsible in part for division. Party names foster division. Partyism is condemned. (1 Cor. 1:10-16). The world can never be united on any denominational name in existence. The only name on which it could ever unify is the name Christ, which is undenominational.

3. **We follow the Bible example.** In fulfilment of an Old Testament prophecy that God's people would be called by "a new name" (Isa. 56:5; 62:2) the "disciples were called Christians first in Antioch" (Acts 11:26). King Agrippa said to Paul, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." (Acts 26:28). Peter declared, "Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf." (1 Pet. 4:16).

We cannot improve on the name for God's people used in the beginning of Christianity. When we wear the name Christian we are in the company of Paul, Peter and the other inspired apostles.

Be only a Christian

By being only a Christian you honour Christ, you wear a non-divisive name and you follow the Bible example. Martin Luther, the sixteenth century reformer, begged, "Do not call yourselves Lutherans." John Wesley said, "I would to God all party names were forgotten." Alexander Campbell stated, "Abandon all party names and take the name Christian."

It is right, reasonable and scriptural to be a Christian only. Why not become a Christian?

—E. C. Gardner, "Gospel Advocate."



(Conducted by
A. E. Winstanley,
43a Church Road,
Tunbridge Wells,
Kent).

A STRANGE CHOICE?

IF you had to choose someone to do a special job, what traits of character would you look for? Probably high on your list would be this: trustworthiness.

Well, Jacob had a rather special place in the purpose of God—like his father Isaac and his grandfather Abraham before him. (See Genesis 28:10-15). God changed this man's name to Israel, and his sons became heads of the twelve tribes—the Israelites. But what sort of a man was this Jacob?—

SUPLANTER

It isn't likely you'd have liked him as a young man. The Bible's first picture of him is far from pretty. Read Genesis 25:29-34. His brother Esau, desperately hungry, asked for food. What did Jacob do? He bargained with him: "Sell me first of all your birthright." The birthright was normally conferred on the elder brother (these two were twins but Esau was the "firstborn") and he inherited his father's place as head of the family. Esau didn't seem to care—"I am about to die," he said, "What good is the birthright to me?" Wily Jacob still wasn't satisfied: "Swear to me this day," he insisted. So Esau, with a solemn oath, gave up his birthright to Jacob for "a mess of meat."

DECEIVER

He is seen in a worse light (if that's possible) in Genesis 27. This time it was Isaac's blessing he wanted. He conspired with his mother to deceive a blind, sick old man to steal the coveted blessing. (The blessing was the solemn conferring of the birthright by the head of the family upon his successor, usually given when the head or chief expected soon to die, verse 4).

How despicably Jacob behaved. (1) He acted a lie—wearing Esau's clothes and putting skins on his hands and neck. (2) He had to bolster up the pretence by telling a lie to his father: "Who art thou, my son?" said the old man. He answered,

"I am Esau, thy firstborn; I have done as thou badest me. . . ." (3) He even involved God in his lying deceit. Isaac said, "How is it that thou has found it (the venison) so quickly?" He replied: "Because the Lord thy God hath sent me good speed."

The old man was still troubled. He felt that something was wrong, but he knew not what. "He felt him and said, 'The voice is Jacob's voice but the hands are the hands of Esau,' and he discerned him not because his hands were hairy. . . ." Once more he questions: "Art thou my very son, Esau?" and again the ready lie is given, "I am." So Isaac gave Jacob the first-born's blessing.

You wouldn't say there was much that was commendable in Jacob—the Supplanter—would you?

PETER

There is something similar in Jesus' dealings with Peter. Peter was a man with many faults. He was very impetuous. He was full of his own importance (swelled-headed if you like) and more loudly than any he promised never to let Jesus down. Others might—but not he. If needs be, he'd die with his Master. But he really plumbed the depths when he denied his Lord with oaths and curses.

And yet, what a great man he became. And of course the same is true of Jacob. Poor material to begin with, very poor stuff it seemed, but they became great men of God.

