

No.
83

***"IF YE THEN BE RISEN WITH CHRIST, SEEK THOSE THINGS WHICH
ARE ABOVE, WHERE CHRIST SITTETH ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD."***
COL.3.1

***LENT, GOOD FRIDAY,
AND EASTER.***

An Address (revised) at

65, St. Mary Axe,

14th March 1913.

by

PERCY W. HEWARD

***Correspondence welcome: Scriptural literature for Believers
Gottlieb-Daimler-Str.1 – 74343 Sachsenheim – GERMANY***

LENT, GOOD FRIDAY, AND EASTER.

An Address by Mr. P. W. Heward,

At 65, St. Mary Axe,

14th March 1913

OUTLINE:

- 1. Truth or Feelings?**
- 2. Have We Scripture for Everything?**
- 3. Thoughts on Anniversaries.**
- 4. Leavening from Babylon.**
- 5. A Few Thoughts on Christ's Death, and its Date.**
- 6. An Appendix on Christmas.**

Our subject, dear friends, is not a popular one. I have not the slightest doubt that in many of our meetings there will be differences of opinion. I do not expect to say everything in a way in which you will agree. I am very sorry that there is a disagreement, and I trust we all are too, but in the sad state of affairs today I should be very sorry for meetings always to start with agreement, because that would imply that there was no real consideration of the problems that separate those who bear the Name of the Lord. I should be thankful if meetings might always FINISH with agreement, but this is vastly different. That there may be a great change between the beginnings and the ends of our meetings should be an object of prayer unto those who value the precious words of the Living God.

Our first point sounds a little controversial. It asks a question, but in so doing it makes a statement. **Truth or feelings?** The implied statement is if there is a care for the Truth there must be a wounding of feelings; and I am prepared to say that is so in the present state. I do hope, dear friends, that I shall either convince you from the Scripture, or kindly wound your feelings. That is to say the only thing that is beyond measure saddening in a gathering is where difficulties are not regarded seriously. Wounded feelings are very precious, and without ANY unkind wish I hope that there may be many wounded feelings when we meet together. None of us learn very much except by being wounded. Pain is oftentimes a lesson in God's school, and when Truth comes to us it often strikes us, not only as something fresh, but as something painful. I am not pleading for quarrelling, but pleading for pain, although pain is not the desirable climax. The glory of God in absolute unity is the ideal, and VIA pain we may expect more unity, for the Holy Spirit works in this way. It is idle to deny differences, it is wicked. Feelings are oftentimes very strong when there is an absence of the knowledge of the Truth; and feelings are certainly very strong when there is a REAL knowledge of the Truth. Dear friends, I take it that we know one another sufficiently well to realise that. The MEANS must not be confused with the OBJECT. I have not the slightest wish to make the wounding of feelings the object, but I do want in all our gatherings that we should have a frankness of expression, with an affectionate concern, that will be used of God's Holy Spirit to awaken to cause mediation, and to bind together, in separation from sin, those whose hearts God has touched. If any child of God is unwilling to have his feelings wounded, that child of God has very little concern for Truth. It is a blessed thing to value the Truth so much that we welcome the parts of sound doctrine or practice that cut at the ROOTS of our opinions and tearing them out, cause us intense pain.

Our second point is likewise a question. **Have we Scripture for everything?** As a rule we speak of different parts of our belief being particularly emphasized by this Scripture or that Scripture. Have we Scripture for everything? This is a deeply important subject, for everyone must acknowledge we have no Scripture for the observance of Lent, Good Friday, or Easter. If it is necessary to have Scripture for everything, these observances fall to the ground, unless it be that there is a principle in Scripture which includes these and can be applied to these, and that

