

The **SCRIPTURE STANDARD**

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

VOL. 32. No. 7.

JULY, 1965

Evolution or the Bible?

IN February this year the "S.S." printed an article, "The Origin of Species," dealing with Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. In the March issue a letter from Bro. Derek Daniell was published, expressing appreciation of this article, pointing out the disastrous effect upon belief in God that the teaching of evolution is having in the schools, and stressing the necessity of keeping the issue of evolution or the Bible before Christians.

That letter showed the interest shown in the presentation of anti-evolutionary teachings and evidence, and that there is a demand for scholarly and scientific refutation of this theory of evolution as so widely accepted today. There would be less objection if the teaching were presented as scientific theory, but it is set before readers and listeners as proven fact, with all the evidence and scholarship uniting in proving its truth. By every means of communication—over radio, television, through books and lectures—evolution is taken for granted, as though there is no case against it.

Not only so, but evolution has been lifted out of physical realms—plant, animal and man—into the realm of civilisation, history and social relations. It has become a philosophy of the whole of the university and thus attempts to destroy the truth of creation as written in the Bible. In short, evolution has become the modern god, in which everything finds its origin and meaning. This view is accepted by most religious teachers and leaders, who try to reconcile the theory with belief in God. One of the chief propagators of the doctrine of evolution, Sir Julian Huxley, has said, "The concept of evolution was soon extended into other than biological fields. Inorganic subjects, such as the life-histories of stars and the formation of the chemical elements on the one hand, and on the other hand subjects like linguistics, social anthropology, and comparative law and religion, began to be studied from an evolutionary angle, until today we are able to see evolution as a universal and all-pervading process."

"The Twilight of Evolution"

It is, therefore, refreshing to read examinations of this almost universally accepted theory and disproof of it written by men whose scientific and scholastic abilities fully qualify them to meet the pro-evolution giants on their own ground, to speak in their own language and to apply their own arguments and reasoning. Such a book is "The Twilight of Evolution," by H. M. Morris (Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1964; \$1.50, 10/6d.; obtainable from W. Carl Ketcherside, through Albert Winstanley). The writer of the book is co-author with J. C. Whitcombe, jun., of "The Genesis Flood." "The Twilight of Evolution" is an examination of the theory of evolution in the light of the Bible. In this article there is not space to make a detailed review nor to quote extensively, although it is tempting to state some of the writer's reasoning and exposition in his own words.

In the preface it is pointed out that leaders of evolutionary thought are not satisfied with attempts at compromise which regards evolution as "God's method of creation" (as so many religious teachers advocate). "If evolution can explain the development of this universe and its inhabitants there is no need for any kind of personal God."

The writer goes on to show that the chief cause for the ineffectiveness of the churches is that, having accepted evolution, they have drifted from their foundations, and are sinking in the sands of modernism and worldliness. We are reminded of something we once read in the same strain, that "the church has come down from the high level of the supernatural to the low level of the natural."

A list of the chapter headings will show what ground the book covers and how the subject is dealt with. They are: The influence of evolution; The case against evolution; The testimony of geologic history; Water and the Word [a study of the Deluge]; The origin of evolution; The death of evolution.

Pages 31-44 are among the most absorbing in the book. It is demonstrated by scripture that creation is complete (Gen. 2:1-3; Exod. 20:11; 31:17; Psa. 33:6, 9; Neh. 9:6; 2 Pet. 3:5; Heb. 4:3, 10). One of the most powerful arguments, indeed irrefutable, is that expounding the "Second Law of Thermodynamics"—that all energy runs down, wears out—and that any changes are inevitable towards decline and decay. The scientific word used for the law is "entropy." This law is accepted by all scientists, yet the author points out the amazing fact that it is completely ignored or contradicted by most of them! The law was developed and demonstrated at just the same time as Darwin was propagating his theory of the origin of species in the 1850s. The law states that there is a universal tendency for everything to become more disorganised (not more highly organised, as evolution necessitates. Could anything more clearly show that evolution is the acceptance of theory as against fact—and fact acknowledged to be so by all evolutionists?

This tendency to decay and death is stated time after time in the Bible (Psa. 102: 25-26; Isa. 51:6; Rom. 8:20-22; 1 Pet. 1:24; Eccl. 3:20; Matt. 24:35). Throughout scripture, we are told that God finished His creation; now He preserves it; but everywhere decay and death bring things and living creatures to their inevitable end. An argument that often confuses believers in the Bible, by its being seemingly undeniable physical fact, is that of the "vestigial organs." Often we have no reply to give to this argument, for we have not the scientific knowledge necessary. But the writer of this book clearly shows that these so-called "vestigial organs," rather than being a demonstration of the fact of evolution, are a refutation of the belief: these organs are proof of the decay and deterioration to which all life is subject.

In another most interesting section, the great promise in Rev. 21:4—that there "shall be no more sorrow, pain, crying nor death") is shown as the reversal of the dreadful curse put upon all things after "sin entered into the world, and death by sin" (see Gen. 22:3). Thus decay and death shall not last for ever (Rom. 8:19-21; 2 Pet. 3:13).

Geology and Fossils

Another difficult problem to explain is what is termed "the testimony of the rocks." Fossils are regarded by evolutionists as the incontrovertible proof of their theory. The strata of the rocks show clearly by the fossils found in them orderly and ever higher forms of life—the lowest buried deepest and therefore the oldest. This book shows that in the Bible we find God intervening on certain occasions, such as the Deluge at the time of Noah, rather than God's leaving His creation to its orderly or undisturbed evolutionary progress. These interventions of God, Mr. Morris terms "catastrophism," and he convincingly demonstrates what tremendous effects upon the world and all life these acts of God have had since. In the chapter, "Water and the Word" he goes on to show that the Deluge was world wide and affected all life and the whole of the physical world. That cataclysm is the cause of the disruption seen so clearly in the rocks, and of the remains of all kinds of fossil life found there.

