

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

VOL. XIII. No.5

MAY, 1947.

'For Such a Time as This'

'FOR if thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time, then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place; but thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed : and who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?' (Esther iv. 14).

Such was the plea of Mordecai to Queen Esther,; at a time when the Jews were threatened with extinction. If any man or woman came 'unto the King into the inner court who was not called,' the penalty was death. Queen Esther took the risk, successfully made her plea, and saved her people, the Jews.

We have reached a time when the Restoration Movement, as represented by Churches of Christ in Britain, is threatened with extinction. We are face to face with a real crisis. The crisis has been forced by the circular of the Central Council Executive, excommunicating those who refuse to move from the original position and plea of Churches of Christ.

Two main questions divide us. First, 'Are the Scriptures God-inspired and reliable?' Second, 'What constitutes a Christian?'

1. The Scriptures.

To speak of 'a particular theory of inspiration' as a cause of division is to throw dust into the eyes of the brethren.

The question at issue is: Is the Bible a "God-inspired revelation, and

absolutely reliable? Either the Bible is that or it is not. If all of it is not inspired and reliable, can we be sure of any of it? If as some claim, parts of the Bible are inspired and parts are not, who is going to decide which parts are and which are not ?

Shall we follow the Modernism which has been insidiously introduced into the Churches to its logical terminus, which seems to have been reached by the Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Barnes ? According to the 'Birmingham Gazette,' of March 24th, the Bishop of Birmingham says: 'Jesus never founded a Church or instituted any sacrament. He never healed the sick or raised the dead. After His own death, He was never seen again. His body was cast into an unknown malefactor's grave, and "analytical scholars" have proved that the two thieves were never there. Pentecost is a dramatised version, of the Apostle's unaccountable confidence, and the commission to go and baptise all nations was never given at all.'

It is along the path that leads to that terminus the Churches have been led by those who believe that parts of the Bible are not reliable, that Jesus was ignorant of some things, and made mistakes about others. Are the findings of Dr. Barnes those of 'a qualified and reverent scholarship,' which, according to the Central Council Executive, we must accept ?

These are the real division and mischief-makers,

2. What Constitutes a Christian ?

In 'Report of Discussions of Differences.' sent out by Co-operation Representatives, they say of the 'Old Path Brethren': 'They further hold that it is wrong to have any association with other Christian communions, and that we ought to cut ourselves off from all intercourse with other Christians (some of whom they deny are Christians at all) organised in the denominations. We cannot agree that such an attitude is Christ-like or likely to assist in the spread of our own position as Churches. We emphatically deny that it was the position taken up by our forefathers in the faith, least of all by Alexander Campbell himself.'

'Hast thou appealed unto Caesar? Unto Cæsar shalt thou go.' Alexander Campbell, in the 'Christian System' sent out by the Publishing Committee of Churches of Christ, says: 'And as to this kingdom of which we speak, as now existing in this world, Jesus Himself taught that into, it no person can legally enter who is not born again, or born of water and the Spirit.' (p. 171).

'How numerous! how clear! and how unequivocal! Are we not, then, warranted to say, Except a man be regenerated of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God? And that all who, believing, are immersed for the remission of their sins, have the remission of their sins in and through immersion?' (p. 257).

'Objection 3: It is so uncharitable to the Protestant Pædo-baptists.' And how uncharitable are the Pædo-baptists to the Jews, Turks, and Pagans! Will they promise present salvation from the guilt, pollution, and dominion of sin, with the well-grounded hope of heaven to Jews, Turks, Pagans, or even Roman Catholics? Or will the Roman Catholics to them? How uncharitable are they who cry uncharitable to us! . . . While they inveigh against us for laying a Scriptural and natural stress upon immersion, do we not see that they lay as great, though an unscriptural and irrational stress upon their baptism

it, without faith, even to infants, as soon as they are 'born of the flesh.' (p. 247).

Lancelot Oliver, for 25 years editor of the official magazine, and trainer of preachers, in his book, 'New Testament Christianity,' wrote: 'We may say, then, in a word, that Christians' are those who have believed the Gospel of Christ, repented, and been immersed into Christ. It will not be found that any others are recognised as such in the New Testament.' (p. 45).

Further, in reply to 'World Conference on Faith and Order,' prepared by W. Robinson and J. Smith, and approved by Annual Conference of Churches of Christ, 1929, it is stated: 'Churches of Christ teach that baptism is the Scriptural means of incorporation into Christ and His Church: that by baptism we put on Christ: that' its blessings are those which union with Christ bestows: that in baptism we are buried with Christ into death and rise with Him to walk in newness of life: that our sins are washed away, and that we are justified from sin. Thus baptism is of the first importance and really effects what it symbolizes when administered to' penitent believers. Unbiased scholars are now unanimous in their testimony that this was the Pauline doctrine of baptism, and that Paul would never have thought of faith and baptism as things apart. This doctrine of baptism has for its support the united witness of the Church of the Apostolic age and of all subsequent ages down to the period of the Reformation: and will need to be incorporated in the witness of the Church when united. But such a doctrine, we would urge, is incompatible with the administration of baptism to other than penitent believers.' (p. 22).

And it is for standing for what it is admitted Jesus and His Apostles taught, which was the practice of the New Testament Church, which our forefathers in the faith pleaded for, that we are charged with being narrow and uncharitable, and causing division! And for this we are excommunicated by the latest Papal Bull!

WE HAVE TRULY REACHED THE PARTING OF THE WAYS. The editor of 'Christian advocate' in the issue of January 3rd, 1936, said: 'The future holds no place whatever for a body of ten thousand souls which is nothing more nor less than a denomination among denominations.'

That is just what Churches of Christ, as represented by the Co-operation, now are. They are one of the 'Constituent Denominations of the Free Church Federal Council,' and have a Denominational Secretary.

Every official 'Year Book' of Churches of Christ contains a statement of 'The Nature and Limits' of the Co-operation,' in which we read: 'That the Churches thus co-operating disavow any intention, or desire, to recognise themselves as a denomination.'

On a poster put out by D. King and J. B. Rotherham, in 1865, it is stated: 'The only Church for the people is the Church of Christ. That Church is not a modern sect, nor is it composed of many sects. Its ordinances and polity were by the Lord, through the Apostles, once for all perfected. None are authorised to alter them, because they cannot be improved.'

Some speak glibly of 'our historic witness' (quite a pet phrase with them) but they do not seem to know what was the witness of our fathers in the faith.

The time has fully come when Churches and Brethren must decide whether the Co-operation or those known as 'Old Path Brethren' are standing for the original plea of Churches of Christ. As to which attitude is most 'likely to assist in the spread of our own position as

Churches,' official figures give an emphatic answer. During the past twenty-five years, a period in which modern teaching regarding the Bible has been spread in the Churches, and there has been much fraternising with other religious bodies, membership in Churches of Christ has dropped from 16,306 to 11,660, a decrease of 4,646.

The Co-operation is on the brink of the whirlpool of sectarianism and will soon be swallowed up. **WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?**

Are you going with them, and thus help to end a glorious movement built up by our fathers in the faith at great cost and sacrifice; or are you going to make a determined stand for the old faith? 'Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?'

'God requires the braye and true,
May He now depend on you?'

If we fail, others will be raised to carry the Restoration Banner to conflict and conquest. 'If thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time, then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise . . . from another place; but thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed.'