POTENTIAL

"The Lord seeth not as man seeth. . . ." God saw Jacob—just as Jesus saw Peter—not merely as he was, but as he could be. God took the potential greatness and made of it something really worthwhile.

YOU AND I

You and I know well that we have more than enough of "character defects," don't we? There is plenty of Jacob—and/or Peter—in any one of us. Of

course Satan would like us to allow these failures or inclinations to discourage us and destroy our usefulness. We shall be foolish indeed if we let him succeed. The full story of Jacob's life is: **Jacob and God. Of Peter's: Peter and his Saviour.** Never forget it. It's the same for us today. For the Christian, it isn't a case of just me against "the world, the flesh and the devil." It is **HE AND ME TOGETHER.** He—Jesus—has promised it: "I will in no wise fail thee, neither will I in any wise forsake thee." (Josh. 1:5, Heb. 13:5). This is not a theory. It is a fact. He is with us, and, if we are willing to let him, he will make of us something great, useful and good. Paul knew it. He said: "I can do all things through Christ, who strengtheneth me." Let's allow God to make us, break us, and use us as he will.

A. E. Winstanley.

YOUTH AND THE CHURCH

It is true that among many young people today there is a real groping after the essential things of Christianity and a real scorn of the inessential. One sixth form boy said to the writer: "Our church is just a social club. I can go to one sort of entertainment or lecture every night in the week, but I don't think that's what the church is for. There's nothing to challenge us or call out the best in us." (J. W. Harmer).

* * *

UNLESS we pray for others we are lacking in that spirit in which alone we can pray hopefully for ourselves, and we are living in neglect of a prime duty to God's dear ones who need and deserve our prayers.—Clay Trumbull.

* * *

THE Lord's purpose in coming to dwell in your heart is to enable you to do His work. There are those who think only in terms of the joy of sitting at His feet and hearing His Word, and become Pietists or Quietists, without a thought of the activity which should result from dwelling in the King's presence.—A. T. Houghton.

* * *

GET a new vision on the pattern of God's plan. Pray that you may see things as it were from His point of view. God's love still stands when all other things have fallen, and the victory of Jesus Christ is the greatest reality.

* * *

Avarice reigns most in those who have but few good qualities to recommend them. It is a weed that will grow in barren soil.—Hughes.

YOU have no need to fear if you let Christ have full possession, because, although He is the Christ of the searching gaze, and the Christ of infinite holiness, He is also the Christ of exquisite tenderness. Do not be afraid to trust Him. Let Him have every part of your being.—W. H. Aldis.

* * *

A **LIFE** need not be great to be beautiful. There may be as much beauty in a tiny flower as in a majestic tree, in a little gem as one great jewel. A beautiful life is one that fulfils its mission in this world, that is what God made it to be, and does what God made it to do.

* * *

THESE two gifts, grace and righteousness, are the two characterising effects of the work of Christ. All our sins are taken from us and placed to the account of the Saviour. That is grace, abundance of grace. All the righteousness of God is placed to the account of the individual believer: that is the abundance of the gift of righteousness.

SCRIPTURE READINGS

NOVEMBER, 1964

- 1—Nehemiah 8
- 8—Job 19
- 15—2 Kings 2:1-18
- 22—2 Kings 8:8-23
- 29—Joshua 1
- 1 Cor. 14:13-40
- 1 Cor. 15:1-34
- 1 Cor. 15:35-56
- 1 Cor. 16
- Acts 18:24 to 19:20

THE GOSPEL
(1 Corinthians 15)

HERE is a summary of what the gospel is in Paul's view. Paul preached it; the other apostles preached it; the Corinthian Christians received it; they stand by it and in it; they are saved by it—provided that they continue in it. It was "preached unto you with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven" (1 Peter 1:12).

The primary meaning of the word is simply "good news." Much more is involved, but it is the only means of salvation for sinful man. It consists of "facts to be believed, commands to be obeyed and promises to be received," but here Paul is concerned with the first of these points. The great and essential fact is the resurrection of Christ. No one would bother to deny that He was born and lived, even if they dispute the manner of His birth. So it was needless to state this.

