

T H E
Free Presbyterian Magazine
 AND MONTHLY RECORD

Vol. LXVI.

May, 1961

No. 1

THE QUEEN'S PROPOSED VISIT TO THE POPE

The following is a Protest from the Church's Religion and Morals Committee:—

May it Please Your Majesty,

We, the Religion and Morals Committee of the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, having learned with profound regret that Your Majesty intends to visit the Pope on May 5th, do hereby utter our solemn and emphatic Protest against such a visit. We have no hesitation in describing this visit, and similar visits by members of the Royal Family and other dignitaries in Church and State, as detrimental to the Protestant religion which Your Majesty has sworn to uphold and contrary to the Act of Settlement and the Bill of Rights. We are aware that it is argued that such visits are paid on the ground that the Pope is the Head of a temporal State, but in Roman Catholic circles they are looked upon as an acknowledgment of the Pope as the Head of the Christian Church. We deplore the conduct of Your Majesty's advisers in arranging such a visit, with its humiliating circumstances, to one who is not the head of the Christian Church, but the head of a corrupt system which looks upon Your Majesty as a heretic, and who claims the right to absolve Your Majesty's subjects from their allegiance to Your Majesty. The visit is ill-advised because it is illegal in the light of the Constitution of the Realm, it ignores the past lessons of history in connection with Rome's fight for Possession of the British Throne, and casts a serious reflection on the stand made by a great army of martyrs both in England and Scotland, whose blood calls for the vengeance of Heaven against the system of which the Pope is the head. We pray that better counsels will prevail and that Your Majesty will cancel this visit which reflects such forgetfulness of God's goodness to us in the past, is so dishonouring to the nation, so humiliating to Your Majesty's Person, and which militates so much against the stability of Your Majesty's Throne.

It is not out of place, and does not diminish the reverence we have for Your Majesty's Person and Throne, to inform Your Majesty that this intended visit has occasioned many petitions at God's Throne of Grace which may have the effect of overturning the counsels of Your Majesty's advisers in a way that will show that the Lord reigns. It is our sincere desire for the temporal and spiritual welfare of Your Majesty and the stability of Your Majesty's Throne which prompts us to address Your Majesty on this matter.

On behalf of the Committee,

(Rev.) John Colquhoun, *Convener*.

F.P. Manse,

Glendale, Isle of Skye,

Scotland, 24th March, 1961.

TRANSGRESSORS GRIEVE THE GODLY

*"I beheld the transgressors, and was grieved;
because they kept not Thy word."* (Ps. cxix: 158)

We shall not tire in listening to this repeated expression of the tenderness of the Psalmist's heart in his exercises with God. Rather, when we consider the mark of peculiar acceptance which the Lord had sealed upon this feature of his character, let every fresh view and recollection of it be followed with some deepened impression of this sweet frame upon our too cold and indifferent hearts. Our joys and sorrows are as it were the pulse of our soul, by which our spiritual life and health may at all times be most accurately marked. A fellowship with the joys of the angels of God over repenting sinners must be accompanied with bitterness of godly sorrow over the hardness and impenitency of those who "keep not the word of God." But even here in the actings of our hearts much and earnest prayer is needed, in order to obtain a clear and well-digested acquaintance with the real springs and motives of conduct and profession. Sin is so subtle in its nature and workings, that it insinuates itself into our holiest desires, and often so far interweaves itself into the graces of the Spirit, as greatly to mar their beauty, and obstruct their operations. And never do we need greater watchfulness over its power than in the temper of our zeal for the honour of God. True zeal is indeed a precious fruit of the Spirit, whose other name is love—active, self-denying, compassionate love for sinners. "Let me never fancy I have zeal," said a Christian

of a very high order, "till my heart overflows with love to every man living." If we are then really under the influence of Christian zeal and Christian love, we shall lose no opportunity of active exertions on behalf of wretched "transgressors," and the limits of our zeal will be only the limits of a fallen world. Especially within our own sphere will labour and pains be employed in seeking to stem the tide of unrighteousness, "saying unto the fools: Deal not foolishly. How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die?"