'But if ye dare not hold it fast
'Yours only is the loss, •

For it shall be victorious,
This Standard of the Cross!

It shall not suffer, though ye rest
Beneath your sheltering trees,
And cast away the victor's crown
For love of timid ease.'

Brethren, 'quit yourselves like men, be strong,' take a definite stand, and fight to save the movement for the Restoration of New Testament Christianity. —EDITOR.

Modernism and the Bible

MODERNISM is just another name for infidelity. It is infidelity trying to parade itself in the livery of scholarship and religion. It is a wolf in sheep's clothing. The threadbare claims and the oft-answered arguments of such men as Celsus, Porphyry, and other ancient enemies of

Christianity have been revived and revamped and dispensed to a gullible people as the 'assured results of modern scholarship.' Satan and his henchmen have well learned that an outspoken infidel, like Paine or Ingersoll, is not so effective as the con* temporary type which poses as

'angels of light.' Infidelity is more acceptable when presented *a la Fosdick* than when delivered *a la Ingersoll*. Modernism professes a form of religion, but denies the power thereof. The claims of modernism and the teaching of the Scriptures are irreconcilable.

A few examples will show that there is a great gulf between the two. No one can believe in the Bible and modernism at the same time. Modernism denies the most vital claims of the Bible.

1. Modernism claims that the Bible is merely a record of the best thoughts and the most heroic efforts of the race, or a portion of it, in its evolution up from the ignorance and superstition of barbarism. It is inspired only in the sense that Shakespeare, or any other great masterpiece, is inspired. The Bible teaches that 'all scripture is given by inspiration of God' (2 Tim. iii. 16); that 'no prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit' (2 Pet. i. 20, 21). This revelation is so complete and final that neither man nor angel can add to or take from it. (Gal. i. 7-9; Rev. xxii. 18, 19).

2. Modernism claims that Jesus was the Son of God only in a sense true of all good men. It admits that he was divine only in the same sense that all men are divine. It denies his deity; whereas the Bible teaches that he was, and is, the only begotten of the Father. (Matt. xvi. 16; John i. 14). He is equal with God (Phil. ii. 6), and He is God (John i. 1).

3. Modernism rejects the virgin birth as being unscientific and offensive to enlightened minds; while the Bible teaches that He was begotten of God Almighty through the power of the Holy Spirit and born of the virgin Mary. (Luke i. 35; Isa. vii. 14; ix. 6). The Biblical accounts of his birth describe it as a virgin birth. To deny the virgin birth is to impeach the predictions of the prophets as well as the records of the evangelists. Denial of the virgin birth makes Mary, his mother, an

immoral woman. It makes Jesus an illegitimate child of unknown paternity. It makes the atonement a farce and his mission a failure.

4. Modernism describes the death of Jesus as merely that of a martyr. He was far ahead of his generation in his social and ethical teachings, the modernists say. His religious views were revolutionary, they say, but his death was premature and unfortunate. This claim lays the infidel axe at the root of the gospel tree. Admit this claim, and the gospel is devitalized. The mission of our Lord ends in inglorious failure. But the Bible teaches that Jesus was a lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. xiii. 8); that he died voluntarily, not because he was overpowered (John x. 18; xix. 10, 11; Matt. xxvi. 53); that he gave his life a ransom for many (Matt. xx. 28), a propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 John ii, 2). Apart from the shedding of his blood there is no remission of sins. (Matt. xxvi. 28; Heb. ix. 22; x. 4; 1 Pet. i, 18-20; Rev. i. 5). Men are not saved merely by following the moral and ethical teachings, of Jesus. It is necessary to obey him in order to be saved, but this obedience involves faith in the atoning merits of his blood. Without his death we could not be saved. We are reconciled to God through the death of his Son. (Rom. v 10).

5. Modernism asserts that Jesus did not rise from the dead, and, consequently, that faith in his resurrection is unnecessary. If this claim be true, we have no reasonable explanation of the empty tomb, or the changed attitude of the apostles and of their consequent sufferings and death. If this claim be true, the gospel witnesses are unreliable; for they testified that Jesus rose from the dead on the third day, as he said; that he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs (Acts i. 2); and that Thomas examined the wounds in his hands and side (John xx. 27). If he did not rise from the dead, 'then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. . . . Ye are yet in your sins . . . Then they also which are fallen asleep in

Christ are perished.' (1 Cor. xv. 14-18).

6. Modernism, since it denies the virgin birth, the vicarious death, and the bodily resurrection, naturally has no faith in the second coming of the Lord. If he did not come from God nor descend back to him, he could not be expected to come the second time from heaven. There could be no second coming if there were no first. But it is part of our faith to look for the 'blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.' (Tit. ii. 1?). The Thessalonians were 'turned unto God from idols, to serve a living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come.' (1 Thess. i. 9,10). He 'shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for him, unto salvation.' (Heb. ix. 28). He promised his troubled disciples that he would 'come again' and receive them unto himself. As David Livingstone would say: 'These are the words of a gentleman. We can depend on them.' The Lord is not slack concerning his promise.' (2 Pet. iii. 9).

Modernism will join hands with almost any other 'ism' to discredit the Bible and subvert the foundations of our faith. In our own country modernism and communism have joined forces to destroy genuine Christianity and banish all sound religious teaching from the press and the air. If they had the power, they would, be as unreasonable and tyrannical as Catholicism in the darkest and bloodiest days of the Inquisition. Modernism has sought and found expression on the radio and through the press; also its claims are being fostered in the schoolroom and in the home. Textbooks are filled with evolution and other theories and speculations of modernism. Modernism often appears in the guise of 'science.' Especially is this true of sociology and psychology. We hear much of the 'social gospel' and the 'new psychology.'

The 'up-to-date' teacher of psychol-

ogy is a purveyor of modernism; He glibly talks about 'self-expression,' by which he means that the child should be permitted to do as he pleases, lest his originality be cramped and his freedom of expression be lost and his personality all but destroyed. Of course, Solomon and Paul, in particular, taught that children ought to be taught, trained and disciplined; but what of it? They tell us the writers of the Bible were illiterate men. They were old-timers! They knew nothing of the 'new psychology'! It is no wonder that the problem of juvenile delinquency is becoming more and more of a national danger. It is the fruit of this modern, let-'em-do-as-they-please psychology. Such teaching is a preliminary course in anarchy. If children are not taught to respect authority in the home, they will not want to respect it in the school and in the state. If they have the freedom of 'self-expression' in the home, they will expect it wherever they go.

Parents should be on the alert to discover any modernistic teaching or influence that may be brought to bear upon their children. Anything that weakens or destroys their faith in and respect for the Bible should riot be tolerated. Parents should see to it that the money they spend for the education and training of their children be not used to destroy their faith in the Bible and to disqualify them for service in the church.

Moreover, parents, should not send their children to schools that are filled with modernism. They are inviting heartaches and disaster when they do. Any institution that will tolerate modernistic teachers and teaching is unworthy of the name 'Christian,' and has no just claim to the patronage of a people who believe the Bible. Modernism is the archenemy of the Bible, of the home, and of our civilization, whether it parade itself in the garb of avowed infidelity or seek tolerance and acceptance in the name of 'science,' falsely so called. It will destroy faith in the Bible and make of this generation a race of rakes and libertines.

'Gospel Advocate,' U.S.A.

What Kind of Bread?