We recommend this book. Scholarly and scientific, it is yet written in a beautifully clear style which most readers can understand with little effort. It is at the same time reverent and convincing in its exposition of scripture. The writer does not make the mistake of attempting to "defend" the Bible, but rather attacks the unproven theories of evolutionists. Too often we are on the defensive on these matters, so that we suffer from a kind of inferiority complex. The truths of the Bible are not established by science; rather science is tested and proved or disproved by the Bible. Wholehearted believers in the inspired word of God do not need confirmation of their belief from outside sources, any more than Jesus Christ Himself, who said "I receive not testimony from men" (John 5:34).

But so widespread is the doctrine of evolution that it is understandable to think that there is no answer to it, and that belief in the Bible means gullible and blind acceptance of what is patently absurd and legendary, in face of evidence of the facts. Such books as "The Twilight of Evolution" are necessary to help sensitive minds whose views on such topics as evolution are not fully formed, to realise that our faith has not been built on "cunningly devised fables" (2 Pet. 1:16).

Closed Doors to Truth

In the scientific and even the literary world there is on this subject "a conspiracy of silence." Few publishers will have anything to do with writings not accepting wholly the theory of evolution, or opposing the theory. Facilities for publishing such works are largely denied, for evolution, like science, is "a sacred cow"—not to be called into question in any way. We read some fourteen years ago a book in which the author gave details of the opposition experienced by scientific societies and publishers to the publication of the work. To believe the plain and sublime statements of scripture as scientific fact would upset many of the cherished aspirations of men, and would destroy their pride. To accept evolution as scientific truth means to dethrone God and to enthrone man, to subscribe to Saintsbury's almost blasphemous boast, "Glory to man in the highest."

What man cannot become by evolution, because of the inevitable decay and death against which he is powerless, it is God's purpose to make him through redemption in Christ Jesus. In Christ are restored all the original blessings given to the first Adam:

"O wisest love, that flesh and blood which did in Adam fail,
Should strive afresh against their foe: should strive and should prevail.

O loving wisdom of our God! When all was sin and shame,
A second Adam to the fight and to the rescue came." (Newman).

EDITOR.

New Wine in Old Bottles

PEOPLE are slow to change their ideas and traditions. The Pharisees were appalled to see Jesus eat with tax collectors and sinners. The Jewish Christians found it hard to leave behind the ritual of the Old Covenant and much of Paul's writing was to correct the Judaizing tendency in the early church. Even Peter was at times slow to recognise that in Christ Jesus both Jew and Gentile are one.

I am certain that Peter understood the meaning of the New Covenant at the time he separated himself from the Gentile Christians at Antioch. He must have known that the gospel was preached to all men under the terms of the New Covenant. He must have known that new wine had to be put in new bottles, but he probably still thought that the "old was good" and preferred the company of Jewish Christians. In a similar sense it is easy to develop a feeling of superiority to my brethren here in Malawi, because they have not had the advantages of modern life that I have. I think that the "old is good" in the sense that I long to worship God in the way that I have known from childhood. The form of worship, the different hymns, language and the weird tunes are enjoyable; but I have a longing to worship God by singing my favourite hymns.

Jesus was not trying to convince the Jews that the Old was actually better than the New. He was trying to make them realise that their attitudes and thinking were not conducive to change. Jesus was preparing them for the great change in relationship between man and God, which was made possible by His sacrifice at Calvary.

Jesus was dealing with people who had closed minds and hard hearts. These people said that Jesus cast out demons by the prince of demons, when they saw Him make the dumb speak. But many marvelled at the things which Jesus did and the words which He spoke. Jesus had compassion on these people for they were harassed and helpless, like sheep without a shepherd.

Our great Shepherd is now exalted at the right hand of the throne of the God of peace. Yet Jesus still sympathises with our weaknesses and through Him our lips should continually offer a sacrifice of praise to God. Let us consider and look to Jesus as the pioneer and perfecter of our faith. We can burst a lot of old bottles by following other pioneers. The more we consider other pioneers, the more we see their faults; but the more we look to *the* Pioneer then the more we wonder at His matchless perfection.

I still admire the men known as the pioneers of the Restoration Movement, but they should not be allowed to displace Jesus as the pioneer and perfecter of our faith. The "wine of change" is bursting the Restoration Movement. The pressure of the gas is causing a verbose explosion. We desperately need a restored Restoration Movement. We need to consider the difference between faith and tradition. We do not want the explosion to be fission, for the only heat of reaction should be the warming of our hearts as we realise that there are devout men from every nation under heaven and that the same Lord is in us all and He is All in All.

D. MURPHY.

SCRIPTURE READINGS

FOR JULY

4—Genesis 15	Luke 7:1-23
11—Malachi 3	Luke 7:24-49
18—Isaiah 55	Luke 8:1-21
25—Psalm 107:23-43	Luke 8:22-30

THE UNWELCOME SAVIOUR

"They besought Him to depart from their borders" (Luke 8:37)

WHAT a strange attitude these words indicate, and yet, sad to relate, not so uncommon in the life and work of Jesus. His reception is epitomised by John (1:11)—"He came unto his own and his own received him not." It is written also of His visit to His own home town, "They took him to the brow of the hill on which their city was built, and would have thrown him down headlong" (4:29). Again a Samaritan village rejected Him so brusquely that His disciples thought it worthy of fire from heaven (9:54). Finally "they crucified Him" (Matt. 27:35) "of whom the world was not worthy" (Heb. 11:38).