But the fervency of our zeal will express itself in something more difficult than personal service. We can often warn transgressors, and labour in their cause, when we are sadly backward in sending up sighs and cries on their behalf; and in uncovering these poor lepers in the sight of that great and good Physician, whose "power present to heal" has been so abundantly manifested. Oh! it is hard to reach this frame; but it is a frame of rich unction and refreshment. It is the mind of the compassionate Jesus, who, while He "looked round on sinners with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts," was ready to remember their case in earnest pleadings to His Father—"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." And who can hope to "assure his heart before God," while a stranger to this frame? Can we bear to "behold" all around us united in a conspiracy against the honour, and, if it were possible, against the life, of our dearest friend and benefactor, and not be "grieved"? Yet if it be genuine "grief," it will begin with exercises on account of our sin—"all of us mourning, every one for his iniquity." We shall never hear of the wickedness of others without our own conscience stirring the conviction within—"I do remember my faults this day." And when once we begin the enumeration, where shall we end? "Who can understand his errors? Cleanse Thou me from secret faults! Enter not into judgment with Thy servant, O Lord."

—Bridges on Ps. cxix.

SPIRITUAL HEALTH

"This is your health" (Acts 27, v. 34)

Bodily health is a great blessing and should not be trifled with, but all means likely to preserve it should be attended to. To this the Apostle refers and recommends the ship's company to take some meat, because it was for their health.

Spiritual health is an invaluable blessing and should be most carefully attended to. Unless the graces of the Spirit are in vigorous exercise and the duties of religion are our delight we are not in health; there is some sickness and we need the physician's care.

To preserve health where it is and to restore it where it is not, attend to the following prescription. It is valuable; it is important, because it is for your health.

First : You must take exercise, and I recommend that you walk daily in the Paradise of God's Word; that you work in the Vineyard of God's Church; that you bathe in the Fountain of Redeeming Blood; that you keep up Fellowship with lively Christians; and that you exercise all the graces of the Spirit. Attend particularly to these for it is for your health.

Secondly : Pay attention to your diet; let your food be the best. The Bread of Life and the Living Waters of Salvation are recommended. They satisfy and sanctify; a little will preserve life but much is necessary to health; take your food regularly for regularity is important. You cannot prosper and be in health unless you live upon Christ and live upon Him every day.

Thirdly : As to your medicine—it is made up of bitter herbs of disappointment, losses, crosses, temptations, bereavements, troubles and trials of various sorts. It is very unpleasant but very profitable. Unless taken freely you will be laid up with idleness, carelessness, anxiety, pride or selfishness, but this medicine is intended to prevent or remove these evils. Your Heavenly Father will prepare it. Divine Providence will present it, you are to beg the Divine blessing upon it; take it and expect benefit from it. Do not despise your medicine for it is for your health.

Fourthly : We prescribe tranquillity. You cannot be healthy unless you preserve tranquillity of mind, in order to which, live in peace with God as a loving child with a kind and gentle father; cast all your cares upon him, daily confess your sins before Him and get a renewed manifestation of His pardoning love. Be content with your lot, it is appointed by infinite wisdom and love. It is the very best that can be and this you will see and confess by and by. Trust the promises and providence of God for the future; live by the day, take no anxious care for the morrow and leave the future with the Lord, for it is your health.

Believer, God designs to preserve and restore thy spiritual health in all He does. Does He require you to obey His wise, His holy, His flesh-displeasing precepts? It is for your health.

Does He afflict you? It is for your health. Does He try you in your temporal circumstances? It is for your health. Does He bereave you of your friends and loved ones? Even this is for your health. The cup is bitter but the design is gracious; the draught is nauseous but the effect is sweet. All things work together for the good of those that love God and are called according to His purpose.

If we use much exercise, pay strict attention to our diet and live in holy tranquillity we shall not want much medicine, but if we become inactive, feed upon the vanities of time and are anxious about many things, we shall often need a regular course of medicine and as surely as we need it we shall have it and if we complain or repine, our Heavenly Father will silence us by pointing to our folly and asking "Hast thou not procured this to thyself?"