Dear Bro. Crosthwaite,—If space permits, may I make a few more comments upon what has been written around the question: 'What kind of Bread?' Three brethren have referred to our pioneers. We value their work, but they were men, and, therefore, fallible. For public exposition the use of Greek is unsatisfactory and, I believe, undesirable. Few are Greek scholars, and if they have inclination to be so they have not the time. The more satisfactory method of interpretation is that of comparing Scripture with Scripture, that we may arrive at the truth. Must I say 'Back to the Bible?'

We are yet without a Scriptural statement telling us, as we take the bread, to let our thoughts 'dwell upon any particular Incident in our Lord's life.' Contrary to this is Paul's declaration in 1 Cor. xl. 26. Why pass over a plain statement of Scripture? Let us beware of that most subtle form of modernism-called humanism. It was not the life of Christ, but His death which rent the veil.

In addition, we have the word of Jesus: 'In remembrance of - Me.' Not an incident, but the person of Christ, laying hold upon the promise: 'I am in the midst.' The order of reasoning was Wrong too. Christ must first be our sacrifice, our Saviour, and then our example. Together, we contemplate upon our Lord in His death. As individual members of the body of Christ, we shall endeavour, in our very different walks of life and by His grace, to follow the teaching and example He left. I understand this to be 'applying truths to our own experience.'

In speaking of Christ as an example, we are led to another point. Apart from His Divinity, Christ possessed an fallen nature, being the second Adam. He was not led by His own lusts into temptation, as we are, but driven by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. It was in His death that His nature was broken. He was made to be sin, and it is sin which breaks. Not thorns, or a spear, or nails, but sin, as God sees sin, and as Jesus endured it. The bread, then, is the symbol of this unique body broken by sin.

'My flesh,' says Jesus, 'which I will give,' refers to His death. Unleavened bread, as Bro. W. understands it, can never represent this. Repetition is not necessarily pointless. For nigh on two thousand years, Christians have kept tryst, and have shown forth the Lord's death. We shall do so until He comes, when we shall realise that it is not the material means we have used to worship Him, nor our geographical position, but the heart of the believer which is precious to Him.

FRANK MURPHY.

Dear Editor,—Bro. Winstanley has not given a very satisfactory answer to 'the question asked in February 'S.S.' I asked him to prove from the Scripture that the Passover, bread (biscuit) was broken in pieces. He says: 'The bread was broken in pieces; how else could the disciples have partaken of it?'

We must remember that it was Jesus, the Son of God, who instituted this Feast, and if He desired it to be partaken in a different way then it would have been so. What is Impossible for man is possible with God.

Bro. Winstanley quotes some remarks of David King. These men may be respected in many things, but are liable to make mistakes as well as others, so we must compare what they say with the Scriptures. 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.'

David King writes: 'The act of breaking is not said to represent anything, nor does it. The bread is broken because it could not be eaten otherwise; the breaking is, therefore, an accidental necessity, not expressive of any corresponding feature in that which is signified. The flesh was pierced with nail and spear and thorn, but the term broken would hardly be selected to denote wounds which left every bone unfractured.' If this be true, why was David King not sure of his statement? He would not have needed to use the word 'hardly.'

Bro. W. in answer to Bro. Barker, refers to 1 Corinthians xl. 23-25, and says it is simply a record of the institution, given (by inspiration, through Paul) to the Church in Corinth. I agree. He tries to prove from this Scripture the unleavened bread, but ignores the fact that the same Spirit (through Paul) has said that: 'Jesus 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.' If the body of Jesus was not broken, then we could not say that the bread" would be a true emblem. I did not say that the body of Jesus was broken in pieces, as suggested, therefore, I do not need to prove such to sustain my contention. If

Paul was merely confirming the divine institution, why did he use the word 'broken' if it does not mean broken? I would not go so far as to say how the bread (biscuit) was broken, I desire to 'speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent.' I desire to be put right if I am wrong, but only by the Scripture. DAVID CHALMERS.

Dear Bro. Crosthwaite,—I begin my answer to Bro. Winstanley's reply to me, by adding my wish to his that this discussion may encourage many to search the Scriptures, to see 'whether these things are so,' not only on the question in dispute, but on all the things which divide us. If we all have equal desire

to find truth, I believe it is possible for all to become of one mind—an end we should ever, keep before us.

As for our brother's letter, I am afraid it reveals him as altogether too quick for me. He reaches so many of his conclusions with a hop, skip, and a jump, at which I can only stand and wonder!

For instance, he writes: 'On one point we are agreed, that at the institution of the supper, Jesus used unleavened bread.' No such agreement is possible. As very likely, yes; but as certain, no! He also writes: 'This *artos* was unquestionably unleavened bread.' How anything that is not proved and cannot be proved can be unquestionable is beyond me. Then he takes a most prodigious jump, and states: 'We must not overlook the fact that in the three Gospel accounts this word [*arios*] means "unleavened bread".' If it is a fact, it ought to be demonstrable, but I have not the slightest hesitation in asserting that neither Bro. Winstanley nor anyone else can produce the evidence that will establish the fact, so-called. All through his letter he takes as fully established what, at best, is only an assumption.

Our brother writes: 'Brethren Barker and Chalmers . . . contend that the breaking of the bread represents "the body of Jesus broken on the Cross".' As for Bro. Chalmers, I have no right to speak, but for myself I contended for no such thing. What I wrote—and no more was intended—was that it was an abuse of language to say, as Bro. Winstanley did, that the Lord's body was not broken, because 'no bone of him was broken.'

It will be noticed that Bro. Winstanley has shifted his ground a little. He began his first article with the words: 'Some maintain that . . . we may justifiably use whatever is commonly called bread, but the following considerations will show that such contentions cannot be sustained.' In effect, that puts every Church which fails to use unleavened bread in the wrong. In his letter of last issue, however, he passes from the offensive to the defensive, and writes: 'Is any one of my critics prepared to say that we do wrong when we use the kind of bread that Jesus used?' The answer to that may be found later in this letter, but it might conceivably be right for anyone to take a certain action, and yet be wrong if it is sought to impose that action upon others, which is what Bro. Winstanley set out to do.

Despite what Bro. Winstanley says about it, the relevance of my remarks about the Jewish law being obsolete does come in. The insistence that, if the Feast is to be rightly observed, unleavened bread—and only unleavened bread—must be used, introduces an element of legalism where all else is perfectly free. Such an idea is an antithesis of Christianity. If unleavened bread was not rendered obsolete (religiously) with

the Passover, will Bro. Winstanley give us chapter and verse for its retention or re-introduction?

Many years ago, I came in contact with a brother who held firmly—almost to a matter of conscience—that as the Feast is called the Lord's Supper and was partaken of in the evening, it—to adapt Bro. Winstanley's argument—must be the right time for its observance, otherwise Jesus would not have chosen it. If that argument is good for the bread, it is equally good for the time. If not, why not?

Bro. Winstanley writes: 'Bro. Barker's argument would have us believe that Jesus used bread which was not a true representation of the thing He [the Lord] said it signified.' This I deny. We are told that 'Jesus took bread . . . and said: This is my body.' It was bread that represented His body. But Bro. Winstanley says: No! It was not just bread. It was a special kind of bread. It was unleavened bread, 'unquestionably so; and thereby introduces something that neither Matthew, Mark, Luke, nor Paul mentions. Indeed, as I think we shall see, they—all of them, with the Lord Himself—would seem to have been careful not to mention it. Bro. Winstanley has nothing but pure inference for his authority, and we have been taught never to assume what is incapable of proof.