they are only an application of an original principle on Scripture lines. I am inclined to think, dear friends, that we shall come to this conclusion in theory, and I hope in practice by the gracious working of the Spirit of God, that we need either Scripture Precedent, or Precept, or Principle for EVERYTHING. We cannot get away from this if we are subject to the Lord, otherwise there is room for self-will, and human development. The apostle distinctly said that he commanded certain things everywhere in every church. His ways that were in Christ were well known. There was a regularity and a consistency. The usual opinion is that God gave certain arrangements and left it to His people to develop them as they pleased. Now that view soon becomes peculiarly dangerous. We are quite ready to acknowledge that we have not direct statement as to everything in the Scriptures, but do we see that we have principles which affect and guide everything? How does this concern the point before us? First of all, if we must have Scripture precedent for everything, as we have seen these three observances have gone. But if this is not exactly so, if the Scriptures are like (if I might so term it) an arithmetical text book which works out one problem and gives twenty other examples underneath: – if the Scriptures are thus arranged, I ask under what rule (to draw our figure from Mathematics) under what rule, and under what branch of the subject have we authority for Lent, Good Friday, or Easter? What is the Scripture PRINCIPLE on which they are based? My own belief is this, that there is nothing logical between Christ and Romanism, between Christ and infidelity. We must have Him as LORD of our whole life. And the simple out sidedness of devotion unto Him, or our logical position is either in Rome or Agnosticism. Once open the flood gates of tradition, once allow the principle of development, and the degree permitted becomes only a matter of personal convenience and ever changing opinion. If traditions are allowed to outweigh Scripture for anything distinct from Scripture is outweighing it, a Scripture position is gone. If the distinctness is a distinctness, is an adding to, that involves a subtraction from, – for if you add new arrangements you subtract from God's all-complete arrangements, there is a serious sin. Anything, I repeat, that allows tradition, is a development toward Romanism, with its blasphemous opposition to the Lord of Glory as the One Mediator between God and men. I ask therefore with solemn earnestness of all who have observed Lent, Good Friday, and Easter, for the production of

some Scripture principle on which they base their observance, or otherwise, in the Lords Name, if they bear that Name, I would plead with them to renounce that which has no basis in the words of the Living God.

“Thoughts on Anniversaries” may next come before us. Here we are coming to a very deep part of our subject. I do not mean deep as to comprehension, but foundational as to its bearing upon other parts of the subject. Lent, Good Friday, and Easter are ANNUAL. In the Name of the Lord, I ask you for any Scripture warrant for anything annual in the present dispensation. I know of a weekly gathering, a weekly gathering which it is the duty, and more than the duty, the precious privilege of the Lords redeemed to frequent, – The weekly gathering on the Lords Day, including, though not only made up of, the Breaking of the Bread. But this weekly remembrance stands out in Scripture in solemn contrast to all anniversaries. Living in the present age, when earthly glory, and earthly nations, and earthly cities are set on one side, I ask what right have we to reintroduce the ornate symbolism, the governmental glory, and the times and seasons that belong to the Jewish dispensation? Every such observance and anniversary is, in the present time, Judaism, and a denial of the heavenly calling. Well might Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ rebuke some who were going back to Judaism, in those striking words, “Ye observe days and months and times and years, I am afraid of you”. It is noteworthy that the only thing not mentioned here is the week, the week is the one division of time which is independent of the sun and the moon. The day depends on sun and moon, the month is likewise, the times which were the Jewish feasts were related to the seasons, and came at fixed parts of the year, the years are plainly associated with the sun and the moon. But we are above the sun. Ecclesiastes shows the position “under the sun”. In heavenly places above the heavenliest in Christ Jesus, we are not busied with anniversaries. We desire simply to retain the numbers of the years, and the names of the months in accord with the fact that we are found in a Gentile Land where those things are mentioned, but to us 1913 does not mean 1913 years since the birth of Christ. It is simple a Gentile number, apart from the fact that the dating is wrong. We count from resurrection, not from birth, but we are not busied in reckoning years at all. Years do not come upon the scene till in connection with Antichrist in the present

dispensation, and then it is noticeable that the redeemed are viewed as being kept aloof from the observances of those years, in that they are looking for the Coming of their Lord and Saviour, and do not know when He will arrive. They are not computing years, they are NOT busied with anniversaries.

Might I suggest in this connection that the birthdays of Scripture are solemn. We find the birthday of Pharaoh and the birthday of Herod, both stained with murder. It is important that children of God should be absolutely free from these things. No observance of that which is annual belongs to them. One views with alarm the present day keeping of anniversaries in connection with religious work!