The incident we are considering, therefore, is not unique but representative of a reaction to Jesus in human hearts with some basic motive—a motive which triumphed in bringing about His death, and has done so with others since. It is surely wrong to have such results but so strong as to overcome better motives at times and in some folks. It will be a valuable exercise to identify it so that we may studiously avoid it. What led the Gadarenes to want to get rid of the one really good man?

Two madmen had plagued the people of Gergesa. This was a small town on the shores of the lake of Galilee about opposite to Capernaum. The ruins and a village called Kherza are there today and the only steep slope which could fit in with the fate of the herd of swine is nearby. Unsuccessful attempts had been made to tame at least the more violent of them by confinement and physical restraint. Driven from the town and its precincts they inhabited the caves and tombs in conditions of hardship and misery, breaking out into occasional frenzy and violence in search for food and shelter. Writing in c.1890 Farrar states: "Furious maniacs—absolutely naked—wander to this day in the mountains, and sleep in the caves of Palestine." They would be a terror to all who passed that way, increasing their loneliness and misery. Luke and Mark mention only one of them, and of him the graphic details are given of his uncontrollable violence, his self-torment and day and night wanderings.

It would seem that the Saviour was seeking relief from the heavy labours on the other side of the sea where the people were thronging Him and bringing their sick for healing continuously. As it was evening when the boat left the western shore, it would be the next day when they landed near Gergesa and the possessed men ran to the shore to meet them. Jesus immediately commanded the unclean spirit to come out. There is a dark mystery to us about the fact of demons being existent and in possession of human beings. We can only disbelieve this if we disbelieve the scriptures and those who wrote them by inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Sure it is that the strange behaviour of some people and sometimes most of us, seems only to be accountable to the power of the Evil One at work.

In this case it is clearly in the power of Jesus to subdue the evil spirits, and repeatedly in the gospels we know Jesus was able to relieve men and women of this torment of body and mind. We remember, when the disciples failed in such a case, He attributed it to their lack of faith and impressed on them the need of prayer and fasting. There was never any doubt of His own power. The prince of the power of the air, the spirit that is now at work in the sons of disobedience, has his emissaries to mislead or to terrify. Only One has sufficient power to protect us and enable us to come out of temptation victoriously. The tormented man ran and worshipped Jesus, and got immediate relief.

For some reason we cannot tell God permits some measure of liberty to the demons, and Jesus permitted them to work upon the swine. Two thousand were there grazing on the hills. They were seized with panic and perished in the waters of the lake. If we can picture this terrific stampede vividly enough, we shall appreciate the terror which seized the herdsmen, and the reason for the request of the people that Jesus should depart. The news of the tremendous loss of valuable animals spread rapidly and crowds from the town and country around came to see Jesus. His power had done what the whole community had found impossible. The two things—the great salvation and the great loss—were obviously of one piece. They feared the power of Jesus which would have brought so much blessing to their town and district, and begged Him to leave them. His wonderful beneficence and His ability to heal and bless were forgotten when measured against the material loss they had sustained.

Jesus had come their way surely to bring the news of God's love and the work of healing. If Jews were the owners of the swine, they had apostatised from Moses. If Gentiles they were keeping the forbidden animals in a district

largely inhabited by Jews. However, Gadara was apparently known for its wickedness, and the person and teaching of Jesus would be sufficiently known as not to be welcome. Their material possessions were more precious to them, and they did not want to be disturbed from their sins. We can see the mistake they made, and any time we put our possessions or position before the interests of the Saviour, we make the same error

John Oxenham wrote a short poem on this incident:

GADARA, A.D.31

Rabbi, begone! Thy powers
Bring loss to us and ours.
Our ways are not as Thine.
Thou lovest men; we swine.
Oh, get you hence, Omnipotence,
And take this fool of Thine!
His soul? What care we for his soul?
What good to us that Thou has made
him whole,
Since we have lost our swine?
And Christ went sadly.
He had wrought for them a sign
Of Love, and Hope, and Tenderness
divine;
They wanted—swine.
Christ stands without YOUR door
and gently knocks;
But if your gold, or swine, the
entrance blocks,
He forces no man's hold—He will
depart,
And leave you to the treasures of
your heart.
No cumbered chamber will the
Master share.
But one swept bare
By cleansing fires, then plished
fresh and fair
With meekness, and humility, and
prayer.
There will He come; yet, coming,
even there.
He stands and waits, and will no
entrance win
Until the latch be lifted from within.

John Oxenham: "Bees in Amber," 1913.
R. B. SCOTT.

Slavery is not Dead

Black men were chained and sold like animals into slavery in the old South. Only by war and blood and the courage of the great man Lincoln did they regain their rightful freedom.

Both white and black men, however, often choose to return to slavery. They enslave themselves to drink, sex, tobacco, and immorality. Mastered by their fleshly desires, they become what Peter called "slaves of corruption."

Ironically, this slavery is often the result of a search for freedom—freedom from responsibility or authority. Young people rebelling against parental control, husbands fleeing family cares. Christians

claiming moral freedom may demonstrate the "freedom" in immoral acts—only to find themselves hopelessly enslaved to a bottle, a weed, or a woman.

As Peter warned long ago: "Whatever overcomes a man, to that he is enslaved."

"Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord" (2 Peter 1:2).

Peace is the child of grace, and these precious possessions are the exclusive property of the child of God. Peter's salutation is in the nature of a benediction. He would have these blessings multiplied to us. And they will be multiplied only as we go on to know God as God, and Jesus as the Lord of life.

One Solitary Life

Here is a young man who was born in an obscure village, the child of a peasant woman. He grew up in another village. He worked in a carpenter shop until he was thirty, and then for three years he was an itinerant preacher. He never wrote a book. He never held an office. He never owned a home. He never had a family. He never went to a college. He never travelled 200 miles from the place where he was born. He never did any of the things that usually accompany greatness. He had no credentials but himself.

While he was still a young man, the tide of public opinion turned against him. His friends ran away. He was turned over to his enemies. He went through the mockery of a trial. He was nailed to a cross between two thieves. While he was dying, his executioners gambled for the only piece of property he had on earth, his coat. When he was dead, he was laid in a borrowed grave through the pity of a friend.

Nineteen centuries have come and gone, and today he is the central figure of the human race and the leader of the column of progress. All the armies that ever marched, all the navies that ever sailed, all the parliaments that ever sat, all the kings that ever reigned, put together, have not affected the life of man upon this earth as has this ONE SOLITARY LIFE.

Phillips Brooks.

There is no good reason for men to lie about each other. Most of the time the plain truth would be bad enough.

"Money and time are the heaviest burdens of life, and the unhappiest of all mortals are those who have more of either one than they know how to use."
—Johnson.

Negligence is the rust of the soul, that corrodes through all her best resolves.

CORRESPONDENCE

'Whither Now'

BECAUSE Brother Slate replied to my original letter, I will direct my comments mainly towards his latest letter, although in passing, I suppose Bro. Hill's use of metonymy deserves a comment, as his mistake is a vital and fundamental one. Our brother says, "Jesus was no more talking about a cup when he said, 'This cup is the new testament in my blood,' than we are talking about a kettle when we say, 'The kettle is boiling.'" Metonymy really is the worst tool Bro. Hill could have used to justify the use of more than one cup. When he says "The kettle is boiling," he is, as far as the question of the container is concerned, envisaging only two things—that the water is in a kettle (not a pot, nor a pail, nor a bottle) and that there is only one kettle intended. The phrase, "The kettles are boiling" would have to be used if more than one kettle are intended. This controversy is, of course, over the matter of container, not the contents.

Apply this rule of metonymy to what Jesus said, and we require a cup (not a kettle, nor a pot, nor a bottle, etc)—and *only one* (the word "cups" never appears). It is incredible that such an obvious point should require to be made in the columns of the "S.S." but it would appear to be necessary and may be helpful in this discussion.

I agree with Brother Winstanley that statements should be confined to the point at issue and personal remarks severely avoided.

In Brother Slate's first letter to the "S.S." he says, *inter-alia*, ". . . We want brethren to know of our willingness to defend or explain the scripturalness of what we do in this matter, as in others." In my last letter, I asked Brother Slate, "to be so kind as to tell us why he, as an individual, desires to have his own personal container at the Lord's table." Brother Slate has not been so kind and in fact, I believe, seems to have ignored the question. Brethren in this country have been thrashing out differing points of view in the "S.S." columns for long years now and Brother Slate's contention that there is insufficient space in the "S.S." for his explanations must come to many as novel as it is surprising.

This finely illustrates the point that when a practice lacks scriptural authority or sanction, the justifications and explanations supporting it must be carefully presented, long and complex. By contrast, I am sure Brother Slate could justify immersion in a quarter of a column in the "S.S." (because of the scriptural support in the N.T.).

Until Brother Slate, or some other brother, provides the explanations we are still in the position outlined in my original letter, "Even now we still do not know why the use of individual containers at the Lord's table was ever introduced into Great Britain, and there seems a lamentable lack of forthrightness on the subject." The church in this country has been grossly injured by the introduction of individual containers by our American brethren and the churches here deserve, at least, an explanation.

To those brethren who may not yet have grasped the gravity of this situation, or who may be standing aloof from the controversy, or sitting on the fence, or just idly disinterested that the church in Britain is in the grips of a grave crisis. let it be pointed out that there are two bodies at present known as "the church of Christ." Soon there will be three, and if the "located pastor" system and "open communion" practice emerges, as it may well do, then there may be four or more.

There are two bodies at present known as "the church of Christ." Soon there will be three, and if the "located pastor" system and "open communion" practice emerges, as it may well do, then there may be four or more.

Our American brothers seem as if they have little intention of giving an inch of ground on this question and we can but record our disappointment that our brethren in Christ cannot see their way to concede a personal choice they have in the interests of the unity, harmony and happiness of the churches here. This controversy is no mere intellectual exercise but is perhaps a portent of what is yet to come, and the church is undoubtedly at the crossroads. For decades the churches in Britain have stood for the "back to Jerusalem" plea and have been the residuary and repository for all those who profess to travel the road back to the simplicity of the new testament pages—and brethren, before we trade our responsibility for the price of popularity or a quiet life, we should take care we don't dispose of something which is not ours to sell. In relinquishing the role of being the custodians of primitive Christianity, we should think long and hard, and consider especially and soberly the alternatives. We have a commendable identity—take care we do not lose it.

Many brethren will awake to the situation sooner or later and tragically it seems as if it will be later—but, let us hope, not too late. Let us continue to

contend, and be contentious, but *only* for the faith once delivered to the saints.

JAMES R. GARDINER.