Point 1: Christ died. He lived a perfect life—but He died. He did not die because He deserved to die, as all other

men do, but because by dying He made forgiveness possible for sinners. "It is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" (1 Tim. 1:15). This happened not by chance, but by previous planning—according to the Scriptures.

Point 2: He was buried. This was necessary as a proof of His rising again from the dead. It was not possible for anyone to dispute His death. All who were present knew it because they saw Him die, and those who did not (possibly Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus) were perfectly certain of it. The spear pierced His side, and to quote the eye-witness, John, there came forth blood and water. Roman soldiers never made a mistake on this point, and four were there with the centurion. Because of the certainty of His death, He was buried, and not one person expected Him to rise. He never lied to, nor deceived His disciples, nor anyone else at any time, but they did not believe that resurrection was possible. They said (Luke 24:21) "We trusted that it was He who should redeem Israel," and thought further "But now we know it was not." Because God had allowed Him to be put to death in this shameful and "impossible" way for such a righteous man, their hopes had gone. We have the same sort of scepticism in the minds of men today, and resurrection is the answer to the doubt. The burial of Jesus was likewise planned beforehand—according to the Scriptures—with supreme accuracy (Isiah 53:9).

Point 3: He was raised. No one has ever raised Himself from death before, nor has since. There are cases of raising the dead in Scripture, particularly in the life of Jesus Himself, but all those died subsequently. Miracles of this kind have been reported from time to time though never very well authenticated, and it is self-evident without proof that "in Adam all die." Strangely the only people who took precautions against Jesus rising were His enemies (Matt. 27:62-66), but they entirely misjudged His disciples. Or is it possible that they had misgivings in their wicked hearts? In some senses they were more intellectually capable of judging the character and work of Jesus than His simple-minded disciples, who did not seem to have remembered His words on this question, as did the scribes and Pharisees. The precaution was childish in the light of the other teachings and the mighty works of Jesus. Did not Jesus compare (in prayer) the two kinds of mind—the "wise and understanding" and "babes" (Math. 11:25)? Intellectual superiority can be blind and dangerous, but honesty never. However, His rising did happen just as He said, and as the Scriptures had foretold. His disciples of course realised this afterwards and their

faith—already by that time strong, was confirmed. We note what appears to be a discrepancy as to time, due to the use of two phrases—"the third day" and "three days and three nights"—which to us mean something different, but obviously not to those who wrote the records. We cannot perhaps be certain, in consequence, of the day of the week in which Jesus suffered crucifixion, but there is one certain date, and that is the first day of the week, the day of resurrection. That is why through subsequent history this day has been marked out for the Christian's observation of "the breaking of bread," "the Lord's supper." Do not let us confuse it with the Sabbath. It is not a day of inactivity, but a day of worship, refreshment, re-creation (not play), labour for God. If we use it for our pleasures, it will be to our loss, but if we use it for remembrance of Jesus and special service for Him, we shall grow in grace and His knowledge.

Point 4: He appeared. History is unexplainable without the resurrection, and the proof of the resurrection is the appearances of Jesus during those wonderful forty days (Acts 1:3), the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost and the subsequent lives and works of His followers—all according to the Scriptures. Paul was able to add his own personal contact with the Saviour "out of due time." The evidence is complete, is beyond reasonable doubt when the majority of five hundred witnesses living twenty five years (after the assumed date of this letter) can be quoted for testimony. It has been asked why Jesus did not show Himself to the unbelieving scribes and Pharisees, and we can only hint at the possibility that such a revelation would have removed their opportunity of repentance and salvation, offered in the gospel. Certainly it was a deliberate design of God that Jesus should appear "not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead": thus did Peter explain to Cornelius (Acts 10:40).

R. B. SCOTT.

CORRESPONDENCE

WHITHER NOW?

Reading the two contributions, "Whither Now?" compels one to think very deeply. After such thought one is bewildered, trying to imagine what elders and deacons have been doing in allowing things to assume such proportions, scarcely saying a word, in some cases even acquiescing. I am in no sense desiring to rebuke. On the contrary I am appealing for true ruling or guidance on this important matter.