But where then are we to find the origin of Lent, Good Friday and Easter? If they are NOT in Scripture, and may I point out that the one occurrence of the word "Easter" in Acts 12 is a palpable mistranslation. The word is "Passover" in the Greek, and has nothing whatever to do with Easter. Our translators have put it in, and in this connection we regard it as one of the saddest things, so to read into Scripture what is not there. If these things are not in Scripture, from whence do they come? If only many of Gods dear people could be acquainted with the history of surrounding practices they would draw back in holy alarm. Ignorance is often linked with superstition, and when we attack the various opinions which are not belonging to the Lord, some will think of us as the Assyrian general thought of Hezekiah. Hezekiah destroyed the idols and the Assyrian general sent a message, "If you say you are going to trust upon the Lord, why, He is the One whose objects of worship Hezekiah has thrown down". You see what I mean? In attacking the false additions and traditions which have become entwined with the Truth, outsiders and onlookers will think we are attacking the Truth itself, and while removing the ivy that will kill the tree, they will think we are attacking the tree itself. But at the risk of being misunderstood, we would cling to the words of God, and would seek to make clear the origin of these observances and of many other things which are manifestly against God. Has God given us any clue in this matter? I think He has. In Rev. 17 we are distinctly told a women who is viewed as "MYSTERY BABYLON" is the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth. Now the Scripture explains what a harlot is in figurative language. There is a

departure from the pure devotion unto Christ alone. A harlot is a woman, a woman is capable of being a bride, a woman therefore is a church or a "system" if we may thus denominate it for the time being. If a church becomes married to another instead of simply betrothed unto Christ, that church has become a harlot. Babylon is the mother of harlots of the earth, but with whom is there this marriage? Rev. 17 says "with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication". As soon as any church becomes a reigning church instead of a persecuted church it is no longer a bride, but a harlot in the language of Scripture. I know this is plain speaking, but it is Scripture testimony. No one can interpret Rev. 17 honestly and without prejudice apart from this clear revelation from God. It is stamped upon the chapter. Herein we see then that though the king and government are right in their sphere and appointed by God as Rom. 13 shows, the Lord's people are not instructed to have any share in governing, and if they do partake, there is the principle of harlot. And thus not only do we find this principle showing itself in every organised church that has governmental association, but nonconformity is likewise full of it in the political seeking and the SHARE in voting which disgraces almost the whole of its various sections. In the light of Rev. 17 we can see what God has appointed for His people. As Paul puts it in 2 Cor. 11, the redeemed are espoused unto Christ that they should be pure virgins toward Him and if there is any settling down in the world there will necessarily be linked therewith a forgetfulness of the return of the Bridegroom, on whom all the heavenly hopes of the redeemed should be now centered. But if Babylon was the mother of harlots and there are many, do we know anything of the mother? We do soon after the flood Nimrod became the first builder of Babylon, commencing a work that Nebuchadnezzar continued. Now Nimrod is evidently the same as Ninus the builder of Nineveh. He is related to Bel, it has been suggested that Bel is another name for Cush the father of Nimrod. Bel is the one from whom Babel may have been named by man, though God showed that it meant confusion in His sight. The wife of Nimrod was Semiramis who impressed herself upon the days in which she lived. She has been rightly described as a beautiful but abandoned queen, and from her, linked with Nimrod, the first Antichrist after the flood, there sprang forth all kinds of unnamable iniquities. Various names were used in various lands, but the worship of Nimrod and Semiramis is found in all parts of

the world. Babylon is the mother of iniquities. Semiramis is also Venus, Aphrodite or Astarte. Astarte is the one from whom Easter is named. Astarte is the same as Ashtaroth. We know how the worship of Ashtaroth is connected in the Hebrew Scriptures with the worship of Bel. Bel and Ashtaroth are Bel and Astarte. Here we have the Babylonian god and goddess, heroes deified whose worship spread not only to Phenice but throughout the world. Easter thus has a most unsatisfactory name. It is solemn to realise that the hot cross buns are associated with the worship of the queen of heaven, the cross itself being the mystic heathen cross, for our beloved Lord was crucified on a stake. The Easter EGG is associated with mystic iniquity. Long before our beloved Lord came into the world these things were existing, even as December 25th was the birthday of the sun-god long before the Lord Jesus was born into the world. These are only heathen arrangements adopted without one fraction of Scripture evidence, without one fraction of Scripture reason, adopted in connection with what God revealed, VIZ. that the professing church would become perverted and become Babylonish. I ask this pointed question, if these things are NOT against God, if they are in accord with His mind and will, then, where are the prophecies of the Lord Jesus as to the ruin of the professing church to find their fulfilment? Where is the leavening from Babylon which Rev. 17 shows? Where is the ruin of which Timothy and the other epistles speak? I venture to say that if these things are in accord with the mind of God, the prophecies of the Lord Jesus must be falsified. We are therefore in a dilemma; – either we must acknowledge that organised professing Christianity has a certain succession from Babylon, not from Christ, or we must attack the prophecies of the Lord of Glory Himself. We must either accept nominal Christianity or accept Christ: we cannot have both. Surely the child of God does not hesitate to make the quick decision. The early Christians did not keep Lent. Even in the fourth century those professing His Name only had a period of two or three weeks associated with Easter. I need hardly say that one of the early controversies was when Easter should be kept. Many kept it at the Jewish Passover time. But the arrangements were made to alter this, why? Evidently there was the drawing away from the original connection which some had with the resurrection of Christ, even to associate it with the Babylonian feast. I said just now the early Christians did not keep Lent, they did not keep Easter. When I was