With respect to leaven, it was noted that Bro. Winstanley wrote that 'it is usually a type of sin,' but he goes on to write as though it always stood for sin, which it does not. In his letter, he says, 'it is the general rule,' and that would be hard to prove. Jesus used it once, at anyrate, to signify that which is good. Before Bro. Winstanley can properly say or imply that only unleavened bread can be an accurate representation of the Lord's body in the Feast, let him first show us where—if anywhere—in the N.T. unleavened bread is definitely stated to be a representation of the Lord or His body. Then he will have a little justification for the position he takes.

Bro. Winstanley is too precise over my use of 'instituted.' Introducing the word, I wrote: 'It can properly be said, I believe,' which was intended as a qualification: that the word was not to be taken quite literally, but, for the matter in dispute, could be accepted. Not that it matters. Take what Paul tells us: I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you.' That which he received, that he delivered. No more, no less. Part of that which was received and delivered, was that 'the Lord Jesus . . . took bread.' To repeat myself: 'No mention is made there of unleavened bread, and unless it can be shown that unleavened is implicit in the term Paul uses, then Bro. Winstanley's contention avails nothing.' Our brother tacitly admits the point, and tries to deal with it.

He says: 'Surely it is significant that the Apostle used the precise word used by the inspired historians.' Yes, it surely is. But the true significance of its use he has quite failed to see, as his letter clearly shows.

He writes, correctly: 'Matthew, Mark, and Luke, all say that Jesus took bread, and the word for bread there is *artos*.' Then, taking a jump, he says: 'This *artos* was unquestionably unleavened bread.' To show how impossible it is to establish a case on inference, let me place in opposition to that statement of Bro. Winstanley's another on the same lines: *Artos* is the word used for bread at the institution of the Feast. Not once in the whole of the N.T. is that Greek word used when unleavened bread is distinctly referred to, therefore the bread used on that occasion could only have been leavened!

That word *artos* is worth looking into, but there is another word, even more important for this discussion: the Greek word *azumos*. This one word in the N.T. is translated into the two English words: 'unleavened bread.' It is the only word—without exception—which the inspired writers use when they mention unleavened bread. So Matthew (xxvi. 17) writes: 'Now the first day of the feast of *Azumos*.' But please note that when, in the same chapter, he comes to the Lord's Supper, he writes: 'As they were eating, Jesus took *artos*,' a word which means simply bread or loaf. That is, with a word at hand which would have drawn attention to the bread as being unleavened, the Lord chose a word which is used for all kinds of bread, and, as Bro. Winstanley points out, it was that same word which was received from the Lord and delivered to Corinthians by Paul. Significant? Yes, very!

It is *artos* which is used in the following sentences: 'Give us this day our daily bread'; 'Command that these stones be made bread'; 'When shall we have so much bread'; 'If a son shall ask bread.' So everywhere else. Where common bread is referred to, *artos* is the word used. So it is, also, where the Lord speaks of Himself as bread: 'The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven'; 'Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life'; 'The bread that I will give is my flesh.' Not *azumos* (unleavened), but *artos*, just common bread.

What does it mean? Simply this, that if, as is affirmed, it was the divine intention that unleavened bread should be used at the Feast, then the Lord failed to use the one word that would have made that intention clear, and He repeated His failure in not delivering that word to Paul, who was responsible for making the facts known to a Gentile community. On the other hand, if it had been, the divine intention to reveal that, though He Himself was using unleavened not common bread as fit choice-

represent His body in the Feast, the word used aptly described it. The Lord, in using unleavened bread—if He did use it, and it is not absolutely certain that He did, for the Feast—did so because, under the Law, He had no choice. We are not under Law. Legalisms are a thing of the past. Common bread, as the N.T. plainly indicates, is a true representation of the Lord and of His body, and common bread is perfectly proper for use at the Lord's Table.

One last point. To those who believe in the full inspiration of the Scriptures, that they are given to us in 'sound words,' and who believe that the word of truth—even one word—should be 'rightly handled' (above all, by those who wrote it!), the choice of a generic term for bread—as *artos* is—settles this matter. When we are told—and Paul tells us it was delivered to him by the Lord Himself in the same form—that Jesus 'took [*artos*] bread,' and not (*azumos*) unleavened bread, we are shown as clear as daylight that the Lord Himself attached no significance whatever to unleavened bread as representing His body. It is as plain as though He said it. The significance unleavened bread is supposed to have is man-made, and worthless. All the evidence that we have shows that instead of it being wrong not to use unleavened bread, what wrong there is—if there is any—lies in its use.

W. BARKER.

[With Bro. Winstanley's reply, the correspondence on this subject must close.]

Another Withdrawal.

THE Church at Blackpool has decided that, in view of the departure from New Testament teaching and the trend towards 'Modernism' by the present leaders in the Co-operation of Churches of Christ in Great Britain and Ireland, generally, that we cannot remain in, or give support to, the 'Co-operation,' and that the Church meeting at Blackpool withdraws from the Co-operation as from she. 1st of April, 1947. The Church will still welcome all who have been received into the body of Christ by faith, repentance and baptism who are loyal to the faith as laid down in the scriptures.

E. WINTER, Sen.

WANTED FOR AFRICA.

VOLUMES of 'British Millennial Harbinger,' and other literature published by pioneers of Churches of Christ. Prices and particulars to Bro. W. N. Short, c/o Bro. J. C. Shewmaker, Kaloma, N. Rhodesia. South Africa,

Christian Pacifism.

Dear Editor,—I wish to make it clear that this is written with no personal feelings. I can testify that on the whole I have met with more sympathy for my views from members of the Forces than from other men at home who have no intentions of serving.

I understood that the subject in hand was war, not citizenship, but I feel that any letter of mine to the 'S.S.', should be read before being criticised. The closing note of my previous letter was: 'Christian thought and living are the surest way to true progress and security.'

The argument for war seems to be built on the assumption that Christians are bound to do exactly as they are told by those who govern them, regardless of any other circumstances. The passage quoted in support of this theory is: 'Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's.' It should be noted that the 'thing' referred to here was a coin of the realm, issued by Caesar for the purpose of exchange and taxation; it is not in any sense to be compared with what God has created.

What Caesar has created he may have—it is Caesar's. When he creates life, then he may demand it again, but why not quote the more significant part of the passage: 'And unto God the things that are God's'? This latter part gives the life to a rather wild assumption. God alone gave life. This then is where we ask for His authority to any man or government to take any man's life for any reason whatsoever. If the statement is true that 'the powers that be are ordained of God,' and we know that it is true, does it not naturally follow that they are in their turn bound to keep His law? Christ assumed that (Matt, xix, 11) and Pilate accepted it without question. Rulers then can only justify their right in going to war when they can show God's authority for their doing so.

Can anyone show us where Jesus Christ or any of His Apostles, ever commanded or inferred by their teaching that Christians, or rulers, should ever engage in acts of physical warfare? If we are to 'speak where the Bible speaks,' where is the divine authority for war in the New Testament, and for what? I suggest that the passages in Rom. xiii. 1-10; Tit. iii. 1, 2; 1 Peter ii. 13; be read and examined in their context. This will show beyond doubt that the reference is in every case to Christians as citizens—civilians—not as soldiers, and has no reference whatsoever to war.