Dear Bro. Melling.—When I wrote for the May issue of the "S.S.," I assumed Bro. Winstanley would understand that my criticisms were directed towards those who have deliberately set aside the New Testament practice of using one cup at the Lord's table. I thought I had made this abundantly clear.

So far as his remarks apply to Bro. Jas Gardiner, I agree with him wholeheartedly. I firmly endorse Bro. Gardiner's statements in the February issue that "A grave situation exists in this country . . . and a pretence is being made that everything in the garden is lovely. . . . Few can but be appalled at the enormity of the cost to the brotherhood in Britain of the establishment . . . of those congregations [those established and supported by American money]. This must undoubtedly be by far the greatest setback the church in this country has ever suffered [and this is saying something!] and it is difficult to visualise any remedy. . . . One finds oneself asking whether the churches in this country have been helped . . . or catastrophically hindered . . . by our American brethren."

Well we know who is responsible for this mess. What I am concerned about is that Bro. Winstanley can commend anyone in Bro. Slate's position for the "reasonable tone" of his letter, no matter how "reasonable" that letter may seem to be. Mere plausibility cannot merit commendation.

Bro. Winstanley will no doubt know the proverb, "Actions speak louder than words." It seems to me that he cannot see any difference in the position of brethren on either side of this question. In his opinion they merely differ one from another, whereas in fact those who are in a matter of such magnitude as this forfeit their right to expect that respect for which he pleads.

Our brother assumes apparently, that criticism is unChristian. If that be so, the apostles must have had a perverted view of Christianity. What amazes me is how those who have caused havoc in the church can call so readily for tolerance, understanding, and love, when they are taken to task for it. We should demonstrate our love with deeds, before we talk about it with words.

Bro. Slate's letter in the March issue states, "The biggest issue in this controversy is neither the violation of custom nor the neglect of the authority of Christ," despite the Lord's command relative to the cup, and, "Rather it is in the long run whether or not the church will tie itself to principles of interpretation which work themselves into a

cultism characteristic of the Exclusive Brethren"—which language I personally regard as being offensive and insulting to brethren standing in defence of scriptural practice. If this is the sort of "reasonable tone" which Bro. Winstanley commends him for, I feel I am justified in looking somewhat deeper for the reason why.

Compare Bro. Slate's statements (March issue): "We are *willing* and *ready* to debate publicly or privately . . ." (June issue): ". . . notwithstanding my expressed *unwillingness* to meet this issue. . . ." Are we to understand that Bro. Slate is hauling down his colours? Or has he simply lost all appetite for debate when the opportunity to do so is presented? Or can it be that he wishes to select his own opponent? My firm conviction is that no advocate of individual cups will ever be prevailed upon to debate this issue publicly on fair terms. Bro. Slate, no doubt, would be willing to demonstrate the application of "correct principles of interpretation" by substituting unscriptural words for scriptural if he could find someone foolish enough to accept an unfair proposition. Let him prove me wrong, if he can, by stating his proposition now.

I would suggest that, if he really believes that the indiscriminate printing of letters serves to confuse rather than clarify, there would seem to be no point in his writing to the "S.S." either. I would also advise him that if he believes that only two are opposed to his ideas, he is far out of touch with current opinion. Let him demonstrate his sincerity by producing a few of the facts I requested of him in the May issue as a basis for discussion.

Bro. Slate also suggests that "representative brethren" should discuss this matter publicly or privately, or in the columns of the "S.S." Perhaps he could tell us exactly who is going to select these men, and how; also who is going to decide whether a brother is "representative," or "characteristically peculiar" in his position? Are we to understand that he and Bro. Winstanley are calling for a conference on this subject?

Jesus said, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, nor an evil tree good fruit." On this principle, it was a foregone conclusion that individual cups would be introduced here when American evangelists set foot on British soil to plant their churches in this land. The root of this trouble lies in the U.S.A. The use of individual cups is not wrong simply because brethren differ about it, it is wrong because it is contrary to the teaching of the scriptures. It is no more right to practice this in America than it is to do so here or anywhere else. The fact that the vast majority in America have accepted, and many young men have been reared in it, does not and cannot

not make it right. I would appeal to every earnest brother in America to break from this sectarian practice, and to exert his whole influence for its abolition. Until that day dawns, disunity will be inevitable. Some have been trying for years to persuade these brethren in Britain who have adopted this practice to abandon it, without success. So long as brethren are prepared to put other considerations before the requirements of the word of God (be it said to their shame) the prescribed policy of the financiers in U.S.A. which Bro. Gardiner refers to, will be carried into effect. Conferences under such circumstances will be a sheer waste of time.

Let us face the position squarely. There is only one possible solution. The unity of the brotherhood is hanging by a thread. Let these erring brethren discard this offensive and antisciptural practice before the tie is finally, and irrevocably severed. JOHN M. WOOD.

WHEN reading over my letter in the May issue of your valuable paper I noticed I had inadvertently left out the words "in His blood" at the end of the second last passage, making it seem that I believe "the cup" in the Lord's Supper is a figure only of the New Covenant

I was surprised at not receiving letters from brethren to correct this mistake, and more so when none appeared in the "S.S." On re-reading the letter, on the surface, it seemed I was right in my assertion that the Lord spoke in metonymy when He said, "this cup is the new covenant in my blood." I have been in correspondence with a brother who believes it right to dispense the fruit of the vine in as many cups as we think fit, and strongly asserts that the cup is the fruit of the vine and a figure of the blood only. Between my inadvertently leaving out "in His blood" in my letter, and he leaving out "the new covenant"; together we made the cup a figure of nothing, and we come under condemnation, having taken away from the word of God what was there. (Rev. 22:19).