a speaking of those who altered the time of keeping Easter, I am not referring to the earliest Christians, but simply showing that there were steps in the down-grade. Originally there was no keeping of any of these things. Then there was the introduction of one, and thus step by step the departure from Christ. But a Lent of six weeks is associated with the devil-worshippers of Kurdistan and with the ancient Mexican heathen. These thoughts are very solemn to a child of God. I need hardly say that in attacking these observances I fully recognize that many dear believers have not the ideas or the origins in mind, and may I remind you that to us as believers in the Lord Jesus there is no wish to take away from the importance of self-denial. If THIS be at all in the mind of any with regard to Lent, I suppose every true believer who is growing in grace has a fuller observance of self-denial for 365 days in the year than many who make it their arrangement during the few weeks. In like manner in speaking against the observance of Good Friday I believe that to a child of God every day is a GOOD day, to remind him of his Lord dying, and every Lords Day is a memorial of resurrection. I do not want to take FROM those seemingly good points which have been wrapped up with heathen festivals to make them more widely palatable, but rather to extend the good points and not simply reduce them to a few temporary observances; not to associate them with heathen companionships. Let the good points stand in their Scriptural setting, let us not marry them to the mysteries of Babylon.

A few thoughts on Christ's death, and its day may now come before us, or rather I will postpone the subject of its date as that will shortly be coming more specially before us as part of one of our topics here. But oh dear friends, HOW precious is the death of the Lord Jesus to those who feel they deserved to die! If we merited wrath, and we did; – if it is only grace we are not in Hell now, – if God has shown us His beloved Son bearing our sins in His Own body on the tree, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godlinesses! How we ought to live to the praise of the glory of Gods grace. Beloved friends, do not let any argumentative subject take off the minds of the redeemed from Christ. It is right to ponder the sad origin of many of these things and let me say that if any have difficulties in this matter, I hope they will state them plainly, and if they would like the historical facts brought out more fully I should be glad to lend them literature on the

subject, that will tell them where they can find these, so that they can investigate and be brought out from this snare. For the origin of these things is so hid away that many are misled and in ignorance observe that which is against God, but for which, if they are His children they will suffer loss at the judgment Seat of Christ. But now my thought is rather, – Let us, if indeed we are in Christ, be preserved from mere argument from even mere consideration of the ruin that sin has brought. Let us think of Christ, in Whom and in Whose work there is no ruin, but a perfection whereby we are fully accepted. How blessed indeed is the privilege of children of God! May we live up to it.

A brief appendix on Christmas. In the Name of the Lord I object to the following-points in connection with the observance of Dec. 25th First, I object to the name Christmas. It is a name without Scripture warrant and the latter part of it is either connected with the worship of the sun god from the word “mizd”, OR connected with the Romish mass. Secondly, I object in the Name of the Lord to the false assumption that our beloved Lord was born on December 25th. The Palestine climate, as Jer. 36 and John 10 show, is against shepherds watching their flocks by night in December. It is fairly plain to those who have studied this subject that Christ could not have been born then, that He might have been born in several other months, but not that month. In the Lord’s Name I would protest against a false assumption, for God is the God of Truth. Thirdly, in the Name of the Lord, I would protest against all anniversaries in the present dispensation. Fourthly, the historical relationship of Christmas must lead every believer to view it with more than suspicion even with abhorrence, unless his eyes are blinded to this, or he is unacquainted with the facts. For Christmas is the feast that was observed long before Christ came. It is the Roman Saturnalia, associated astronomically with the lengthening of the days. It is heathenishly linked with the birth of the sun-god, and with idolatries and iniquities in many lands. Fifthly, I would protest against the character of the present day observance of Christmas. A memorial nominally of Christ’s birth, it, to a certain extent, necessarily puts aside His death and resurrection, introducing a conviviality of those who are in earthly and FLESHLY relationship, forgetting that in Christ Jesus the redeemed are cut off from the friendship of the world, and that even ties of blood can never be as close as ties of grace. The feast not only is without Scripture warrant, but it

