

The **SCRIPTURE STANDARD**

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

VOL. XIII, No. 4

APRIL, 1947.

'Neither Invite Nor Debar.'

A LONG article, with the above heading, from the pen of Bro. John Allen Hudson, appeared in 'Gospel Advocate,' U.S.A., of Jan. 23rd. Of this phrase, Bro. Hudson says: 'Where it came from I do not know. My impression is that it originated in British history. It is not current in America. I never heard it before visiting the United Kingdom.'

Bro. David King, in 'Ecclesiastical Observer,' Jan. 1st, 1878, tells of British Brethren writing to Alexander Campbell, in the year 1859, re American practice at the Lord's Table. He replied, 'We neither invite nor debar.' In 'Apostolic Times,' of Aug 2nd, 1877, Bro. J.W.McGarvey said of this: 'I propose no defence of this mode of procedure. I am not sure that it can be defended. Indeed, some of our ablest writers in its defence have admired that it is involved in logical inconsistency.' It is pleasing to note that there is much on which we can agree. Bro. Hudson says: 'The way we teach it is, the Lord has placed the table in His kingdom. (Luke xlii. 29, 30). We cannot enter that kingdom except through the new birth (John 3:5;) Only those, then, who have entered the kingdom through the new birth have a right to the table of the Lord that is in His kingdom. The Lord has done His own restricting.' Again, Bro. H. says: 'Mark you, there can be no justification for an unbeliever or an unimmersed person

partaking of the Lord's Supper and if he should do so, someone has been remiss in his duty.' So far, we are agreed, but we differ on how the table should be guarded. Bro. H. says: 'Do we have a right to do more than to bar the way to the wrong person except through teaching, publicly, or privately? Can we bar the way by force?' . . . 'But to throw up artificial distinctions as to meetings, to watch the door and see every stranger and jump on him before the service starts, to see whether he will be allowed to partake, or being re-fused without his ever having pre-sumed that he would partake, places him in such an awkward and confusing position that he will not visit a

service again. I have seen that happen, and others have seen it happen.' If the foregoing is intended to represent the British position, it is, to say the least, an exaggerated picture.

We do invite, and cordially welcome, non-members to our Breaking of Bread services. We are glad for them to witness our order. Which practice is most likely to give offence, to tell non-members before the service that only the immersed can partake, or to let them come in expecting to partake, and then to tell them publicly that they cannot? In our judgment, the latter is more likely to offend. We have not known of any driven away by our practice, but we have known many who were led' to see their position and who

lately obeyed, the Lord. To allow one to partake, to wait until 'one has erred, before speaking, is likely to blind him to his real need. To leave it to the individual to decide whether he shall partake, is to allow man rather than *the* Lord's Word to be the Judge. 'The Lord has done His own restricting.' Certainly, and' as stewards, it is our responsibility to see that His will is done. Is there not in this, and other matters, too much fear of offending men; and too little fear of offending the Lord? We do not doubt Bro. Hudson's statements, but other American writers give a very different impression. We gave

some quotations from these, in our issues of July and August; B46.

On the question of allowing Baptists and other immersed believers to partake of the Supper, we must write more (D.V.) later. Here we just ask: 'If immersion into Christ is for the remission of sins; and is the appointed way into the Lord's kingdom, can we say that those thus immersed have not received remission of sins, and are not in the kingdom? The design of baptism has been fixed by the Lord, and what such people see or think cannot alter that design. Such need teaching the way of the Lord more perfectly.

EDITOR.

Revival in the Churches of Christ.

REVIVAL is the most urgent pressing need in our Churches to-day. In these days, when modernism and worldliness are in so many Churches, falsely called 'Churches of Christ,' as their unscriptural standards and practices belie the Name, it is lamentable that in many loyal, genuine, New Testament Churches, there is a spiritual stagnation or paralysis that calls for a revival of New Testament Christianity in spirit as well as in practice.

Although we know the Bible constitutes the Word and Will of God, and we will not countenance nor tolerate modernism or worldliness in the life as well as in the Church, there appears a deadness in our services, together with a lack of enthusiasm in personal witness, which is hindering the progress of the Church, resulting in a dearth of conversions. Will the average loyal Church stand comparison with the Church at the beginning? Please do not let us merely accept present conditions as fulfilling prophecy, and do nothing to improve matters, for I am convinced that the experience of the early Church could and should be ours to-day. The World then had no time for Christ and crucified Him, as it would do to-day. Hypocrisy and formalism abounded in the Church

then as now. Humanity has not changed; Sin is as black as ever. The heart still cries out for joy, peace and satisfaction. But, thank God, Jesus is still the same. His word is still sharper than a two-edged sword. The Gospel is still the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, and the blood of Christ still cleanses from all Sin.

Did Peter and the other Apostles fold their hands in despair, when Christ commissioned them to go preach the Gospel and make disciples of all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, in a world that preferred a Barabbas to the Son of God? No!

God's biddings were God's enablings. 'They Believed that the Christ who bade them would bless and honour their labours. He always does when we take Him at His word and serve Him with unquestioning Obedience and unwavering faith, *the* New Testament Church was powerful and passionate, virile and vigorous, a glowing and growing Church, worthy to be called the Church of Christ, its founder. Can such be said of present-day Churches? So many appear powerless and passionless, static and stag-

nant, whose members are living joyless and fruitless lives.

How many Christians to-day possess the passion for souls that urges them, yea compels them, to go into the open-air, the shop and factory, anywhere and everywhere, to witness to Christ's saving, satisfying and keeping power? In the face of persecution, the Church at Jerusalem 'went every where' preaching the Word. When Peter and John were forbidden to preach in the name of Jesus, they replied that they could not but speak the things that they had seen and heard. The divine urge was so great, their love for souls so strong, that nothing could damp their fervour, nor quench their zeal. 'I could wish myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren,' writes the Apostle Paul, whose passion and devotion to Christ and love for souls have possibly never been surpassed, He knew what it was to travail for souls, 'till Christ was formed in them.' He not only urged the Church to pray without ceasing, but prayed night and day with tears, When did we last weep for souls? When 'Zion travaileth,' then souls will be saved. Then we shall see revival and a reproduction of apostolic experiences; multitudes saved, liberality exemplified, meetings crowded, and God's name glorified. Impossible! Does someone suggest? 'All things are possible to Him that believeth.'