Not a single brother holding office in the Lord's church anywhere, can say he has never read Matthew 7. Why then do they divorce themselves from the divine counsel in refusing to accept the teaching of our all-wise Elder Brother: "By their fruits, ye shall know them"? Instead of being fed on the sincere milk of the word, we, the flock, are being fed on those fruits, which produce division and disunity, while at the same time we are asking for our Lord's prayer to be answered. This is hypocrisy of the first order, which God detests and says is an abomination to Him.

There is no need to name those who are sowing the seeds of dissension: we have only to examine the fruits. Then withdraw ourselves and our support from them. "Come ye out from among them and be separate." Jesus says (Rev. 22:19), he that addeth to or taketh away from His precious word, his part shall be taken away from the tree of life. Any tampering with God's word is unfaithfulness; all failure comes through unfaithfulness. Let us, then, determine to become more and still more faithful. We need Paul's advice in 1 Cor. 15:58; also 1 Cor. 10. 13-14.

Some have said, regarding the publishing of articles by those not adhering strictly to God's word: "Cancel your order for 'S.S.'" To this, I say unhesitatingly, increase the "S.S." Do all in your power to support it, by circulation and interest. Only by such action, can we hope to attain its former plea—"The exaltation of God's Word."

The Psalmist says—"They word is a lamp unto my feet." Let us use the lamp, avoiding all occasions of stumbling. Jesus says, "If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch." Therefore let us walk as the children of light, using no innovations of man, purporting to be super-light or knowledge. Trust only in Jesus and His word. He makes no false claims. He is the light of the world. God grant us the courage to follow that light.

J. A. Gregory.

(Following is an extract from a letter dated August 14th, 1964, from our American brother Carl Ketcherside to Bro. Paul Jones):—

"We think that the paper is getting better all of the time and I have been especially pleased with it. I am not unaware of the fact that we have differences of temperament, attitude, background, etc., with which to deal, and I know that some of the things in American papers seem to be so utterly irrelevant to the brethren in Britain (and to us as well). Yet we are one body, and I never lose sight of the fact that men . . . who are indwelt of the Spirit, are doing your best under God's

providence, to strengthen the cause of Him whom having not seen we love.

And I thank God for you all. I was especially thrilled to see the reproduction of David King's work on ministry of the saints. It was one of the best I ever read. The first time I saw it, I read it snuggled under the covers of a bed in Scotland one night whilst the snow was blowing and a blizzard was howling outside. But I could not put the book down until I had finished.

"I am often in prayer for the brethren over there. . . I love you . . . and I trust that God will bless you richly and all who are dear unto you. May His grace continue with you in all things unto His glory."

Yours and His,

Carl.

Dear Brother Melling,—I have been asked to indicate the present position with regard to the new church building now being used by the church in Tunbridge Wells. It is as follows:—

Loan from Bank: £500. Cash at Bank: £245—£745.

Owing to Builder: £500 (approx.). Owing to Electricity Board: £377—£877.

This means that we still need £132 to pay our debts. We know that many who read this will have already helped us, and we are deeply thankful to God for all such help. If there are others who intend to help, will you please "do it now," and enable us to meet these debts fully? We will do all we can ourselves, but the accounts must soon be met and any help, however small, will be appreciated. We ask for the prayers of all our brethren. In His service, A. E. Winstanley.

VESTMENTS

Sir,—I feel that the question that should be asked is: "To be clothed in vestments or to be clothed in humility?" Anglican friends have confessed to me the difficulty in suppressing the feeling of pride when clothed in these ornate garments. The Apostle Peter wrote, "Let not yours be the outward adornment of elaborate hair styles, the flaunting of gold jewellery or wearing of costly dresses. Rather let yours be the hidden character of the heart with its imperishable jewel a gentle and quiet spirit which is of supreme value in the sight of God."—I Peter 3. This exhortation could well be directed to those males who "like dressing up." If it's not contrary to the letter of scripture and of the Gospel, it surely is contrary to its spirit.