produces a spirit of earthly gaiety, it is entirely inharmonious for those who are in the Lord Jesus and taught to rejoice with trembling. Finally, in the Name of the Lord and with a desire after the manifestation of Christian love, I protest against Christmas. More young Christians have been caused to stumble then than at most times of the year. Not only is there in connection with Christmas a display of gaiety, but believers are afraid to stand out, and earthly business arrangements are oftentimes an additional attraction, to draw them at that season from the things of the Lord. Oh how important that we who are saved by grace, if indeed we are, should be separate from everything that is not revealed in the Scripture as the mind of the Holy Spirit. If God has veiled the birthday of Christ, iniquitous is the curiosity which seeks to remove the veil.

Now, dear friends, the meeting is open.

Q. *What are the eggs to do with, Mr. Heward?*

H. *Nothing to do with Christ, nothing to do with Scripture, but the egg was associated in various idolatries with a figure of the world, and so it was brought about as a figure of resurrection, – not the resurrection of Christ, – the resurrection of the world, for to Nimrod the going through the flood (I do not mean he was personally there but Nimrod, who belonged to Hams family was associated by man with coming through the flood) the going through the flood was a stepping forward to the earth to start iniquities that had been before, it was therefore a new birth of iniquity.*

Q. *How do you account for the fact that Oxford and Cambridge, – places where men are being trained for the so-called ministry, are ignorant of this?*

H. *They are not, dear Mr. --- these things are know largely.*

Q. *Is it not a fact that the knowledge of them undermines, to some extent the faith of any young believer entering upon the training?*

H. *I do not quite follow the question?*

Q. *A student may identify the Scripture revelation, first from creation onward, as identical with mythology?*

H. *I follow what you mean, and I am quite of one mind with you in that. Superstition and tradition are a growth, a fungus growth that gets round the tree and when you remove that, the natural tendency with a goodly number at first is to think that you removing everything, and they are apt to throw over everything, and lose faith as to everything, just as it is with Israel. You point out to them that have superstitions and traditions, they will frequently, unless God prevents, throw up their Judaism AND throw up their Bible with it. The incrustation of additions to Scripture always leads to that.*

Q. *Where is the origin of festivals?*

H. *Three yearly Mosaic festivals?*

Q. *Are they traced back to Rome?*

H. *Festivals are Jewish or Gentile, not Christian.*

Q. *The thought of eggs I suppose, typifying the resurrection of evil, as having its new life in Ham who came through the ark suggested the continuance of that evil which was destroyed by the flood, being associated with Easter, I suppose largely based upon the fact that eggs become very plentiful at Easter, and therefore, like the coming again of buds and flowers, these are typical of resurrection?*

H. *Yes, almost all feasts seem to have some relationship to physical arrangements as well. I mean, the old worship of the sun-god was linked with the lengthening of the days after the winter solstice.*

Q. *Is there anything to prove that Christmas Day was mentioned before the birth of Christ?*

H. *Christmas Day, not as Christmas Day, the NAME is recent; but there are plenty of things to prove that Dec. 24 & 25 and just around that time existed a period of heathen festival. The early Christians never kept it, but that it was introduced, I think Chrysostom the great Greek preacher, mentions that Christmas had lately been decided, the birthday of Christ had lately been decided to be at such and such a day, his period was somewhere about 400 years after Christ. We may, generally speaking, say that at the beginning of the fourth century they fixed on Christmas day, evidently dealing with the fact of which Tertullian speaks. Tertullian speaks of the way in which the professing Christians joined*

themselves up with the heathen festivals, and as the nominal church became more worldly, the idea was this, – we will adopt the heathen festivals, renaming to prevent our people going to them. Just in the same way as you will find Christians, or professing Christians at the present day adopting worldly expedients, to RETAIN their young people. They will say, well, we do not want them to go to the picture palace or the theatre, we will give them a picture palace in our place of worship (that is done), so there is the attempt to meet half way, and one gets most awful parodies of Gods arrangement in this connection. I was about to say that accidentally, humanly speaking, I passed by a shop associated with professing Christian work with which it was associated, and saw over the door there was “Bible Talks”; in the doorway there was a notice of adance, a select dance.