If we take into account the persecution of the Church and the martyrdom of the saints for refusing to bow the knee to rulers, and if we consider the answer of Jesus to the High Priest, and His refusal to speak under compulsion before Herod, or to save His life before Pilate, their example would be enough to

convince us that it was not because of respect for those in authority that they endured these agonies, but respect for God who gave the rulers their powers. Consider Christ's opinion of Herod. (Luke xiii. 32.)

There is no possible case for war in the New Testament; but it is clear to any unbiased person that Matt. v. 44 is directly opposed to it. The words of Christ in 'love your enemies,' is a rule given to Christians the wide world over, and in personal practical manifestation is not limited in any sense by the snobbery of nationalism. The moral law of the Sermon on the Mount recognised no barriers of class, creed, or colour.

J. WOOD.

Bro. Editor,—Bro. Clark's letter does not bring from the Scriptures anything new as to precept or example, and his assertions are too freely made to be convincing.

Bro. Jepson also makes one or two statements, that it may be better if they are just left to find their level. Apart from those, however, our brother says: 'You cannot love your fellow-man, much less your enemies, and at the same time be a man of carnal warfare,' and he adds: 'This, I claim is the sum and substance of the whole argument.' Therefore, let me say his whole argument rests on his own reasoning. He may base his own life on his reasoning, but it gives him no right to dictate what another man should do, seeing he cannot give Scripture in support of his reasoning. He finds neither laws or example. I question his statement, as I believe that circumstances can arise when a man's love for humanity is indeed very low if it does not compel him to obey the call of his country. There are times when human life is not the most sacred thing at stake.

Our brother also says: 'I fail entirely to see anything in his deductions and conclusions upon the subject, that is in harmony with the whole trend of N.T. teaching.' Now, my conclusions are not in conflict with a single passage. It must not be concluded that because I prefer God's method of opposing war rather than the method Bro. Jepson supports, therefore I must be in favour of war. I do not differ with Bro. J. as to the trend of N.T. teaching and the spirit of the Gospel being against war. I have believed that for sixty years. But I differ with him as to how the Christian should seek to bring it to an end.

I belong to a class whose influence against war far exceeds that of pacifism. The methods of pacifism defeat the end in view, by bringing a prejudice against the movement for peace that retards rather than assists its spread. And on the religious side, when they go beyond what is written and teach that war is an evil and that a Christian should not

be a soldier, it only divides the Church and hinders the spread of the Gospel, and obstructs the great divine means by which peace must come. To associate with the Gospel unauthorised doctrine that would soon be prohibited and expelled by every empire and nation, is not to give our lives for the Gospel, but rather to make its spread impossible. The Gospel stands supreme and has claims far above those for our devotion to a novice human method for the suppression of war.

The substance of our difference I would say, is that, considering the Scriptures do not condemn war as an evil, nor do they even hint that a Christian should not go to war, therefore the question is not a religious one, but is a political affair, wherein every Christian, as in his home and industrial life, may as a citizen, in association with his fellow-man, carry out his national duties as he deems they are in accord with his Christian principles and the spirit of the Gospel and realising his responsibility to God.

JOHN ANDERSON.

HOW COME ELDERS?

Dear Brother Editor,—In reply to Bro. G. M. Bishop's query, it seems strange to some people that assemblies claiming to be guided by the Word of God as given in the N.T. should have different practices relating to the manner how elders should be appointed in the Church of Christ. Why should there be differences? Surely all believe that the writers of the N.T. knew what they were saying.

The Apostle Paul gave definite instructions that 'elders be appointed in every city, as I gave thee charge' (Tit. i. 5). Did the Apostle give Titus a charge without instructions how it was to be done? Was Paul less careful regarding the method how elders were to be appointed to have the spiritual oversight of the assembly, than his Master Jesus was when He commanded His Apostles how they were to make disciples of all the nations? Certainly not. The qualifications are distinctly stated. The crux of the whole query circles round the question: How; in what manner; by what means were the elders appointed? Acts xiv. 23; 2 Cor. viii. 19; define the how.

Let us face facts and deal with them as we find them in the N.T., in Acts xiv. 23. The writer gives the word *kirotoneosantes*, which literally translated means they (the assembly) stretched their hands after prayer and fasting.

The above-mentioned word has three parts. It is a compound word, giving three distinct parts or separate meanings. (1) =hand; (2) *toneo*=to stretch; (3) *santes* is the ending of the third person

plural of the first aorist participle active.

If we put these three parts into their places we have the following sentence: They stretched their hands. How is answered by prayer, fasting, and a show of hands.

The Apostle Paul uses the same word in 2 Cor. viii. 19; but a different participle, passive instead of active. The word used by Paul was *kirotoneis*. This word is also a compound word, and, has three parts distinct from each other. (1) *fei*=hand; (2) *tonee*=to stretch; (3) *theis*, which is the ending for the first person singular of the first aorist participle passive nominative case.

The above-mentioned appointment, 2 Cor. viii. 19, shows how one brother was appointed. Why should not all the Churches conform to the same order as given in Acts xiv. 23; Tit. i. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 1, 2?

Brethren I ask you to prove all things, and hold fast to all that is according to truth.

G. ALLAN.

VOTING,

Dear Brother Editor,—Many brethren are perplexed regarding voting on Church business. Would you give me your ruling on the above subject? Have we any New Testament authority or example after the Church was established on the day of Pentecost? I know we find *kleeros* in Col. i. 12, 1 Pet. v. 3, but was such done by voting?

Voting on any subject by an unenlightened assembly may lead to many unscriptural and antisciptural practices. I am perfectly sure that all the innovations have been brought into being by means of the majority vote. What do you say?

A more reliable guide is found in 2 Tim. iii. 16-17.

Trusting you will find time to reply.

G. ALLAN.

[We think it best to leave this open for brethren to express their views. We could-soon give our view.—Ed.]

CREMATION.

Dear Bro. Editor,—May I thank Bro. Ferguson for his reply to mine on 'Cremation.' I appreciate his coming out into the open with his opinion.

Still he has not stated that cremation is un-Scriptural and not according to God's divine will.

He has shown well the method of burial in the times of Abraham, Jesus, and others. This method was performed with much ceremony according to Jewish history and tradition. The body first being washed, anointed with perfumes, swathed in bandages, and eventually laid in tomb, sepulchre, or apartment, which previous to burial was purified

with sweet, smelling herbs. (2 Chron. xiv, 14; John xix. 39, 40.)

This type of burial Bro: W. calls 'Christian burial.' I believe he errs on this point. There is no such thing as 'Christian burial' in the New Testament. The nearest to such a title would be the burial of the 'old man' in the waters of baptism.

If it be 'Christian burial,' we are guilty of departing away from the method as practised in times of Christ and others, to the present system of burial.

In the closing remarks of his letter, he says he prefers 'God's way of burying good men.' Where in the New Testament does it show us God's way of burial or the disposal of our dead? If there was, it would be clearly revealed to us as part of His will.

I maintain we have liberty on our method of disposing with the empty shell or tabernacle of the dead, and there is no evidence in the N.T. of any objection to cremation..

A. ALLAN.

SCRIPTURE READINGS

James's Letter.