How can these, things come to pass? When we fulfil God's conditions. When we get in line with God. Let us confess our sins of omission as well as sins of commission; humble ourselves before God; prove our faith in God's promises by claiming them. 'If we ask anything in His name, according to, His will (and surely God wants more than anyone the salvation of souls), He will do it. The fervent (effectual prayer of a righteous man still availeth much. The Churches of Christ have the ruth. We hold the secret of revival. Complete trust in His word, absolute surrender, of our lives, intercessory prayer, and questioning obedience to every command of God

**Thw field are white unto harvest.
God is asking still, 'Who shall I
send and who will go for us?'**

**Let every individual member of
every Church reply, 'Here am I,
Lord, send me.' Then we shall
see revival**

Hark, the voice of Jesus crying,
Who will go and work to-day?
Fields are white, and harvests waiting,
Who will bear the sheaves away?

Loud and long the Master calleth,
Rich reward He offers free;
Who will answer, gladly saying,
'Here am I, send me, send me?'

Let none hear you idly saying,
"There is nothing I can do,"
While the souls of men are dying,
And the Master calls for you.

Take the task He gives you gladly,
Let His work your pleasure be;
Answer quickly when He calleth,
'Here am I, send me, send me.'

JAS. A. BALLARD.

Book Review.

BIBLE v. MODERNISM, by A. N. Trice

and C. H. Roberson, LL.D. This was, first published some years ago. Now a second revised edition has been published. Giving reasons for this, the authors say: 'The first edition has been exhausted for some time, but several things have contributed to the delay of a second edition. The authors have not seen fit to make many changes in subject matter of a new edition, but a number of new discoveries are

covered in this revised edition, which were not available, for the first edition, and more extensive treatment of modernism from a scientific point of view is included.' The book is what it claims to be A Compendium of Sundry Critical Hypotheses and their Refutation.' It deals effectively with 'Destructive Higher Criticism' and the 'False Claims of Evolution.' In justification for adding another unto the 'many books,' the authors say: 'The fact that the adversary has written an indictment against truth and righteousness which has been widely distributed throughout the civilised world is sufficient excuse' for this defence. . . . 'The conflict between truth and error has raged since the beginning of man's existence on earth and will continue while we exist in the flesh. This conflict was begun by the enemy of truth who is also the enemy of mankind. This enemy often objects to a review of his false theories, and cries 'Peace, peace,' when there is no peace; his plea is 'Let us alone,'

while he continues his activities in spreading false doctrines and false theories. Each year brings a number of new books filled with indictments, in varying degrees of unbelief, against the Bible as the inspired word of God. The authors of many of these profess adherence to faith in the Bible, but a careful examination of their teaching reveals an obvious purpose of reducing to nothingness the claims of inspiration.'

This is a book which should be possessed by all preachers and teachers of Christianity. It should be a text book

where young men are being trained to preach the Gospel. The critics and evolutionists are answered, and evidence of the inspiration and reliability of the Bible are given. The book contains over three-hundred pages, and at the close of each chapter a useful synopsis is given.

The book can be had (if money for books is allowed to go out of Britain) from Gospel Advocate Co., 110 Seventh Avenue North, Nashville, Tennessee, U.S.A. The price is 2 dollars-50 cents.

—EDITOR, 'S.S.'

Certainty.

THIS grand strong word names the thing above all others lacking in popular religion to-day. It is, considered the sign of a sound mind and a heroic soul to say you are not sure—you have your doubts—about the essential truths of Christianity. On the other hand, for anyone to say that he is convinced that there is a God; that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; that He rose from the dead; and so on, is to create the impression that he is a person easily led: one who has received these things on trust without personal investigation.

Now, without entering into the question of the necessity for doubt, it must be affirmed without any doubt, that the condition of one who is simply uncertain—who neither affirms nor denies positively—is a most unsatisfactory and unhappy one. To accept without investigation and without proper evidence, is of course unreasonable; but if it is possible to reach certainty by investigation, that is surely far more to be desired. - If it is the certainty that Christianity is untrue—well, that is at least a thousand times better, a condition of doubt; and if it is a certainty that the great alleged facts and truths of Christianity are true, then there comes the highest of all blessed experiences—'joy and peace in believing. Now note

1. *The early disciples held it possible to be CERTAIN, after investigation.* A very clear view of the state of the case 'in the beginning' may be obtained from the introduc-

tion to the Gospel by Luke. The writer informs us that the subject of his book is the facts about Jesus Christ, the statements of persons who professed to have seen the things they affirmed. He has made a personal investigation of the whole wonderful life of Christ from His birth in Bethlehem to the day that He was received up. His investigations and tracings back to the original witnesses have filled him with certainty, and so he writes that Theophilus may share his conviction. Says Luke: 'It seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest

KNOW THE CERTAINTY

concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed.

No doubt Luke desired to believe the things reported about Christ. But he is here seen to be as far as the poles from that condition of mind which sceptics are apt to think is the normal condition of the Christian mind—the condition in which a thing is received merely because it is agreeable to the previous condition of the mind. No! Luke seems rather to have taken all the more pains to make sure that these things were so, He desires certainty after inquiry, and he deems it a blessed thing for Theophilus not merely to receive the things as probably true, but to know the certainty on the

Very best evidence that was obtainable.

The same reasonable and sound view of what was desirable pervades the New Testament. The disciples no doubt desired to believe that their Lord had risen from the dead; but they were made all the more hard to convince by that; 'they believed not for joy' until they were sure that it really was their Master risen again. Thomas was specially slow to believe. He was painfully cautious, lest he should be the dupe of his desires and the wish should be father to the belief in the resurrection of Christ. His doubts were removed, he gained certainty, and exclaimed in a heartfelt cry of reverence and joy: *'My Lord and my God.'* Nor was it otherwise with Paul. Not until he had indubitable and undeniable proof that Christ was risen, did he believe, and again and again did he tell the story of how he, with the strongest reasons for denying the facts of the gospel, especially to justify himself in leading cruel persecution against the believers, was, in the end, compelled to acknowledge himself mistaken, and to accept the fact that Christ was raised, and with the fact, all those great truths that henceforth prompted his conduct and moulded his character.

And what Paul did the others did. They deemed it the highest blessing to be sure of these stupendous facts and truths; and they wrote and spoke, so that men might be sure—as one of them puts it—that they had followed no quinnirigly devised fable when they made known the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

John, for example, writes down the things he had seen, and heard; tells the story of Christ's manifestation as the Son of God; the development of faith in Him, as His miracles and His character were seen; and especially exhibits the perfecting of that faith by Christ's resurrection from the dead; and then he says, 'These things are written that ye may believe that Jesus' is the Christ the Son of God.'

Say we not well, then, that the early disciples held it possible to be *certain* after investigation?