Let us pay heed to essentials not luxuries, in a spiritually and materially impoverished humanity.

Robert Williams,
(Theological Student).

—"British Weekly," Aug. 7th, 1964.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES

Blackburn (Park Road).—With joy we record an addition to our numbers, Linda Jackson. The brethren at Scholes, Wigan, assisted us in our arrangements for the immersion on October 1st, 1964, when before a number of witnesses, Linda confessed her faith in Jesus as the Son of God and was added to His church. We pray that, with us, she may discharge her duties faithfully to the glory of Him who died to save us all. R.R.

Dewsbury.—The Church has just had an intensive mission with Bro. A. E. Winstanley. Much visiting has been done, and very much appreciated help has been given by Bro. Donald Hardy of Morley, in advertising the meetings with his loud-speaker van. Much literature has been distributed in the district. The local response has been disappointing but brethren from a large number of churches have helped very much.

On Saturday, October 10th, tea was served on the occasion of the church anniversary; a very large congregation attended the evening meeting.

The Sunday school was very well attended on Sunday morning; we are hoping as a result of visiting to welcome more scholars.

Last Sunday evening we were pleased to witness the baptism of Nina Thomason, a member of a well-known family in the churches.

The church is very grateful to Bro. Winstanley for his labours.

R. McDonald.

Kentish Town.—The 93rd anniversary of the opening of Hope Chapel was the occasion of meetings on Saturday, October 10th. About 40 had tea together between the meetings and Brother Harold Baines served us well on both occasions, and on the Lord's Day following. In the afternoon he gave hints and instructive advice on Bible study and preached the gospel at the evening meeting on Saturday. On the Lord's Day he exhorted the church in the morning and preached the gospel in the evening. We thank God for restoring our brother to vigorous health, and tender our warm thanks to those from sister churches who gathered to encourage us on Saturday. The services of our brother are most warmly appreciated.

Ulverston.—The church rejoiced to witness the confession and baptism of Ian Malcolm Reay. Son of Sister Flo Reay, Ian is a regular Sunday School pupil. We commend him to the Lord of Glory.

James McF. Black.

Dear Bro. Melling,—I hereby inform you about the death of our dear Bro. Mannuel Ephraim Makhoti. He passed away peacefully on the 8th October.

He was laid sick in hospitals, Conradie, Groote Schuur and back to Conradie.

It was in May last year when he attended the hospital, but the specialists could not find out what the source of the trouble was. One doctor mentioned cancer and told us he could not last long.

In the last months before his death, he became confused, i.e. we couldn't follow what language he spoke.

Born in Nyasaland about 73 years ago, he was baptised to the Lord in 1915.

He was on his way to England in the early 1930s but could not get through South West Africa. So he got settled in Capetown and he was together with the late Bro. Hollis and some others.

He was a devoted preacher, teacher and everything. I remember while in hospital he did much to preach the word to his fellow-patients till he was confused. In order to comply with the apartheid policy of the land, he started a small assembly at Langa Native Township.

Through new teachings, practised at the Woodstock Assembly, we withdrew from them in 1958.

Just before he was caught up by sickness, he called the Langa assembly to discuss ways and means of spreading the Gospel beyond the borders of the peninsula. It was unanimously agreed to call all the assemblies in the peninsula to that effect but that failed owing to his illness. I, the undersigned, was appointed to carry on with work.

We have been a small assembly all the time but now we're fewer than ever.

This decrease in number has been caused by two brethren who fell away and two sisters who went to settle at Cale Transkei of whom we always pray hard to get in touch with the Church of Christ, at present there's none nearby.

So I am struggling hard to get the word to the people. At intervals I visit Capetown but as I was ordered to feed the little flock I must do so every Lord's Day.

I wholeheartedly thank you for the "Scripture Standard" which you send me. I find some good teaching from it. People are too fast to try to mislead others.

I hope this letter will find you in sound health both physically and spiritually and I hope to hear from you soon. I remain yours in Christ, Gordon Ntungwe, No. 442, Nyanga, West Township, Capetown.