Q. With regard to Easter, the mention of Acts 12, – can that be proved a mistranslation?

H. There is no word for Easter in the Greek at all.

Q. It says so to in the Bible, sir.

H. Only in the AUTHORISED Version, all that one has to do is to look at the Greek Testament, and you will see that the words are τó πάσχα which you can see is the word Passover The only mention of Easter in Scripture is of course Ashtaroth, the heathen goddess.

Q. The fact that most of Christian churches, or rather branches of Christendom, the Greek “church”, the Roman “church” have the same feasts in them, I suppose, would suggest that the error came in about the same period, before there were the branching off into the Anglican and the Roman, and all these errors are retained. It is sad that they should have been retained at the reformation, but we are thankful for so much that was cleansed out at the reformation, and yet the prayer book seems to leave the subject almost open, that unless anything can be proved by Scripture it is not to be retained?

H. The periods of division of the branches of Christendom of course would form a long subject. The Eastern and the Western, that is to say the Greek and the Roman churches, so called, continued with one another for several centuries at the first, consequently there was plenty of time for all kinds of evil to be introduced first. Then there was that

division, but other churches did not split from Romanism till the fifteenth century.

Q. But then it was entwined around political differences rather than Scriptural facts, and truth; was it not, at that period practically in the reign of king Henry VIII when the first division came about between the Anglican church and the people of Rome?

H. The reformation was most mingled, part of it was plainly arranged by children of God who were in intense earnest.

Q. Touching Wycliffe and Luther and those, did you mean?

H. But even in the later division of the Anglican "church" there were some who were deeply earnest servants of God as far as one can find out, men for example who refused at the first to be consecrated in any special vestments, viewing them as Romanism, – yet some of these very men gave way afterwards. If only they had stood firm, and refused the identification of church and state, how different history might have been. The little compromises of the 16th century have borne abundant fruit in the 20th century.

Q. The draping of the crucifix, is that allowed in the church of England? I saw a crucifix draped with purple cloth standing behind the place where the man reads the text?

H. It is very difficult to say just exactly what is allowed in the church of England as to those matters, The church of England has, by certain legal decisions, made itself exceedingly broad, that is to say some judgments have been given which will include those who deny the very inspiration of the Scriptures, other judgments have been given which will include those who are extreme ritualists. In other words an attempt has been made to cause an intense broadness, to include nearly everybody and everything; but may I go a step further than the draping of the crucifix and ask what is the authority of the crucifix at all?

Q. Question as to legality of these things?

H. I would definitely say, dear friends, that to us the point is not what is not legal or allowable or common. But what is Scriptural? If Scripture is against anniversaries, against Easter, why should it be kept? I am sure in our studies we shall find plenty of things that are common

that are not according to the mind of God. What shall rule in our lives, – tradition, or Christ?

Q. Can you give me one or two Scriptures that everything must be found from the Scripture, that our walk should be found from the Scripture? Personally I do not say they are not there, but I just ask for one or two passages?

H. Isa. 8. 20 suggest a general principle. “To the Law, and to the Testimony; if they speak not according to this word, there is no morning for them”. Then we have the general Scripture statement, that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine ... that the man of God may be FIT, having been outfitted to every good work, – implying we have something therein to guide in all. Then inferentially, we have this thought in Pauls application of the Scripture: – for example, when he wants to prove anything about even remuneration for those who serve the Lord in certain ways, he refers to what the Law says, as much as to say, I will bring forward Scripture for it, and shows a certain principle. Then the “according to” of the Psalms are suggestive “According to Thy word”, “According to the word”. This expression again and again appears in the Psalms. The language implying that there is not necessarily a direct Scripture for everything, but that everything is to be in accord with Gods Truth.

Q. Of course, our Lord in the wilderness says, “It is written”.

Q. The one gathering sticks on the Sabbath was put in ward till the MIND of the Lord was known.

H. Of necessity, the general teaching of Scripture that we are ignorant and need Gods Holy Spirit would illustrate the same precious thought.

Further addresses available:

Scriptural literature, Gottlieb-Daimler-Str.1, 74343 Sachsenheim, GERMANY