2. *It is no more difficult to be convinced of the truth of Christianity to-day, than it is to be convinced of the affirmations of science.* Attention is called to this point, because many have an idea that it is otherwise. Let us take one or two specimens of the certainties of modern science. There is the now well-known teaching of geology, according to which the solid rocks that now rib our globe were once a liquid fire; and that afterwards there came a time when arctic cold pervaded the land, and when down the sides of every mountain and through every valley huge glaciers ploughed their way. They tell us, too, of a time when a luxuriant vegetation grew upon the earth in such gigantic forms as to cause our world to shine in its enveloping cloud to distant planets with a green and delicate ray. They tell us also of enormous monsters that peopled the earth in strangeness and size more than rivalling the great dragons and griffins of mediæval legend. Humboldt, in his 'Cosmos,' speaking of the extent of God's physical universe, says that while light travels in a single hour 592,000,000 miles, it would require two million of years for it to pass to this globe from the remotest luminous vapour seen through Herschel's telescope.

Now on what ground do the majority of people who accept the teachings of modern science believe all this? The person who thinks it necessary to doubt the truth of the Gospel, is generally quite certain about the general reliability of the teaching of modern science. Either people, not having time or opportunity to pursue the investigation for themselves, accept these things from the mouth of those who have, or they have really acquired the general education and particular training necessary, and then have gone into these things for themselves. The vast majority undoubtedly have simply accepted these things, believing that the scientific

students are earnest, able men, and will not wilfully mislead, and on the essential facts are not likely to be mistaken.

Now what is here affirmed is that, in either case, certainty in the Gospel of Jesus Christ is at least as easily and as reasonably attained : I am inclined to think more easily and reasonably. If we put trust in Humboldt, or Darwin, or Huxley, is it not as easy to trust Luke, or Justin Martyr, or Augustine, among the early investigators ? These men made a special study of the matter—Luke, especially, was in a position for investigation that left nothing to be desired. Further, granting the scientific investigators to be as candid as the religious ones, is not their subject to be studied one where a mistake could more easily creep in ? Luke, and the rest had a very simple inquiry—Did these things really happen ? Can the eye-witnesses be believed ? Is it so simple an inquiry to solve, Was this earth once a fiery cloud ?

Or take the case of those who have made an investigation of these things for themselves, that they may know the certainty of these things wherein the leading scientists have instructed them. Does anyone suppose that it is more difficult to make a first-hand study of the beginnings of Christianity—to test the truth of the New Testament account—than it is to make a first-hand acquaintance with the facts and the inferences

from them—on which 'certainty, in the conclusions of natural science, is based ?

Why should it be considered reasonable to accept the teachings of Darwin and Huxley in their special study, and refuse credence to Paley, Cairns, or Row, or Ramsay, when they tell us as the results of their special study of the origin of Christianity ? Or why should it be considered unworthy of a noble mind to be sceptical in science until the fullest investigation has been made by the individual for himself, and yet be deemed quite the right and even the heroic thing for a man to hold himself sceptical in relation to Christ's claims, and yet have made no real investigation of the matter for himself ?

Clearly, without assuming the truth of Christianity, the glorification of *doubt* is a most unreasonable phase of modern thought. Let a man strive for certainty. Strange indeed if the facts of Christianity cannot be ascertained with certainty to be either, true or false. Seek then to know the certainty of what you believe, or, if it must be, learn that it is certainly not true. Either position is better than doubt. And if once you attain certainty, you, too, my reader, will be able to set out in order the grounds of that certainty, in order that some modern Theophilus may share your conviction and your joy.

L. OLIVER.

New Testament Church Order.

IF our observation is correct, a very great change exists in very many of the Churches of Christ at the present time. It is amazing how far some Assemblies have deviated from the simple order as given in the New Testament.

A reliable rule would be, and also a deciding factor at all times and under all conditions, when dealing with any Biblical subject: 'What saith the Scriptures on this matter?' The order of the NT. Church is very plain, to all people who are prepared

to read the Word of God with an un-biased mind.'

There are just two classes of officials mentioned, in the New Testament :

(1) A group having the spiritual oversight of the Assembly. These are variously designated, 'elders,' 'bishops,' or 'overseers,' in the N.T., and come from different Greek words? They do not differ, but denote the same office in the Assembly. When the following passage's of Scripture are examined carefully,

they will show, beyond doubt, that only one office is implied (Acts xx. 17-28; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1-7; Tit. i. 5-9; 1 Peter v. 1-4.)

Duties: These are clearly stated in the above-mentioned passages of Scripture. 'Take heed, therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers,' to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.' 'Tend the flock of God, which is among you, exercising the oversight, not by force, but willingly, according unto God; nor yet for low gain, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples [or pattern] to the flock.' And when the Chief Shepherd shall be made manifested, 'Overseers' shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away, if faithful servants.

Qualifications (see 1 Tim. iii. 2-10; Tit. i. 5-9; 1 Peter v. 1-4). 'Overseers therefore must, be without reproach, the husband of one wife, temperate, sober-minded, orderly, given to hospitality, apt; to teach, no brawler, no striker, but gentle, not contentious, no lover of money, one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all staidness; not a young convert, lest being puffed* up fall into strong impeachment from the devil.' Moreover, he must have good testimony from them that are outside the Church, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.

(2), The second group, designated 'deacons,' which comes from a Greek word, *diakonos*, mentioned about thirty times in the N.T., being universally admitted to mean, 'servant.' But in the N.T., we find that the translators have given different words, such as 'minister,' mentioned nineteen times, 'servant,' seven times, 'deacon,' three times and 'fellow-servant' once. Why should we find such a mixture of names? Such a translation becomes misleading to many people who fail to grasp, that these names are taken from (the same Greek word.

Duties: A deacon is one who, by virtue of the office assigned to him by *the Church*, attends to temporal things in connection with the Church.

The following describes his duty: Acts vi. 1-5; Rom. xvi. 1-2. The duties and authority of these officials were entirely local, being limited to the church of which they were members. The Apostles called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reasonable that we should forsake the word of God, and serve tables. Look ye out, therefore, brethren, from among you seven men of good report, full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word.'

The brethren chosen were not called deacons. While we fail to find the word *diakonos* in Acts vi. 1-5, we find *diakonia* in verses 1-4, which means service. These two words are so close in meaning that anyone will find it a problem to distinguish servant from service. The one implies the other. They come from different declensions, hence the reason for a change of termination or endings.