IT is probable that this letter was written by James the brother of our Lord. He played a prominent part in the Church at Jerusalem (see particularly Acts xv). It was written to Jews in foreign cities who had accepted Christ (John vii. 35, 1 Peter i. 1). The teaching is such as we all need all the time. Somewhat abrupt in expression, it emphasises the practical side of our faith. Perhaps we could call it the epistle of Christian practice. There are many subjects of instruction in the compass of these chapters and we can only hope to touch upon most of them.

After a brief introduction reminiscent of the letter in Acts xv. 23, we pass from greeting, to encouragement to joy in suffering. It is a repetition of Matt. v. 11, 12, where the same command appears. Evidently, it was known that the readers would be bearing at least a fair measure of persecution. The word rendered 'servant' in verse 1, represents 'slave' in the original, a title claimed by both Peter and Paul also in their letters, and reminding us of our position as redeemed creatures—'bought with a price.'

Trials rightly borne develop patience, and patience produces in due time the ultimate object of the effort and soundness of the spiritual man.

Thinking of the complete Christian brings forward one thing which most do lack—wisdom. God can give that (and

only God), and it must be sought diligently and confidently.

We suppose a natural Characteristic of the first readers would be their acquisitiveness, and therefore the letter has frequent references to temptations applicable to the well-to-do. The wisdom from above will guide both rich and poor, and keep both humble.

Riches tempt through worldly desires, yet the poor likewise are tempted by their lusts. Some who have little are more avaricious than their rich neighbours. Their very lack tempts them to covet. We must not, however, blame God for temptation. This is a common attitude of mind, revealed for instance by the cry, 'Why does God allow this, or that?' Those very circumstances which may by endurance be the path to the 'crown of life,' may our failure to stand fast, drag us down to sin and death.

God is the Giver of all good, and His purpose ('will') through His Word is that we should be like the first fruits of harvest, His special portion. The outworking of the new life is in listening with care to God's commandments, and controlling speech and action in accord therewith. Receiving the Word involves responsibility to give obedience to it—if any benefit is to follow. We see the same thought at the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount. Merely to hear deludes and does not save.

Again our speech must be right or we shall be deluding ourselves as to our salvation. Our choice of words, our refraining from worldly expressions is vital. The word 'religion' (i. 26 and 27) conveys rather 'observance' or 'worship' here. Our attendance at worship must go hand in hand with curbing our speech, caring for (rather than merely 'visiting') those in need, and not getting soiled with worldliness.

The exhortation in ii. 1, indicates a tendency on the part of those addressed to respect station in life rather than spiritual things. This is, however, a universal tendency too. There are some meeting places where a poorly dressed person would feel decidedly embarrassed. It is just a part of 'loving our neighbour' to make no distinction on account of dress or station in life. The Saviour lived with and walked among the common people, and certainly never favoured the rich. The emphasis is again upon word and deed, see the summary exhortation in ii. 12.

The connection between faith and works is of vital importance—worship and works have already been brought into partnership in 1.27. To be regularly in our place to worship is good, to cling tenaciously to the truth is splendid; to combine both with pure speech and noble action is best. Unless we do so, our profession by acts of worship or expressions of belief is in vain, and we shall not find acceptance in the **Great Day**.

Luther rashly condemned this portion of Scripture, on account of his 'faith alone' ideas. To the New Testament Christian, the reconciliation of Paul and James is too obvious to need comment. The doctrine of 'faith alone' must be given up if we are to please God—believing His Word. Even the harlot of Jericho is commended for action based upon belief in God. Many in Jericho may have similarly believed the reports, but they were not saved because they did not act.

With our strong adherence to mutual ministry in relation to the public work, we must earnestly consider the warning in iii. 1. To teach is a grave responsibility, and not one of us dare claim we have that complete control of our tongue which assures that the hearers will be blessed thereby. Here again, is the two-fold warning against misuse of speech and action.

There are those who feel they are wiser than their brethren and those that are so. They may prove it by an abundant measure and practise of meekness. We should never have contemptuous feelings towards others. Let our ambition be to acquire the wisdom which makes the delightful picture in iii. 17 and 18.

Our fourth chapter gives further evidence that all was not well with the lives and characters of the readers. Those natural longings for pre-eminence, the wish to please the well-to-do, the rivalry among the teachers produced strife in the Church—as they do now among us at times. They are forms of spiritual adultery—turning away from the One who is all in all to us, and flirting with the world. True humility is the only safeguard. Deep sorrow of heart should fill us when we contemplate, divided conditions in the Church—our thought should humbly be 'Is it I, Lord?'

The particular form in which the tongue can do most harm is in speaking evil of another. Christ forbids us to 'judge'—which rather surely indicates 'condemn' (Matt. vii. 1 to 5), and we are law-breakers if we do it.

The concluding verses of our readings deal with thought and speech in relation to the future. In every plan the Christian must have consciousness of God's overruling. We must never say we shall do this or that without the thought, or better the expression of it, that what we do is subject to the divine permission. To boast in regard to our future action is certainly inconsistent with a true profession of Christ. Everyone (Christian or otherwise) knows that the future is really beyond our control, we have a duty to have it always in mind.

'Our failure to act when we know we ought to do so, is as much sin as disobeying a command. We have said before that Christ's laws are deeper and fuller than those of Moses, or of an earthly government. They deal with the in-

dividual heart and conscience, and touch every thought and motive. "All things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with Whom we have to deal" (Heb. iv. 12-13).

R. B. SCOTT.

THE AMERICAN SCENE.

Correction.—Bro. D. A. Sommer has written to point out an inaccuracy in our article in November 'S.S.' and has sent evidence to prove his point. The Colleges do receive grants or gifts from Church funds. I regret this mistake on my part, and apologise to readers for being so long in making the correction.

R. B. SCOTT.

FELLOWSHIP OF YOUTH WHIST DRIVE AND DANCE

The Carden Fellowship of Youth held a successful whist drive and dance in the Masonic Hall. Miss Proctor, the organiser, spoke of the good work being done for the Youth of the district, and urged public support in the furtherance of this good work. Mr. James Moffat, Youth Leader, supervised the arrangements. Keen competition ensued under the direction of Mr. R. Moffat, Card master.

Fife Local Paper.

You can write 'Ichabod' on every Church and religious movement that resorts to such worldly, dangerous, and destructive methods of attracting youth.—Ed. "S.S."

BELFAST CONFERENCE

THIS was held on April 5th, and was a time of rich fellowship.

The next 'S.S.' will (D.V.) be a conference number, containing report of conference and week-end meetings.

HINOLEY BIBLE SCHOOL

Final Reminder

BIBLE SCHOOL to be held by the Church of Christ, meeting in Argyle Street, Hindley, May 24th to May 29th, inclusive.

Lectures and messages by well-known brethren. Early morning Prayer Meetings.. Questions answered. A session enjoyed last year by many brethren. Mountain-top experiences. Happy fellowship. Write immediately stating requirements.

Day visitors are requested to drop a line, so that catering arrangements can be made in advance. Write to: L. Morgan, 'Glen-Iris,' 44 Lord' Street, Hindley, Wigan, Lanes.

Should I ?

IT is continually noised abroad: 'We need the young in the Church,' while, not so loud, we also hear: 'We are losing the young members from the Church.' Sapping the strength from our Churches is the continual drift of young men and women into the world through 'unequally yoked marriages.' How often it is said: 'Bro. or Sis. — was a grand worker for the Lord until married out of the Lord; we never see them at the Breaking of Bread now.' It is a sad picture, in many of our assemblies at the present time.