DIFFERENCES IN THE TWO SACRAMENTS AS SEALING ORDINANCES

By the late John Kennedy, D.D., Dingwall

They of the South maintain that both the sacraments, being seals of the same covenant, and imposing the selfsame obligations, ought to be administered on the same footing, the same kind and measure of profession and of qualification being required on the part of applicants for either; that no adult should be admitted to the one without being admitted also to the other; and that the Christian profession required of a parent, in order to the baptism of his child, cannot be complete without his being a communicant. The result of these views being carried into practice in the Lowlands, or rather the result of their mode of reducing them to practice, is that, with rare exceptions, all the members of a congregation above a certain age go to the table of the Lord, and that any parent who is a communicant receives, as a matter of course, baptism for his child.

The Ross-shire Fathers held that though in general the two sacraments were equally seals of the covenant of grace, they do in some respects differ even as sealing ordinances; that baptism, being the door of admission into the visible Church, a larger exercise of charity is required in dealing with applicants for that sacrament than is called for in administering the other, which implies a confirmation of those who were members before; that the lessons of baptism are more elementary than those of the sacrament of the Supper; that the connection of the child and of both the parents, with an ordinary case of infant baptism, calls

for peculiar tenderness on the part of church rulers, and that the rule of Scripture requires baptism to be given on an uncontradicted profession of faith, while an accredited profession is required to justify the Church in granting admission to the table of the Lord. The result of carrying these views into practice is well known; the number of members in full communion is comparatively small, and parents who have never communicated receive baptism for their children.

The Ross-shire Fathers, of course, held that the two sacraments were in *general* seals of the covenant of grace, and that as such they were equally valid. But they also held with Maastricht that they did not *specially* seal the same measure of privilege. They regarded baptism as the sacrament of admission, specially sealing the believers' introduction into the covenant of grace, and his interest in the initial blessings of regeneration and justification, and formally admitting him into the general membership of the visible Church. They regarded the Lord's Supper as the sacrament of nurture, specially sealing the believer's right to all that is required to advance him to "the stature of a perfect man in Christ Jesus," and formally admitting him when first administered into full communion with the Church, as one who, by the seeming fruits of his faith, had established his claims to the Church's confidence. They also held that in the professions required from applicants there must be a corresponding difference; the profession in either case being suitable to what is specially sealed by the Sacrament for which they apply—an applicant for baptism making a suitable profession when declaring his faith in Christ, and specially his willingness to receive Him as his Saviour, and his resolution to serve Him as his Lord; but that a person desiring to communicate must profess not merely the first exercise of faith in Christ, but a persuasion or a hope derived from an examination of his experience and his life, that his faith is that which "worketh by love," "purifieth the heart," and "overcometh the world." They, moreover, held that there must be a corresponding difference in the actions of the Church in administering the Sacraments—that the Church ought to sustain, in the case of a person applying for baptism either for himself or for his child, a profession not made incredible by ignorance and immorality, but that none ought to be admitted to the Lord's table in whom, after examination, tenderly and wisely conducted, no seeming evidence of grace can at all be discerned; or, as Dr. Macdonald was accustomed to state it, applicants for baptism should be admitted on an *uncontradicted*, and applicants for the other sacrament on an *accredited*, profession of faith.

There are here three distinct statements: the first, defining the distinctive characters of the two sacraments; the second, describing the profession required on the part of applicants for either; and, the third, laying down the rule of the Church's duty in dealing with these applicants. If the position assumed in the first of these statements is tenable, the defence of the others is secured. But let it once be determined that there is no such difference between the two sacraments, as has been indicated, and it will be impossible to hold the position that they ought not to be administered by the Church on the very same footing, or that she should require a different profession and a higher qualification from applicants in the case of the one than she insists on in the case of the other. But if the distinctive characters of the two sacraments be such, as the Ross-shire Fathers were accustomed to define them, the practical distinction observed in their mode of administering them can be triumphantly defended. And yet it would seem an easy thing to defend the first point of attack, though one cannot but suspect that something is overlooked in examining the position, and that this accounts for the confidence with which it is scanned when he looks to the hosts across the Spey who are marshalled against him.