Qualifications: 'Deacons must be men of good behaviour, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre, but holding the mysterious truths of the faith with a clear conscience. And let these first be proved; then let them serve, as deacons, if they be blameless.' We have a pattern in the N.T., how God desires His assembly to be guided and fed. If the oversight selects its own ways and means in doing work in His name, God will not work in us, nor through us. He will certainly withhold the blessings which we sometimes pray for in our meetings.

therefore, if the Churches are to be successful in building up an assembly which will be distinguished from those of the world, more discipline and fuller instruction must be exercised by the oversight, teaching the Church what God requires' from those claiming to be His followers.

Let us remember the advice of the Apostle Paul, 'If however, you have risen with Christ; seek the things that are above, where Christ is, enthroned at God's right hand. Give your minds to the things that are above, not to the things that are on the earth.' If you have buried the old man, why doth earthward inclination, unholy desires, and all greed exist? Let all resolve through the grace of God to 'set aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with

patience the race that is set before us. Looking unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith.' Such a pattern manifested before the world will certainly bring joy to all God's people, and joy in Heaven over many souls being united to the Saviour, through complete obedience to His commands. We can do all things through Christ, who strengthened us. If we do our duty, God will give the blessings promised. Therefore, success depends on our faithfulness.

G. ALLAN.

Men of the World and Gambling.

PROBABLY, no evil is so prevalent in our land to-day. From the side-show at the fair to the trickster with the cards, from the penny sweep-stake to the putting of hundreds of pounds on one horse, the same principle is involved.

We submit the following opinions on this evil:—

Dr. B. Hollander, in his book: 'The Psychology of Misconduct, Vice, and Crime,' says, 'Gambling arises from the wish to make money without having to work for it, and may be compared to drug addiction: once started, it grows on one. Even if money is made by it, the winner rarely gains anything, except temporarily, for money thus lightly come by, goes lightly. On the other hand, the loser often not only ruins himself, but drags his family with him. Moreover, gambling is one of the commonest incentives to crime, especially embezzlement.'

A Select Committee of the House of Commons wrote, in 1808, concerning gambling: 'No mode of raising money appears to the Committee so burthensome, so pernicious, and so unproductive; no species of adventure is known where the chances are so great against the adventurer; none where the infatuation is more powerful, lasting and destructive.' The Committee also spoke 'of all the evils of which it has proved so baneful a source.'

In 1902, a Select Committee of the

House of Lords 'deplored the spread of a practice which, when carried to excess, they consider opposed to the true interests of sport and injurious to the general community.'

Prof. G. H. Palmer, of America: 'Living long among students, and observing their natural pleasure in all sports of moral experimentation, I have come to believe gambling the vice most likely to wreck character. . . . When I see the gambling habit getting hold of a young man, I despair of him. For several reasons, it is unlikely he will be good for much thereafter. . . . The gambler gives up rational modes of guidance, ceases to calculate clearly, lives on the unexpected, and looks for some deliverance to drop from the sky. A hectic anxiety takes possession of him and disorganises his-life.'

Gambling is Condemned by men who, if they were even nominal Christians, spoke merely, as observers of the influence of this evil. My Brother, my Sister, are you playing with this? monstrous evil? The 'Christmas draw,' the football pool, the side-show at the fair—all of these ate implied when we say: 'Come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch no unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be to you a Father, and ye shall be to me sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.' (2 Cor. vi. 17-18, R.V.)

ANDREW GARDINER, JUNIOR.

The Poor African Church of God,
N.A. Mwambo,
P/O Zomba,
Nyasaland.
2nd March, 1947.

Dear Editor, — I have the honour to notify what befalls me here; that is, I by my praying to God of the Holy Bible Scripture, I continued asking Him where He intends us to stand, by the reason of false leaders in His Scripture, who seems to lead us a stray in the Scripture!

And by His answer He enabled me to attain the written papers such as "The Scripture Standard," vol. xi., No. 7, July, 1945, and when I read it "The S.S.," I rejoiced in the Lord Jesus Christ; for since before my prayers never have I seen even to read it "The S.S." For we are poor Africans only, and are entitled, "The African Church of God," and I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord who by His will caused me to see your address.

Thank you, Editor, for so in the manifold wisdom of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. And we are hoping to you even to what God intends you to do for us here in Nyasaland.

I have the honour to remain, Editor.

Your humblest,

GARNETT LIMANI,

For the Church of God.

What Kind of Bread ?

Dear Bro. Crosthwaite,—May I thank the four brethren, who wrote replies to my article? A frank discussion of this subject, conducted solely in the interests of truth, will do much good. May it encourage many to 'search the Scriptures' to see whether these things are so.

On one point we are agreed: that at the institution of the Supper, Jesus used unleavened bread. It was of that bread that He said: 'This is my body.' Is any one of my critics prepared to say that we do wrong when we use the kind of bread that Jesus used, and devote it to the particular purpose for which He designated it? Do we err in following His example?

Bro. Barker's second and third paragraphs seem hardly relevant. There is no question as to the fact that the law was then in operation. But does this mean that Jesus used bread which was not a true representation of the thing He said it signified? Bro. Barker's argument would have us believe that, but I cannot. The vital question is: When Jesus said of unleavened bread, "This is [represents] my body," was that bread a

true symbol of His body, whatever the term 'body implies'? It must have been a true symbol, otherwise Jesus would not have so used it. He could not have used as a symbol of His body, something which was not an accurate representation of that body. If unleavened bread was a true symbol then, it is so to-day. Can we change the bread without destroying the symbolism? I fail to see how our practice can be questioned if we use what He used, in implicit obedience to His command: 'Do this in remembrance of me.'

Bro. Barker says that 'at a later date, the feast was instituted for a second time.' Is not this an unfortunate use of the word 'instituted' (established)? The feast was instituted by Jesus in the upper room. What Paul 'received of the Lord' was a divine revelation describing that institution. To speak of it as 'a second institution' might imply a difference between the two, an idea some entertain, but which is wholly erroneous. 1 Corinthians xi. 23-25 is simply a record of the institution, given (by inspiration through Paul) to the Church in Corinth. Of Paul's account, Bro. Barker says: 'No mention is made there of unleavened bread.' But let us look at the facts. Matthew, Mark, and Luke all say that Jesus 'took bread,' and the word for bread is *artos*. This *artos* was unquestionably unleavened bread. In his account, Paul uses the same word: 'He . . . took bread (*artos*).' Surely it is significant that the Apostle used the precise word used by the inspired historians? Consistency surely demands that the same phrase means the same thing in all four cases: unleavened bread. We must not overlook the fact that in the three Gospel accounts, this word means 'unleavened bread.' Paul is describing that same institution. Then why should the same word, used in the same context, mean something different? We may say that if it had been the divine intention that the bread chosen by Jesus be changed, then Paul might easily have given instructions. But not so. He merely confirmed the divine institution.