If the question: 'Should I marry in the Lord or out of Him?' or 'Should I marry a Christian or non-Christian?' were asked more often before the actual step of marriage was taken, yes, at the very commencement of a friendship, great changes and much harm, would be averted.

Only in the light of the New Testament can this important question be answered; which says: 'The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth, but if her husband be dead she is at liberty to marry to whom she will only in the Lord.' (1 Cor. vii. 39).

'Only in the Lord.' No other choice here! 'Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers.' (2 Cor. vi. 14). This covers a lot: 'shady' business, clubs, societies, companions, etc., as well as marriage.

The New Testament teaches to be 'unequally yoked' is dangerous: 'Evil communications [companions] corrupt good manners.' (1 Cor. xv. 33). Christian character in danger of being ruined.' 'What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness and what communion hath light with darkness.' (2 Cor. vi. 14). True Christian fellowship impossible! 'And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body should be cast into hell.' (Matt. v. 30). We are in danger of losing our SOUL.

While it can be said some have been added to the Church through such a marriage, the good done can be easily overshadowed by the harm. Anyhow, who adds to the Lord's Church, is it not the Lord? And shall it be said, 'Let us do evil that good may come?' Such marriages are a transgression of God's Word.

—A. ALLAN.

EASIER TO BLAME THAN TO PRAISE

IT is so much easier to blame and find fault than it is to praise. Praise is never 'under proof.' It radiates like the sun, and it warms more than the one praised. It even warms the one who praises. It is a joy to work for one where praise is given whenever merited. It is something that is always appreciated. Without praise and encouragement few of us could long strive—not even for the monetary rewards.—Praise is both food and drink to the mind and to the spirit. It is something that you gladly give away that has cost you nothing. It is soul spur that works double.

George Matthew Adams.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

TO end of May: A. E. Winstanley, c/o J. Wilson, Station-Road, Slamannan, Stirlingshire.

MARRIAGE

ILKESTON. — Bro. Gilbert Edward Bullock to Sister Joyce Mabel Booth, on Saturday, March 22nd, 1947, Bro. S. Jepson officiating.

COMING EVENT

THE half-yearly Conference of Sunday School Teachers in Slamannan District will be held (D.V.) in Blackridge Church Meeting House, on Saturday, May 24th, beginning at 4 o'clock. Bro. Duncan Stewart will preside. The conference address is to be given by Bro. A. E. Winstanley on 'New Methods of Teaching in the Sunday School.' A hearty welcome is extended to all.

East Ardsley.—We have Just concluded with the services of our Bro. P. Worgan, for a short time. Our brother has worked very hard in this district, not sparing himself in speaking and in visitation. While we have no results to show, we

feel that valuable work" has been done, and the members strengthened in the desire to serve the Lord. We are looking forward to our brother coming back again to serve us for another period, God willing. He has gone to Ilkeston, and we hope, with the help of God, that he will have a successful mission there.

ii. WORTH.

Buckhaven.—We are pleased to report the immersion of two young women on Lord's Day, March 30th. Marion McLaren (wife of Bro. David McLaren), who has come out of the Church of England, obeyed the Lord Jesus, and was baptised into Him. Isobel Carnegie also rendered obedience to the Saviour, according to the New Testament requirements. She is the daughter of Christian parents, members of the Church of Christ.

The whole service this Lord's Day morning was a very inspiring one. Everyone experienced an uplift and a sense of the presence of Him in our midst. The blessing of Moses on the children of Israel was pronounced upon our two sisters, as they were received into the Church.

Our hearts were gladdened when observing these two ordinances, the Lord's Supper and Believers' Baptism, in our morning worship. Coming to our final hymn, which was sung with real fervour, expressing our sincere resolve, we sang:

'Faith of our fathers, holy faith,
We will be true to thee till death.'

We feel sure there was joy in heaven and joy in His Church on earth.

J. McLAREN.

Kirkcaldy, Rose Street.—The Women's Meeting closed the winter session on Monday, March 31st, when about forty members and friends met in a social capacity. Sister Mrs. Steedman occupied the chair and carried through a varied programme very acceptably. Bro. R. Roberts voiced the thanks of the Church for the good work the sisters were doing for the Master, and expressed the hope that next 'session would see a still greater success. • At the close, Sister Mrs. Roberts moved the vote of thanks to all who had contributed to make such a happy evening.

Kirkcaldy, Rose Street. — The Church here held its annual social on March 8th, when a gathering of about 180 brethren and friends filled out meeting place to capacity. Indeed, it was the largest attendance ever. All Churches in Fife were represented and, in addition, we had many brethren from Churches across the Forth: many of whom had travelled a long way to be with us. Owing to unforeseen circumstances, our material provisions ran short, but what we lacked in

that respect was amply made up in the feast of good things spiritually. Bro. Ketcherside, from U.S.A., and Bro. Winstanley, both gave of their best and took us to the mountain top. Bro. Ketcherside is a strong, forceful speaker, and gets more words into the minute than most of us are accustomed to. Nevertheless, he is clear and plain and has a personality which impresses and inspires. We were also delighted to welcome Sister Ketcherside, who, in the short time here, endeared herself to all whom she met. Altogether this was a memorable occasion, rich in Christian fellowship.

Bro. Ketcherside also spoke at both services on Lord's Day: at the Women's Meeting, on Monday, March 10th, and the Fellowship meeting, on Wednesday, March 12th. At all of these meetings we had splendid attendances. Truly, this was a time of great refreshing for the Church here, and we are grateful to our brother for his willing and inspiring service.

Kirkcaldy, Rose Street.—On Lord's Day evening, March 16th, the Church here again rejoiced in hearing the good confession, when Mrs. Agnes Downie, wife of one of our members, was immersed into the ever-blessed name. She was received into the fellowship of the Church on Lord's Day, March 23rd.

Leicester, Churchgate.—It is with great joy we report our first addition by immersion. Doreen Silvia Atterwell was immersed by Bro. E. D. Pearce, on March 22nd. Following contact with Bro. Pearce, she attended our meetings and expressed her desire to put on the Lord in the way He has appointed.

We record our sincere thanks to Bro. A. Gardiner, who gave an address at this service, and to the Loughborough Church for loan of their baptistry. We pray that our new sister may continue to walk with her Lord, and that this may be the beginning of many additions.

S. HARBOTTLK.

Morley.—The Church has just concluded a fourteen months' effort of evangelistic work under the able leadership of Bro. Frank Worgan, evangelist. The work has been shared by us and the Churches of Ardsley and Doncaster, and has been a period of much hard work with little to show for it, as far as additions are concerned, but the spiritual benefits cannot be measured.

We are deeply grateful to our brother for the unstinted service he has given, and desire to place on record our high appreciation of what he has done.

Our thanks, too, are due to the Hindley Church for placing our brother at our disposal. We look now for his return to us shortly for a further period, when we trust he will reap the fruits of his labours with us,

U, BANKS.

Newtongrange.—We have just finished a three months' mission with Bro. Albert Winstanley. Our brother has not spared himself in declaring the whole counsel of God, to very good and appreciative audiences. He has stirred up the Church to their responsibility and duty to one another and to their God. He has spent much time in visiting the members, and from door to door. We hope and trust that the efforts of our brother may be lasting in the many hearts that heard him. Our prayers go with him into his new field of labour. May our heavenly Father bless his labours, and may our brethren labour with him to the extension of our Lord's kingdom by many souls being won for Him.