Always having believed in the simplicity of the word I have come to the conclusion that if two people (far less thousands) can be divided over a figure of speech given by the Lord, then our understanding of it is at fault. This I believe is the root of the trouble in the church today. Until we arrive at an understanding of it I would urge the brethren neither to add to nor take from the word; also to make sure that each part of the figure and that which it represents fall into place, before saying the kind it is, or we may lead others astray. Allow me to present my findings for your consideration.

It has been averred the Lord spoke in metonymy when He said, "This cup is the new covenant sealed by my blood"

(1 Cor. 11:25. New English Bible). Metonymy is "a trope (figure of speech) in which the name of one thing is put for another related to it, the effect for the cause." (Chambers's Dict.). Never do we find one thing being put for two or representing two things or *vice versa*: it is always one thing put for one thing. The Lord could not have spoken in simple metonymy because, although we say He only referred to one thing when He said "this cup," it is a figure of two things—the new covenant, and the blood of Christ which sealed it. After careful thought I have come to the conclusion that the Lord spoke in a form of metonymy known as "metalepsis," because it is the only form in which the figures—and that which they represent—fit into place.

Metalepsis is defined as "the conjunction of two or more figures in the same word." The Lord in saying "this cup" joined two figures in the one word, "cup," namely, cup (container) and the fruit of the vine (contents). These figures represent two things; the new covenant and the blood of Christ by which it was sealed. Although Christ uses two figures to represent two things, when joined together, both the figures and what they represent become one.

For example, a cup and fruit of the vine are separate things, but they become one, when the fruit of the vine enters or is poured into the cup. Both those things in one Jesus held in His hand when He said, "this cup." The things represented—the new covenant and His blood that sealed it are one also. To illustrate this we take a last will and testament, and a stamp or seal of authority. Separate, they are two different things; but when the stamp or seal goes into or "in" the will, they become one.

When the Lord gave the new covenant it was separate from the shedding of His blood; but in shedding His blood He sealed the covenant, and gave it authority as one New Covenant for all mankind. Words spoken at marriages seem very fitting in this case: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." For if we take away "cup" (container), a figure or symbol of the new covenant, we are left with the stamp or seal (His blood), which is useless without a will. If we take away "the fruit of the vine" (contents), then the will (new covenant) is useless, having no authority. On the other hand, if one Cup was to represent one New Covenant, and one blood; what do "cups" represent?

We must see that "a little learning is a dangerous thing," and it never does to try by so-called wisdom to alter in any way an ordinance of God. Let us keep the ordinances as they were delivered by the Lord (1 Cor. 11:2). If we have

in any way departed from the original, let us pray God our sin be forgiven, then try and undo the damage we have done in failing to understand a figure of speech He has given. Perhaps to some my findings may not seem reasonable; but please inform me if so, as my desire is to help my brethren, and glorify the Lord.

DAVID DOUGALL.

I AM sorry this issue has again arisen. The issue is simple. When instituted, one cup sufficed for the disciples.

What happened at Pentecost when thousands believed "and they devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers" (Acts 2:42)?

Individual cups—no; a vessel of some kind is essential. If the size of the church would be better served by using two or more cups I see nothing against this so long as thanks are given before distribution. In this case a container may be used and thanks given before pouring. I would not object if the fruit of the vine was poured out first and then thanks expressed. Where I now worship two cups were used previously and in my view this could be done now to advantage.

I am not a "one cupper." A little common sense is called for at times.

A. L. FRITH

Dear Bro. Editor,—I find your Correspondence Column always interesting and usually providing much food for thought. I think this exchange of views, opinions, and beliefs is beneficial in stimulating thought and Scripture searching to establish the truth of the statements made by your correspondents. Controversy, rightly used, prevents acceptance of practices and beliefs unless they have been thoroughly examined and the acceptor is aware of the alternatives. But I think Bro. Winstanley's last letter does focus attention on the dangers of controversy where personalities are allowed to predominate over the questions at issue, and comportment becomes less than Christian. Hence these verses:—

To and fro the battle raged,
But neither side would yield;
And even at the close of day
No victor held the field.

Though tongue and pen were used with
skill,
No compromise was found;
But when the smoke of battle cleared,
A corpse lay on the ground.

Said, sad the visage of the Christ
At this unhappy sight.
"Why, friends, did you slay Charity
To prove that you were right?"

"For while with skilful argumentz
You strove your case to win
And broke your brothers' fences
down—
The enemy crept in."

"Whilst Faith and Hope you did
defend
With all your might and main,
By Satan's sly, deceitful blows,
Lo, Charity was slain."

J. J. Smith.

LOGIC?

It has been said that all religions have some good in them and therefore should not be criticised.

By this logic, we need, then, not to be afraid of rat poison because it has a LOT OF GOOD in it—it is 98 per cent corn meal.

BUT, the two per cent poison in it is enough to kill! And, error mixed with truth, even in small amounts is very dangerous and can be fatal.

CAMEROONS EVANGELISATION FUND

IN my last report (April) I was delighted to report that the fund for the printing press had reached £108 2s. 6d. I am still more delighted to say that it has now reached £178 4s. 8d., and on behalf of our African brothers and sisters, I

would wish to thank again all those contributing. Contributions have come from Hindley, Dunbar, Leicester, Reading, Athelstanford, Plymouth, Wallacestone, Birmingham, and again from Australia.