Brethren Barker and Chalmers insist that the body of Jesus was broken on the Cross. They contend that the breaking of the bread represents this. Will they deny my contention that "the Passover biscuit was broken in pieces, the body of Jesus was not"? Was the body of Jesus broken in the same way that the biscuit (or bread) was broken—in pieces? Yes, Bro. Chalmers, the bread was broken in pieces: how else could the disciples have partaken of it? David King writes: 'The act of breaking the bread 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.' (*Memoirs.*)

To sustain their contention, these brethren must prove that the body of Jesus was broken in pieces.

My statement that 'in the Scriptures leaven is usually a type of sin' is not nullified by the quotation of Matt. xiii. 33. I did not say leaven always represents sin. The exception quoted merely confirms the general rule. Would Bro. Barker deny that 'leaven' symbolises 'sin' in 1 Cor. v.? The chapter reveals that a position of extreme wickedness existed in that assembly. Paul describes this sin as 'leaven,' which, if not 'purged out,' would corrupt the whole Church. He concludes and applies his argument: 'Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person' (13).

Bro. Baines says: 'It is rather surprising that many of our pioneers failed to notice this question.' It is even more surprising that he should have failed to notice what the pioneers have said on this subject. Attention was drawn by the Editor to the testimony of Brethren Oliver and McCartney. I recommend Bro. Harold, and all interested, to a careful reading of 'The Lord's Supper,' by David King. (*Memoir.*) The following is an extract:

'... according to the most common interpretation of the symbols, the cup seems a sort of superfluity, which could very well be dispensed with. ... You have the death, the sacrifice, all in the bread. According to this interpretation, either the bread alone or the cup alone would suffice to show forth the whole truth, and the other could very well be dispensed with ... an understanding of the ordinance which makes one part of it, as to its significance, a mere repetition of the other part, most surely fails to grasp its entire signification.'

'The weakness of this contention (that the broken bread represents the crucifixion) is that it involves a pointless repetition. As I said: 'It would be unreasonable to assume that both bread and wine represent the same thing.' The weight of evidence is against the inclusion of 'broken' in 1 Cor. xi. 24. In 1 Cor. x. 11, 17, Paul speaks of 'one bread,' i.e. a complete loaf, which he says symbolises the one Body. 'The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread [lit. "loaf"] and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.' The significance of the bread is here emphasised: it is one loaf, a complete loaf. Had there been any significance in the breaking of the bread, Paul would here

have named it. The 'body' represented by the bread is indicated by the Saviour's words: 'A body hast thou prepared me.' 'Body here unquestionably embraces the whole life that He lived.

'By the bread, then, let us discern—not a dead body, not a broken body, not the sacrifice unto death for our sins—but the living body, manifesting God in the flesh, and teaching us how to live the life that God demands.' (P. King, *Memoirs.*)

Many other, quotations from the pioneers could be given, but space forbids. I cannot here reply to Bro. Murphy, with much of whose letter I am in agreement. I insist, however, that the symbolism of the complete unleavened loaf is seen only in a contemplation of the perfect life of Jesus, lived and given unreservedly in service for us.

A. E. WINSTANLEY.

'CHRISTIAN PACIFISM.'

Dear Editor.—Like Bro. Jepson, I am amazed that any Christian would suggest that war is not an evil. War is the most obviously wicked thing we can imagine, and if God wills it, then we are all morally mad, and don't know good from evil. For us to take upon ourselves to destroy God's greatest handiwork, and - at the same time to destroy the spirit of fellowship which Jesus taught us to strive for, is to me the very antithesis of Christian principles.

How can any normal person who has experienced the utter beastliness of war reconcile it with the teaching given in the Sermon on the Mount? How can we use the argument that it is right to go to war in defence of women and children, etc., etc., when" we have the supreme example of Christ going to the Cross and leaving His ovp friends seemingly defenceless?

Where is our faith in the living God, when we use methods entirely irreconcilable with His love, to defend temporal institutions?

Let us seek first the kingdom of God, and we shall help to bring order out of chaos in this troubled world.

I would go so far as to contend that, as long as we are divided on this important issue, the Church of Christ cannot claim to be the Body of Christ.

WILLIAM G. CLARK.

Dear Brother Editor, — In reply to Bro. Anderson's further amazing assertions may I add a further word. If he can show HOW- one can be said to do the will of God, and follow out the teaching of the N.T., by doing something directly opposed to what is taught therein, then I might be convinced of the soundness of his arguments. I fail entirely to see anything in his deductions and conclusions upon the subject that is

in harmony with the trend of N.T. teaching. You cannot love your fellow man, much less your enemies, and at the same time be a man of carnal warfare. This I claim is the sum and substance of the whole argument. I can do no other, therefore, than to leave your readers to form their own conclusions as to what is the plain teaching of God's Word. For my own part, I must reject Bro. Anderson's human reasonings as both erroneous and dangerous.

I have no desire whatsoever to impose my views upon any brother, much less upon one of Bro. Anderson's standing and experience. Nevertheless, I would respectfully remind our brother that

Lord and Master was the greatest 'Pacifist' that ever lived, and some of the strongest words that ever He spoke were addressed to those who sought to justify their own actions rather than obey the dictates of His word. To Him (I agree) 'we all must stand or fall.'

W. B. JEPSON.

HOW COME ELDERS?

Dear Editor.—It Ms said that when Alexander Campbell was asked about the appointment of elders in the Church, he replied, '*Vox populi, vox Dei*': the voice of the people is the voice of God. The power resides in the Church. Any power that elders may have is altogether a delegated power. They possess no power on earth but a delegated power reposed in them by the Church.

It has been, I understand, the practice of the Churches of Christ to follow this teaching ever since.

As the practice of the Churches of Christ relating to the appointment and ordination of elders, and the pattern and teaching of the N.T. differs, would some brother or brethren answer, in the 'S.S.' my query, and clear my perplexity? I can only be brief, so details must be left out.

1. *Vox populi, vox Dei*, seems strange from a people who believe that only the Word of God, i.e., the Scriptures, are the voice of God.

2. I have always been taught that the model of the Church is the family, hence the reason for the 'bishop' to be a family man (1 Tim. iii. 4, 5), and no one would suggest that the only power parents have is a delegated power reposed in them by their children.