COMING EVENTS

Bedminster (Bristol).—Mission from 4th to 18th November. Bro. C. Philip Slate, American evangelist, preaching. Theme: "Christ's way the only way." Leaflet containing details will be sent to any who may wish to support any of the meetings. The local brethren are working hard for great success. Brethren, pray for us!

A.L.D.

WANTED.—A willing and capable brother to work in London for a protracted period.—Write to R. B. Scott, 20 Midhurst Avenue, London, N.10, in the first case.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Edmund Hill, 221 Derby Road, Loughborough, Leicestershire.

Peter D. Hill, 55 Knight-Thorpe Road, Loughborough, Leicestershire.

Hereford, 72 Whitehorse Street.—Bro. R. Coles and family have gone to Liberia, where Bro. Coles is taking up an educational appointment. May God bless them now and always.

MARRIAGES

At the Church of Christ Meeting Hall, Cluny Terrace, Buckle. On Wednesday, 30th September; Bro. Maurice Cousier to Sis. Phyllis Bean, both of the Church in Belfast; Bro. S. Hunter officiating.

Gerald Timothy Starling (evangelist) to Marion Joyce Cole (late Aylesbury, Bucks) on September 5th, 1964, at Church of Christ Hall, 122 Chuznee Street, Wellington, New Zealand.



If you stand high in life, like a great pine on the cliff, expect to be shaken by the storms. (W. W. Ayer).

SCRIPTURE READINGS FOR 1965

Bro. R. B. Scott is again preparing the list of suggested readings. These will be ready for circulation in good time for the new year. Please write for required number (enclosing 1d. for each card, plus cost of postage) to the "S.S." agent, Paul Jones, 41 Pendragon Road, Birmingham 22B.

It will be appreciated if you will send requests well before the Christmas postal rush and the end of the year.

The deep thanks of the churches and of readers of "S.S." are extended to Bro. Scott for this work of preparing the list over so many years. All of us much appreciate his "labour of love."

THE RISEN MAN

'Twas on the first day of the week,
The people wandering in the street,
Stopped to murmur, "Have you heard
The latest news? It's most absurd:
A man has risen from the dead.
One wonders such things dare be said."

But, in an upper room apart,
His friends are talking heart to heart,
When suddenly, without a sound
The Risen Man with them is found.
"Peace be to you," they hear His voice
And with a bound their hearts rejoice.

"As I was sent, so send I you,
This have I chosen you to do.
Go and preach to every nation,
Preach the word of my salvation.
I will fill you with my power,
And be with you every hour."

And so the story flew and spread
About this Man raised from the dead.
Believe on Him, His life, His birth,
And that he walked this sinful earth;
And be baptised into His name,
Looking for His return again.

E. M. Blundell.
(Hereford).

THE SCRIPTURE STANDARD is published monthly. Prices: Home, one copy for one year, 12/-; two copies 20/6; three copies 28/6 post free. Canada and U.S.A.: one copy, one dollar 80 cents. All orders and payments to the 'S.S.' Agent and Treasurer: PAUL JONES, 41 Pendragon Road, Birmingham 22B. Tel. Birchfield 5559.

All correspondence, including articles, news items, coming events, etc., to be sent, before the 10th of the month to the Editor, C. MELLING, 133 Long Lane, Hindley, Lancs. Payments to PAUL JONES, address as above.

NOTICES. Scale of charges: 3/- for first 3 lines or less; 8d. each subsequent line. Repeats (if notified when sending copy) half original charge. Payments to PAUL JONES, address as above.

EVANGELIST FUND: Contributions to R. McDONALD, who is also Secretary of Conference Committee, "Aldersyde," 10 Mardale Road, Bennett Lane, Dewsbury, York.

NYASALAND Mission: Contributions to W. STEELE, 31 Niddrie Road, Portobello, Edinburgh, Mid Lothian.

Hymn Book Agent and Treasurer: FRED HARDY, 73a Bridge Street, Morley, Leeds, Yorkshire. Tel. Morley 255.