It is not denied that baptism is a seal of the covenant of grace, and that an interest in all the blessings of that covenant is secured to the believer at the moment of his union to Christ. Nor is it denied that the blessings which are said to be specially sealed to the believer by baptism are in earnest of all spiritual blessings in heavenly places. At the same time, it is held that the blessings of regeneration and justification alone are directly presented in baptism to the understanding and faith of the believer, and that it was the divine intention, as declared in the divine Word, specially to seal by this sacrament an interest in these blessings alone (Rom. vi: 1-4; Col. ii: 12; Acts ii: 38). It is difficult to see how, without this limitation of its special effect as a seal, baptism, once for all, is sufficient. The fact that it is administered only once to the same individual is instructive and necessary according to the view of it now given. It teaches the consoling truths that once in Christ the believer is for ever in Him; that once regenerated he is for ever spiritually alive, and that once justified he is for ever free from condemnation.

If these blessings alone are specially sealed by baptism, how and when is an interest in them obtained? At the moment of the soul's union to Christ, and, in the case of an adult, when he first exercises faith in Jesus. If so, this act of faith is what an applicant for baptism must profess. He may at once, yea, he

ought immediately to profess it; and on that profession he may be "baptised straightway." Such was the profession of which the Pentecost converts, the Eunuch, the Philippian jailer, and Lydia were baptised. It was the invariable rule to sustain such a profession in the days of the Apostles. They did so not as men inspired to judge infallibly the state of those who applied to them. Instead of this, they refrained from forming any positive judgment regarding the state of professing believers. They acted as wise men, but as mere men and charitable, not as inspired men and infallible; and, casting the responsibility on those who made it, they administered baptism on an uncontradicted profession of faith. Proof that they were not infallible is furnished by every reported case of apostasy, and proof that they did not venture to pass judgment on the state of applicants is clearly furnished in Paul's method of dealing with the Philippian jailer. What but a merely uncontradicted profession of faith could there have been in the case of one whose conversion could only have occurred a few minutes before? He "was baptised, he and all his, straightway." There was no opportunity of knowing him by his fruits. He professed to have just believed in Christ, and there being nothing known to forbid the hope that his profession was genuine, he was at once baptised. Now, if it was the same profession that was required by the Apostles for the baptism of oneself, as for the baptism of his child, and if it was and could only be such, as the "charity" that "thinketh no evil" alone could accept, was not this exactly the practice of the Ross-shire Fathers in administering that ordinance?

It may be objected, however, that the profession of a parent educated under the Gospel ought to embrace more than that of a recent convert. We ought, indeed, to expect more knowledge in the former case; but, if that is competent, and if his conduct furnishes no positive evidence against him, why should not his profession of faith be accepted? And there is in his case a reason why it should, not found in the case of one claiming baptism for himself. He is already a member of the Church, and as "the infants of such as are members of the visible Church are to be baptised," on no ground can the baptism of his child be refused that will not justify the Church in excommunicating or suspending him. The fact of his not being a communicant is held in the South to be a sufficient reason for refusing the baptism of his child. If it be so, it must be a good reason for at least suspending him from the enjoyment of all the privileges of his status, as a member of the Church. To refuse baptism is but to take that suspension for granted, when there is no such act

of the Church to which to refer. And the strange thing is, that the very man who would be punished, to the extent of disallowing his membership altogether, would be, at the very same time, rewarded with both the Sacraments, if he would take them! The one, which demands the larger exercise of charity in its administration, is refused, but both would be given him at once! He, who is on the eve of being excluded from the pale of the Church, will be welcomed into the full communion of the Church, if he will only offer himself to her embrace!

It may be said that, by not accepting of both the Sacraments, he proves himself unfit for either of them. This might be allowed, if it might be taken for granted that in absenting himself from the Lord's table he indicated a wilful contempt of Christ's authority and a wanton neglect of His ordinance. But surely this is not always the case; and we are firmly persuaded that such a feeling as often finds expression in the conduct of those who go to the table of the Lord as in that of many in the North who refrain from communicating; the difference between some of either class being simply this—the former, being dead to all the solemn considerations suggested by the ordinance of the Supper, are bold to go forward, while the latter, having some sensitiveness of conscience, shrink from approaching the table of the Lord fearing that it is neither legitimate nor safe for them to do so.

It is altogether unfair to charge on the Ross-shire Fathers any remissness in requiring from parents the due discharge of their duties towards their children. They were careful to seek security to the Church for “the godly upbringing of the young”; but this they obtained more effectually than by making each parent a communicant, by taking pains in private and public catechising to teach them the doctrines of grace, and the requirements of the law of the Lord. The plain truth is that they were invariably more strict in administering baptism than their brethren in the South, who differed from them mainly in this—that while opening the door of admission more widely than they, these laid the other Sacrament in front of it, not as a barrier against the rush of the multitude, but as a broad stepping-stone to facilitate their access.