3. All Scriptural indications of actual appointment and ordination of elders show that the appointments and ordinations were made by the Apostles or by their delegates. (Acts xiv. 23; Titus i. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 1, 2.) David King (*Memoirs*, page 276) writes concerning the ordination of elders: 'The Church should take nothing which the Lord has not given to it.'

i. *The*, very obvious N.T. pattern is: First, the Lord chose the twelve (Mark

iii 13, 14; Luke vi. 13; John xv. 16); second, the Apostles' and or their delegates ordained elders in every city. xiv. 23; Titus i. 5) and third, the apostolic injunction is that this procedure be continued (2 Tim. ii. 2), with an obvious reference to the 'teaching' of 1 Tim. iii. 1-7.

Hence we have an example, an express statement, and the necessary inference that we should continue to do the same, i.e., responsible elders appoint and ordain elders. Appointment and ordination of Apostles (Acts i. 15-26) and deacons (Acts vi. 2-6), although the qualifications are some what similar in some respects, should not be confused with the appointment of elders. What do you say brethren?

G. M. BISHOP.

GOD'S WORK—GOD'S PAY.

WHO does God's work will get God's pay,
However long may seem the day.
However weary be the way;
Though powers and princes thunder
 'nay.'

Who does God's work will get God's pay.

He does not pay as others pay—
In gold, or land, or raiment gay,
In goods that vanish and decay;
But God in wisdom knows a way,
And that is sure, let come what may—
Who does God's work will get God's pay.
—Selected.

RULE OF MY LIFE.

THE rule that governs my life is this: anything that dims my vision of Christ, or takes away my taste for Bible study, or cramps my prayer life, or makes Christian work difficult, is wrong for me. and I must, as a Christian, turn away from it. This simple rule may help you And a safe road for your feet along life's road. J. WILBUR CHAPMAN.

COMING EVENT

Morley, near Leeds.—Special visit *pi* Biro. Carl Ketcherside, U.S.A., Saturday, April 13th. Public meeting at 6 p.m. Chairman: R. McDonald (Dewsbury). Address of Welcome by Bro. F. A. Hardy, of Morley. Lord's Day services addressed by Bro. Ketcherside. Monday: Social meeting in the Morley Chapel, at 7 p.m. AH local brethren invited. Gospel meeting, Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.; and at Ardsley, on Wednesday at 7.30 p.m.,

Bro. Ketcherside (D.V.), w/H speak at all these meetings. A special invitation given to all local brethren.

II. BAINES.

SCRIPTURE READINGS

THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS.

(xi., 23-40).

IN the case of Moses it was of course the faith exercised by Amram and Jochebed, which resulted in the wonderful change from hut to palace. Here again we have that working together of the divine and human in history. We have to realise that 'all things do work together,' while we must also realise that the loving of God means simple obedience to His will. Little did Moses' parents think that the babe whose beauty won their hearts, and that of the Egyptian Princess was to lead Israel triumphantly out of bondage: a mob of slaves cumbered with their children and household goods, brought safely from the clutches of an empire. But so it was! Their decision to risk death for the child's sake, and for righteousness, was their act of faith.

We cannot realise what it meant to Moses to identify himself from the palace of Pharaoh, with the persecuted slaves. His learning, like that of Paul, did not puff him up, but was brought into the service of God. The allusion to forsaking Egypt must, we think, apply to his leading the people out, not his flight to Midian. The reproach of the Christ could hardly indicate any realisation of what Christ would suffer, but involves faith in the promises made to Abraham—a willingness to be identified with God's covenant people.

To continue the list in detail would not serve the writer's purpose, so he passes summarily over it, giving names, acts, and endurances. Some of the references are to events not recorded in the canonical books of the Old Testament, but in the books of the Maccabees. The history of our own country can furnish similar annals in darker days, and doubtless this letter has brought comfort in recent times to German Christians who remained faithful, and suffered and died. Let us pray that we may have grace to stand fast, if the growing godlessness of this nation should develop a persecuting spirit.

While God did fulfil His promises to those who served Him faithfully by sustaining them to death itself, the great promise of a deliverer was only fulfilled in Christ ('Some better thing,' verse 40), and we thus share the honour as we shall share the joys with those who have gone before.

(xii., 1-11).

We have here a passage of surpassing literary beauty.

The picture is of the arena and we are runners in the race. 'The cloud of wit-

nesses' are those who are pictured as looking on. The contestants in the race must be stripped of encumbrances. 'The word 'weight' may refer—in training language—to superfluous flesh, or figuratively to such capacities as pride, self-seeking, or worldly ambition—anything, in short, which hinders our Christian endeavour. Anything which closely clings must also hinder the runner, and the margin of the R.V. gives us for the one Greek word translated 'which doth, so easily beset,' 'doth closely cling to us' or 'is admired of many,' indicating two possible meanings, both full of significance. How good a thought: Looking unto Jesus, Author and Finisher; He is everything to us. Considering the trials and efforts of those ancient heroes, we need always to be considering Him who loved us at immeasurable cost.

The lesson on 'chastening' is one we often need to bear in mind. We are so prone to regard suffering as the one thing to be avoided—and it is a dreadful error, for sin is that. Suffering is unpleasant but God permits it as a corrective for our sinful propensities and uses it to save us, and to make us fruitful.

Encouragement to Positive Effort— and Warnings.

(xii. 12-29).

Discouragement by reason of chastening must be replaced by renewed vigour and exercise when it is realised the divine hand working for blessing is behind it. Spiritual muscle must be taut, lameness must not develop to dislocation; but be healed. We wonder if these thoughts originated with Dr. Luke.

The word 'men' (verse 14) is better omitted. The peace and sanctification is necessary within the Church, and the other points refer also to those within. The example of Esau solemnly warns against worldliness with the characteristic thought of the slipping away and being finally lost. The appeal is then made to the contrast between the two covenants, that of Sinai with its terrifying manifestations, and that of Christ, as greatly surpassing it as heaven surpasses earth.

God's voice at Sinai shook the earth, but in the person of His Son He speaks from heaven in that revelation now enshrined in the New Testament writings. There is the same power in that gentle voice of Jesus, an even greater responsibility to obey exactly, and the solemn and terrible fact remains: 'he that believeth not shall be condemned.' Thankfulness ('grace,' verse 28), reverence, and awe are our natural and proper feelings towards God, great though our love may be.

Christian Behaviour and Thought Enjoined

Cxiii. 1-17).

Brotherly love is a beautiful thing. It covers hospitality and a living sympathy with suffering souls. Christians should overflow with it. It should mark them out. It was an age of sexual vice and laxity—as it is to-day, with less excuse. In this too the Christian must stand out like light against darkness. Conversation is 'turn of mind.' Covetousness often arises from a fear of want, and trust in God removes that, and brings contentment. Remembrance of those who carried the gospel to the first readers of this letter will help in every way towards the practice of these virtues. There is even a more glorious example in the unchangeable Christ.