Some brethren have offered gifts for a second and third time and we can only say "thank you" and cherish the hope that much good will be accomplished by our joint efforts in this enterprise. May the seed be sown and God be glorified. Much more interest has arisen concerning Brother Elangwe's paper "As the Oracles of God" and we hope that even more enquiries and orders for the paper will be forthcoming.

Please remember the work and workers in the Cameroons in your prayers, and if you can possibly spare a little financial contribution towards this good cause, please continue to send it to: James R. Gardiner, 88 Davidson Terrace, Haddington, East Lothian, Scotland.

Trees

TREES are valuable to mankind. They produce shelter, food and beauty for the enjoyment of the earth's inhabitants. People who have lived in an area where there are many trees, find themselves wishing for the trees when they have moved to a new location where trees are few.

In the first Psalm the Holy Spirit likens the man who delights in the Lord's law to a tree. Such a person, He says, "is like a tree planted by streams of water, that yields its fruit in its season, and its leaf does not wither" (Psalm 1:3). If we will study this verse, we can learn some valuable lessons about us as God's trees.

Trees Provide Shelter

One of the very valuable services offered by trees is that of shelter. They shelter the weary from the heat, and they are used to shelter land from ravaging winds. So he who lives by God's law is like a tree to his fellow-travellers. "Each will be like a hiding-place from the wind, a covert from the tempest" (Isa. 32:2).

God's trees bear one another's burdens (Gal. 6:2) and provide shelter for others who have become beaten or harrassed. Bereavement, defeat, sickness, or many other crises compel us to seek some shelter from our fellow man. May God be thanked for the Christian who believes and practises the command "We who are strong ought to bear with the failings of the weak, and not to please ourselves; let each of us please his neighbour for his good, to edify him" (Rom. 15:1-2)!

Trees Bear Fruit

Another service of trees is fruit bearing. Many tasty, valuable foods are from trees. This parallels the Christian life exactly. Consider the following texts:

"You will know them by their fruits. Are grapes gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles? So, every sound tree bears good fruit, but the bad tree bears evil fruit. A sound tree cannot bear evil fruit, nor can a bad tree bear good fruit. Every tree that does not bear good fruits is cut down and thrown into the fire. Thus you will know them by their fruits" (Matt. 7:16-29).

"Every branch of mine that bears no fruit, he takes away, and every branch that does bear fruit he prunes, that it may bear more fruit... By this my Father is glorified, that you bear much fruit, and so prove to be my disciples" (Jno. 15:2-8).

It is no marvel, then, that the Psalmist likened the righteous man to a tree that brings forth his fruit in his season (Psalm 1:3b). Fruit bearing is an essential part of righteous living.

Profitable Trees Need Ample Water

If we are to be trees bearing fruit and offering shelter, we must have interior resources to stand the stress and heat of life. Our "leaf does not wither." An adequate water supply is the source of such inner strength. God's trees have such a source of strength, for they are "planted by streams of water" (Psalm 1:3). These streams of water are the word in which the righteous person meditates and delights (Psalm 1:2). Christians who become fruit-bearers and shelters to other practice the presence of Christ. In Jesus' words, "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit by itself, unless it abides in the vine, neither can you, unless you abide in me" (Jno. 15:4). In Christ is a life that is a real service to all people. In Christ is a life that bears fruit honouring God, and filling the needs of our circle of fellowship.

In Christ is the only life that counts. Consider this well, and build your life in the vital contact with Christ. This is the only life that will count for both time and eternity.



Victory is of the Lord. Prov. 21:31, R.V.

The Victory in just one life is immeasurable in its extent. Victory in your life today will be felt in the lives of Christians in the islands of the sea. It will reverberate throughout the entire Church of Christ.

The morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Matt. 6, 34.

Life is built a day at a time, and the Scriptures keep this constantly in view in their promises. So, Christian, tired and somewhat disheartened, take not only life, but the Lord, a day at a time. Let the life-time you deal with be just for today, with its birth when you wake. And for today you possess nothing less than the whole Christ of God.—Bishop Moule.

THE TONGUE

"The boneless tongue, so small and weak. Can crush and kill," declared the Greek. "The tongue destroys a greater horde," The Turk asserts, "than does the sword." "The tongue can speak a word whose speed."

Say the Chinese, "outstrips the steed." While Arab sages this impart: "The tongue's great storehouse is the heart."

From Hebrew has the maxim sprung: "Though feet should slip, ne'er let the tongue!"

The sacred writer crowns the world: "Who keeps his tongue doth keep his soul!"—Selected.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES

Aylesbury.—On Lord's Day, May 16th, we rejoiced to witness Mrs. Ivy Francis put on the Lord in baptism. She is from the West Indies and has been attending our services for some time. We pray that she may be blessed richly as she grows in grace and knowledge of the Lord.

We were happy to receive into fellowship on Lord's Day, May 2nd, Bro. Prince Henry. Bro. Henry is from British Guiana, and was there baptised for remission of sins. We are interested to learn that he was with a religious group in that country which is also striving after the New Testament pattern. Our brother has a good grasp of New Testament truth and we are assured will be a great asset to us.

Dewsbury.—The Church at Dewsbury has just had a mission under the general theme, "Tell Us Plainly." The missionary Bro. Philip Slate has worked very hard during the period, and made many contacts.

During the Whit weekend extra meetings were held, when visitors from other churches spent the weekend at Dewsbury.

Much instruction has been given which, it is hoped, will have benefited the hearers. R. McDonald.

Ilkeston.—The 85th anniversary services were held on Saturday and Lord's Day, May 29th and 30th. On Saturday about eighty sat down to tea. The evening meeting was presided over by Bro. A. Gregory.