We were greatly cheered and uplifted, on March 21st, when we heard the good confession, and witnessed the Immersion of two of our Bible class scholars, Connie Aitken and Betty Kerr. We commend them both to the Lord of Glory to keep them faithful to that day when He shall come to take all the faithful to be with Himself. Also on March 30th, we had a grand time. Truly the bells of heaven were ringing when two young men, and one of our Sunday school scholars came forward. James Brunton, Eddie Millar, and David Kerr confessed their faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and were immersed into His ever-blessed name. We are very happy indeed at such a fine wind-up to a very successful mission, which has resulted in seven being added by immersion and restoration. May the Lord bless them and keep them. May the Lord make His face to shine upon them, and give unto them His glorious peace.

W. H. AUAN.

Ulverston, Ford Villa. — We have been much encouraged and strengthened by the visit, of Bro. and Sister Ketcherside, of St. Louis, U.S.A., and Bro. A. E. Win-Stanley. Meetings were held on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, March 25th, 26th, and 27th, and all were very well attended. At one meeting eighteen adult non-members were present. It was good and refreshing to hear three brethren so faithfully preach the Word, and to have fellowship and conversation with them. The Lord bless and prosper them in every good word and work.

Newtongrange.—With great joy we announce that the Gospel has been the means of bringing two young men to see their need of obeying our Lord and Master. On April 4th, we were overjoyed to hear the good confession and witness the immersion of Bro. Murdoch Wilson, and on April 9th Morris Finlay came forward and was immersed into the name of Jesus, our Lord and Redeemer.

May our brethren be kept faithful and prove to be a power for truth and the extension of our Master's kingdom.

W. H. ALLAN,

Scholes, Wigan.—After a season of sorrow through the recent death of beloved members, the Church is rejoicing with the joy of harvest through the power of the Gospel. During the eight days, March 22nd—30th inclusive, an intensive mission was conducted by Bro. Leonard Channing, of Kentish Town. Bro. Channing threw himself wholeheartedly into the work. All day long, he visited and had earnest conversations with those who were outside the kingdom of God; and in the evenings the Gospel was faithfully made known through him.

Our brother's messages on 'Modernism,' 'Inspiration of the Bible,' 'Faith,' 'Baptism,' 'The Resurrection of Christ,' and 'Denominationalism' were powerful and convicting, and one felt again how irrefutable is the Word of God. That the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation was proved among us, in that seven during the week gladly received the Word and were baptised. These seven were Moses Boardman (a former Methodist), Sydney Housley (at one time associated with the Church of England), Tom Birchall and his wife Annie (former Congregationalist), and three scholars from our Bible school: Normal Parker, George Astley, junior, and Elsie Davenport.

Not only have these evident fruits followed the faithful sowing of the Word, but the field is white for the gathering of a still greater harvest. There is a spirit of enquiry abroad, born out of the clear and simple testimony of the Scriptures, in contrast to the confused and apologetic witness commonly heard among the denominations, which has caused many to lose faith in 'organised religion.' Our earnest prayer is that, through God, we shall be sufficient for these things, and that the message and lives we present to the people shall be equal to their needs.

The Church, too, has been edified and strengthened by Bro. Channing's service. Great interest has been aroused among the brethren, and a deeper realisation of our privileges as the save of God. Bro. Channing also gave attention to teaching in the Bible school both Lord's Day mornings and afternoons. In both Church and school the meetings are being better attended than for many years. Revival seems to be among us and there is 'sound of abundance of rain.'

Now that Bro. Channing has left us to resume work at Kentish Town, we pray that he may have been cheered and encouraged by the glorious results he has seen for his labours, and that the zeal did not die down and fritter away but was a Holy fire purifying our own souls that we may be vessels more fit for the Master's use. We are grateful again to our brethren at Kentish Town for his labours, and that the zeal

sending Bro. Channing among us. We know that they will feel that any sacrifice they have made has been abundantly worth while in view of the results achieved.

The mission happily coincided with the visit of Bro. Carl Ketcherside to the Wigan district. On two occasions, Bro. Ketcherside preached at Scholes, as well as serving the Churches at Hindley and Albert Street, each time before crowded congregations. Bro. Ketcherside's messages, absolutely true to the Scriptures, and his presence among us, had not a little to do with the glorious experiences we had in those all too few days. We are grateful to him. May God abundantly bless these 'beloved brethren, and faithful ministers, and fellow-servants in the Lord' as they labour for Him in His vineyard.

Tranent, East Lothian. — We held our social meeting on March 22nd. It was a united meeting of all the Churches in the Slamannah District, at the conclusion of Bro. Ketcherside's mission. We held the meeting in the Town Hall., It was good to house such a gathering. They came from all parts Bro. Ketcherside has visited. It was a great meeting, the largest ever in Tranent. The number at the tea was about two hundred and sixty. After a good tea, we began the meeting by singing, 'Zion stands with hills surrounded.' The singing of this was grand. Bro. Steele, who was chairman, made a few remarks, but said he would not take up time. He called on the Motherwell choir to sing to us. They sang a lovely piece. Bro. Dougall sang a solo very effectively. Brethren Ketcherside, Winstanley, and Dougall sang to us a nice piece.

Bro. Winstanley gave an address, rousing us to further effort for our Lord and Master. Blackridge choir then sang to us. It was a fine effort. As time was getting on, the chairman allowed Bro. Ketcherside the rest of the time. He spoke for seventy minutes. He held the meeting spell-bound, telling of the building of the walls of Jerusalem, a task for

everyone in the Church. It was a great and inspiring address, one that will be long remembered by us all. •

Bro. John Richardson moved votes of thanks in an interesting way, and commended Brother and Sister Ketcherside to our heavenly Father, and wished them everything that is best; and hoped to meet again, if the Lord wills. The meeting ended by singing, 'From distant places of our land,' and prayer by Bro. George Allan, Newtongrange.

WALTER WILSON.

Obituary.

Birmingham Charles Henry Street.—We regret to record the passing of our brother Leonard Tranter, during the early hours of March 10th, after much suffering. We pray for the consolation of God to be granted to his wife and daughter in their need and sorrow.

East Arclsley.—It is with deep regret that we announce the falling asleep of our Bro. George Holdsworth. Our brother, who has suffered for two years from illness, finally went for an operation, and survived only a few days after. We shall miss our brother very much indeed. He was a sincere worker in the school, and did many things in the Church which many did not see, such as kind actions. During his two years' illness, he rarely missed a meeting, although very often he was ill. He gave a lesson to many who are well, in attendance at the services. Bro. Allen Murray, of East Kirkby, conducted the service in the chapel and at the graveside. We commend his sorrowing wife and relatives to the tender mercy of God, that He will sustain them in their need, until we meet again.

The wife of our late brother and his relatives wish to extend to all, their thanks for kind sympathy and help extended to them in their sad bereavement.

E. WORTH.

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

AH matter for Insertion must-be sent before the 10th of the month (News items, the 15th) to the Editor: W. CROSTHWAITE, Ford Villa, Hart Street, Ulverston, Lanes. All orders and payments to the Treasurer: A. L. FRITH, 18 Poulton Street, Fleetwood, Lancashire.

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

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

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

THE SCRIPTURE STANDARD is printed for the Publishers by Walter Barker, Lanfley MM, Nottm,