A final reference is here made to the Old Covenant in helpful comparison with the New. The 'Hebrews' may be taunted for carelessness in the matter of eating, the lack of an altar, priesthood and sacrifices and their close connection as Christians with the 'unclean' heathen. This need give them no concern for they have the grace of God in place of eating special foods, the Saviour to feed upon in place of an altar (or the reference may be to the Lord's Supper) and its victims, and in place of the sacrifices they have the joyful songs of praise, the happy deeds of love and contributions to the needs of the saints. They have also the New Jerusalem, the eternal city of God, in place of the Shrine.

In view of these higher privileges they must bear the reproach their Saviour bore in being cast out of the city. He atoned for sin being treated thus as unclean like the victims of the sin-offering. (Lev. xvi. 27).

Concluding Greetings and Blessing

(xiii. 18-25).

We have here request for prayer, assurance of honesty of purpose and life, desire and expectation to see those to whom the letter is addressed, request for acceptance of the letter in the right spirit, news of Timothy, special greetings to the leaders, and a message of greeting from Italians.

The sublime benediction embodies some of the great points of the letter, and those best of good wishes which we all heartily wish one another as lovers of the Lord Jesus. The supreme blessing is to do the will of God, His will working in us, to His glory.

The subscription is without sufficient authority and is manifestly incorrect, as in the case of several others printed with the Authorised Version. It is omitted from the Revised Version.

It would be impossible in these notes to discuss the question of the authorship of the letter. That the Holy Spirit is the

Author we have no doubt whatever, nor, of course, that it is indeed verbally inspired. We view these wonderful works of God with profound reverence, and receive them with humble gratitude.

R. B. SCOTT.

Conference at Belfast.

5th April, 1947

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

PASSPORTS AND TRAVEL PERMITS

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

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

ACCOMMODATION.

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

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

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

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

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

C. I. HENDREN.

Answers to Crossword.

Down : 1 Appearance. 2 Birds. 3 A Rolls. 4 Tower. 5 Often. 6 Surfeiting. 12 Eve. 14 Awe. 16 Grey. 17 Bobe. 18 Herd. 19 Away. 21 Wen.

Across: 1 Amber. 4 Troas. 8 Peril. 9 Water. 10 Lie. 11 Asses. 13 Range. 15. Anger. 18 Heart. 20 Owe. 22 Chamberlain. 23 End,

What is Essential to Valid Baptism.

(From article by David King in 'Old Paths,' February, 1880)

YOU cannot change the design. You can leave undone the thing commanded, and do some other thing, as sprinkling; but, then, we say not, the baptism is not valid, but that it is not there. You can substitute a babe for the believer; but, then, also, the baptism is not there, for the baptism of which we speak is baptism consequent upon faith. But when the proper action and the believing subject are there, it is beyond our power to affect the design—the design of the ordinance is whatever God has fixed, and the baptism is into whatever God has determined shall result therefrom.

(Whether the subject understand it or not?)

'Certainly. It is in the nature of ordinances of induction, or translation, that, the proper subjects of them are translated into that state into which those ordinances are designed to induct, whether they understand the design or not. A slave might pass through the legal forms of manumission without knowing the design, but then he would not be less free than another who had understood the whole. Persons, in other respects qualified, have passed through the forms of marriage, legal in the place of their sojourn, without knowing their design, but they have been fast bound.

'Your mistake is simply this—that you confound two essentially different things—the design of baptism and the knowledge of that design. You think that where the design is not understood that remission is not imparted, but you cannot prove this from Scripture. God has not said so. It is not a self-evident truth, and if true at all, you have only guessed it, and you are not justified on such ground to tamper with Christ's baptism.'

'We repeat then, that Christ's baptism and promise are not to be tampered with. The Saviour has said: "He that believeth and is baptised, SHALL be saved." But at is said, that he shall not, though he have all faith and repentance, unless at the same time he understand the design. We deem the declaration an insult to the Lord—first denying what He says; and second, by exalting a mere opinion to the level of His clearly asserted conditions of salvation. Let us say to every one who has been baptised, relying on Christ: "Believe His blessed promise! Cling to it! Plead it before Him!" Say: "Lord, I did believe and I was baptised, and if I was not saved Thou has deceived me! But, blessed Jesus, I have no Other hope than Thyself and Thy

promise, and if my baptism was not valid I plead Thy broken bond!" Soul, rest on this, and if they tell thee to mistrust the baptism to which thou didst submit in faith and repentance, "Get the behind me, Satan," is the proper answer.'

Alcohol's False Claims,

'Alcohol gives strength.' If so, why do athletes abstain while training for a contest which requires all their strength to win?

'Alcohol gives endurance.' If so, why do employers always require absolute abstinence from those who are engaged in long and difficult tasks?

'Alcohol gives heat.' If so, why do travellers in the arctic and antarctic regions abstain from it?

'Alcohol steadies the nerves.' If so, why do marksmen, surgeons, and men whose living depends upon a keen eye and steady hand let alcohol severely alone?

'Alcohol sustains health.' If so, why do abstainers have less sickness than drinkers?

'Alcohol lengthens life.' If so, why do many insurance companies charge a lower premium to abstainers?

'Alcohol brightens life.' If so, why are the darkest and dirtiest places always those in which drink shops are most numerous? And why are the worst crimes, the most brutal assaults, and the most terrible murders always mixed up with drinking?

The fact is: alcohol is a mockeiv-promising one thing and giving another—and whosoever is deceived by it is not wise.—Christian Publishing Society.

THOMAS E. DEWEY, Governor of New York, Albany, N.Y.: 'It is a deeply disturbing fact that no fewer than seventeen million young folks in our country receive no religious instruction whatsoever. For the future, of the nation it is desirable that we leave no measures untried to enrol all our future citizens in the Sunday schools of America. No person can call himself educated who does not maintain familiarity with the Bible.'—20th Century Christian.'

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES

Morley.—The Church, on February 22nd and 23rd last, celebrated its fifty-third anniversary, with good meetings and excellent addresses. We had for our speakers Bren. F. C. Day and J. A. Ballard, of Birmingham and Hull, respectively. We had also hoped to have Had Bro. Charles Bailey, of Doncaster, as our chairman, but he was unable to be present because of illness. Bro. W. Wintersgill, of Ardsley (another veteran in the faith) very ably took his place at short notice.