About ninety members and friends listened to fine addresses given by Bro. T. Nisbet, Scotland, and Bro. A. E. Winstanley. Bro. Nisbet took as his theme "God's kingdom is Spiritual not earthly," and Bro. Winstanley dealt with the subject, "Jesus Christ at our elbow." Both addresses were well received, and gave much food for thought.

Lord's Day, May 30th, 45 members gathered for breaking of bread. Bro. Winstanley exhorted the church to faith and good works. The evening service was also well attended by members and friends, Bro. Winstanley preaching the gospel. We pray that these services will inspire us to greater efforts in the coming year. To God be the praise and glory. F.G.

Tunbridge Wells (corner of Cambrian Road and Upper Grosvenor Road).—The meetings held on May 22nd and 23rd were a great encouragement to the church here. It was just one year since we had begun to meet in the new meetinghouse, and we were glad to welcome many brethren who had been with us at the opening. In addition, we were delighted at the large number of non-members who came to the Saturday-night meeting.

Brother Frank Worgan gave a stirring address on Isaiah 6:1-8 at this meeting. He also spoke three times here on the Lord's Day—to the children, then to the church, then preaching at the gospel meeting. In addition he came with us on our monthly visit to Piltown, and preached there also.

We commend Brother Worgan to the blessing of the Lord in his faithful ministry of the Word. We pray that the work done for God in this town may bear fruit in lives consecrated to the service of Jesus the Lord. A. E. Winstanley.

OBITUARY

Buckie.—We deeply regret to record the passing of Bro. Robert Souter, on Monday, 7th June, at the age of 81 years. Our brother was revered and beloved for his devout Christian life and character. He was a loyal member, always present at every meeting, till he took a heart attack last Wednesday. We shall miss him, but our loss is Heaven's gain. Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth; Yea saith the spirit, that they may rest from their labours and there works do follow them.

Our sympathy goes out to his dear wife, our sister, and his family, that our heavenly Father may comfort and sustain them. The funeral services were conducted by Brethren George Reed and Peter Innes. J. Geddes.

COMING EVENTS

Aylesbury; July 25th-August 8th.—Summer School: "Training for Service." Classes will be held daily, Monday to Friday, of each week. Subjects to be discussed are: "Calvinism," V. Hunter; "New Testament Preaching and Teaching," Roy Davidson; "Christian Living," W. N. Jackson; "Principles of Biblical Interpretation," C. P. Slate; and Group Discussions on selected topics.

On Tuesday to Friday evenings of each week, L. H. Channing will present "The Holy Land," illustrated by colour slides taken during his recent tour in that country. Hospitality will be given without charge by the Aylesbury brethren. We regret however that we cannot accommodate children.

Will those who wish to attend the school, either for the whole period or part of the time, who have not as yet received programmes and registration forms, please write to: L. H. Channing, 10 Mandeville Road, Aylesbury, Bucks?

Kirkby-in-Ashfield (Beulah Road).—We extend a warm invitation to Brethren to join with us on the occasion of our anniversary, Saturday, 10th July. Tea 4.15. Evening meeting 6 p.m. Speakers, Bro. Tom McDonald and another brother. Please come and enjoy a time of real fellowship in the Lord.

T. Woodhouse.

Liverpool.—The church meeting in Dudley Institute, Blenheim Road, Liverpool, 18, will (D.V.) move into the next building for the Campaign for Christ, July 18th to 28th, inclusive. In Holyoake Hall, Smithdown Road ('buses to Penny Lane) every evening except Friday, the preacher will be William S. Banowsky, of Broadway church, Lubbock, Texas; his theme, "The Dynamic of Real Christianity." Meetings will commence at 7.30 p.m., followed at 8.45 by a "Fact and

Faith" film. Refreshments every night for those from a distance.

Saturday, 24th July; 10.30 a.m. "Training for Service" class for young men; 3.0 p.m. Special Young People's Meeting.

Brethren are invited to join the teams of workers planning personal evangelism in support of the campaign. Write to R. A. Hill, 31 Mossley Hill Road, Liverpool, 18, for full details. Telephone: Allerton 3772.

Tunbridge Wells (corner of Cambrian Road and Upper Grosvenor Road).—Campaign for Christ, July 17th to 29th. Preacher, William Bowman, New York, U.S.A. Saturdays, July 17th and 24th: tea 4.30 p.m. Meeting 6.30 p.m.

Meetings:

Sundays 18th and 25th, 6.30 p.m.

Tuesdays 20th and 27th, 7.30 p.m.

Thursdays 22nd and 29th, 7.30 p.m.

Wednesday 28th, 7.30 p.m.

Brother Bowman has voluntarily given up his annual holiday to preach the gospel in this effort. Sister Bowman and two other Christians will be with him, to assist in door-to-door visiting.

We would welcome any brethren who are willing to come and spend a while with us to assist. We will gladly provide hospitality. Write Derek L. Daniell, 38 Hopwood Gardens, Tunbridge Wells, Kent. (Phone: Tunbridge Wells 23864).

—♦—
THE branch cannot bear fruit of itself.

John 15, 4.

It is wonderful to say, "God is with us." It is more essential to enquire, "Are we with God?" We cannot enjoy the reality of His presence unless we respect the conditions which govern it. We have to abide in Him, if He is to abide in us.

Dr. A. Skevington Wood.

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.

"The Scripture Standard" is printed for the publishers by Walter Barker (Printers) Ltd., Langley Mill, Nottm. Tel. 2266 Langley Mill.