Great credit is due to our two visiting speakers, who at great personal inconvenience, and in bitter weather, travelled a great distance to serve us—Bro. Day particularly. Snow and Morley anniversary are become synonymous terms, for we have had snow at our anniversary more years than we have been free from it. However, quite a number of brethren from far and near, including Hindley and Blackburn, in Lancashire, braved the elements to join with us in our celebrations.

Our two brethren gave us two very fitting addresses on 'Vision' and 'Delusions.' They had not the slightest idea what each other was going to talk about, but each fitted into the other perfectly.

The sisters again rose to the occasion and provided a good tea on both the Saturday and the Sunday. Bro. Day again served us very well on thfi Lord's Day.

It was Bro. Day's first visit to the Morley Church, and we trust he took back with him many happy memories. Bro. Ballard is becoming quite a well-known figure at Morley, and greatly enhanced his already good reputation as a preacher.

A letter of greeting was read by the secretary from Bro. Bailey. We all trust for a speedy recovery for our brother.

II. BAINBS.

Newtongrange.—On February 26th the Church was overjoyed to hear the good confession and to witness the immersion of James Campbell, and again on March 2nd we were taken to mountain heights by one of our Sunday school scholars coming forward and declaring, before many witnesses, that Jesus is the Son of God and her Saviour, and being immersed into the ever-blessed name of Jesus. May our Heavenly Father bless them and keep them in the straight and narrow way that leadeth unto life eternal.

Bro. Winstanley will be with us during the month of March, and we are hopeful of even greater things being done for our Master. Brethren pray for us that the work of the Lord may be glorified.

W. II. ALLAN.

Newtongrange.—The church was o Joyed to hear the good confession of o Bro. James Gardner and to witness hjs immersion into the ever-blessed name of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. May our Lord bless and keep him, and may he be instrumental in His hands in bringing many to the knowledge of the truth. We certainly are having mountain-top experiences. Bro. and Sis. Ketcherside are with us this week-end and what a week-end: Friday, Sunshine Corner, attendance sixty; Saturday afternoon, Bible Study, forty present; Gospel meeting, 6 p.m., about seventy present; Sunday, Lord's Table, forty-two in Fellowship; Bible Study, fifty-seven present; Gospel meeting, over eighty adults present. Our Brother certainly gave us of his best, and it was good to listen to him unfolding the Word of God. We hope and trust that great good may be the outcome of his visit to us.

W. II. ALLAN.

Capetown, Woodstock.—We are glad to report that on February 2nd a young man confessed the Lord, and was united with Him in baptism.

The service was conducted by Bro. Kannemeyer, who very plainly set forth the importance of baptism in relation to salvation, and its significance, as shown in Romans vi. May these seasons of refreshing stir us to labour more for the extension of God's kingdom.

With patience let us look for the coming of the King of kings and Lord of lords, who will surely come and receive us unto Himself. Is not this worth while Striving for?

T. HARTLE.

Tunbridge Wells.—The school at Silverdale Hall held their winter treat on February 8th. A very happy time was spent. Tea was provided at 4.30. In the evening, the children entertained their parents with recitations, solos, and a dialogue successfully given. Toys for the infants and books for the elder scholars were presented at the close. The number present, including parents and children, was sixty-five.

We thank our Heavenly Father for these joyous occasions.

D. CILLKTT.

Hindley Bible School.

May 24th'to 29th, 1947.

Have you booked yet? We have been fortunate to secure the services of well-known Brethren to give lectures on 'Back to Jerusalem.'

We hope shortly to produce a programme with meetings, and names of Brethren who are sharing the work. If you would like one, please write to L. Morgan, 44 Lord Street, Hindley.

Obituary.

Heanor. — The Church has suffered a great loss by the passing of our Sister W. E. Barker, whose death occurred on Thursday, February 20th.

Always, of a bright and cheerful nature, she was highly esteemed by all who knew her, and as a teacher in the Sunday school, and in recent years, as president of the Sisters' Meeting, her influence will have been felt by many with whom she came in contact.

At the comparatively early age of fifty-seven years, her death came as a great shock to all of us. A husband, two sons—one of whom is on his way home after two years in India—and a daughter, are bereaved. We commit them to the care of Him who careth for us.

The funeral service was conducted by Bro. Allen Murray, of East Klrkby, when, a large and representative gathering assembled to show their esteem and respect for one they loved. The committal rites were performed at Wilford Crematorium, Bro. Murray officiating.

W. HAWLRY.

Portnockie.—With deep regret we record the sudden death of Sister Catherine Stewart, who passed to her rest on Monday, March 10th, in her 65th year. Sister Stewart has been a lifelong and devoted member with the Churches of Christ in Buckie and Portnockie. Sister Stewart was a very active woman for her years and was a regular attender at the Lord's Table. She was present on Sunday, 9th March, when she appeared to be in her usual health, and her sudden passing early on Monday came as a shock to the Church and her many friends. When the day dawns and the shadows flee away we feel sure Sister Stewart will be amongst

those with white robes before the throne of God,—serving Him there as" she sought: to serve him below. To the husband and family of our departed sister, we tender our sincerest sympathy and commend them all to the God of all grace and comfort.

W. MAIR.

Wigan : Scholes—For the third time within nine weeks the Church has "suffered the loss of a member. Jane Cherrington, a beloved sister and faithful servant in the Lord, passed away on Saturday, 1st March.

Sister Cherrington, who was 56 years of age and unmarried, was baptized into Christ some eighteen years ago. Since then, she had been faithful in all things pertaining to life and Godliness. She was a regular attender at the gospel meetings and women's meetings, and the things she learned of her beloved Master were translated into action in daily life. She was of humble and self-effacing disposition, and did good to many in the name of Christ. For the last four years, she had looked after the two sons of a brother of hers like a second mother. Indeed, it can be said that she gave her life in willing and glad service for others, and forgot the needs of her own body. Truly the beauty of Jesus shone through her, and the words of the hymn were fulfilled in her:

'As some rare perfume in a vase of clay,
Pervades it with a fragrance not its
own,
So when Thou dwellest in a mortal soul
All heaven's own sweetness seems
around it thrown.'

She fell asleep in Jesus. And we leave her in the blessed assurance that when the day dawns and the shadows flee we shall see her again with the Saviour at whose feet she loved to sit.

We commend her only sister, Clara, and her several brothers to Him who is the source of all comfort.

C. MELLING.

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.

AU 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, 12 Poulton Street, Fleetwood; Lancashire.

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

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

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

THE SCRIPTURE STANDARD is printed for the Publishers by Walter Barker, Langley MI. Nottm.