The views of the Sacrament of the Supper, and the practice in administering it, which are peculiar to the North, remain to be considered. The difference between it and the other Sacrament, insisted on by the ministers in the Highlands, has been already pointed out. This distinction was clearly seen and firmly acted on by the Ross-shire Fathers. They were fully persuaded in their own minds as to this matter. They had no difficulty in regarding the Sacrament of the Supper, as intended by the Lord,

specially to seal something other and higher than that which is specially sealed by baptism. They called it, with Mastricht, "*sacramentum nutritionis*," as being intended to be an occasional feast to believers during all their wilderness journey. They beheld in the symbols of Christ's body and blood the clearest and the closest manifestation of the glory of the Lord, and in the exercise of those who partake of them the nearest approach to the Lord that can be on the earth. They regarded the guests at the table as having the most conspicuous connection with the cause and glory of Christ. They saw the Church pointing the eye of the world to a Communion table, to inform them whom she accredited as the true people of God. On all these accounts they felt that they were specially called to guard the passage to the table of the Lord, and to subject to the closest scrutiny all who would approach it. And surely they were right. And if they were, how can an indiscriminate, a wholesale, admission to this Sacrament be justified, when the mass is just as heterogeneous as that with which they had to deal!

As to the propriety of carefulness in granting admission to the table of the Lord, as a matter of opinion, there will be no dispute, whatever may be the difference in practice. Those who condemn the mode of administering the Sacraments followed in the North must insist that there is no more urgent call to fence the table of the Lord than there is to guard the Sacrament of baptism. If they can establish this from the nature of the two Sacraments, and from the Word of God, they may prove the Ross-shire practice to be wrong; but just as surely as they do so, they will fail in showing that their own is right. If there is an equally urgent call to be careful in the case of both, they may prove it is not right to make a distinction in administering them; but they cannot surely make out, what would be the only justification of their own practice, that it is right not to be careful as to either. But the former they will fail, and the latter they won't try, to prove.

It is surely unnecessary to furnish any proof of the statement that both the Sacraments do not specially seal the same blessings, though both are, in general, equally seals of the covenant of grace. If it were not so, it would be impossible to show why there should be two; a second would be quite superfluous if it specially sealed no more than the first; but surely there is no redundancy where only two are acknowledged and administered. If baptism seals the believer's introduction into the covenant, and his interest in the blessings bestowed on him immediately on his union to Christ, and if these blessings are an earnest of all "spiritual blessings in heavenly places," the other Sacrament

directly seals his right to all of which he had a sealed earnest given to him before. The Lord's Supper as a seal was intended to assure believers of their interest in all that was required to prepare them for glory, and as a feast was appointed to be a means of applying that provision to their souls.

It is difficult to conceive how any serious objection could be offered to this representation of its use. "This cup," saith Christ, "is the new testament in my blood," the fulness of the blessings of that covenant as procured by His blood, being by these words, in explanation of the symbol, specially represented and sealed to believers. In only one of the four descriptions given in Scripture of the mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper is there any mention of the blessing of pardon, and there it is not spoken of as if specially sealed at the time. It is only referred to in such a way as to intimate that it was unnecessary specially to seal it, this having formerly been done. "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for *many* for the remission of sins." In these words Christ mentions it in a doctrinal statement, to explain how the provision of the covenant was secured to His people by His blood, and what was the divinely appointed order in which that provision was applied. *Their* justification is taken for granted, and the abstract blessing is pointed to, only in its place in the arrangements of the covenant, as an earnest of all other spiritual blessings, and the benefits, of which it is an earnest, are alone directly represented and specially sealed.

If it seals a more advanced privilege, it teaches a higher lesson than baptism. It presents to us the mystery of Christ's person, and the mystery of Christ's death, in relation to the everlasting covenant of grace. Deeply did the disciples feel that these lessons were not easily learned. In presence of no other does a living soul feel more dependent on divine teaching than when before the lesson of the words, "This is my body which is broken for you." And who, being one of the "disciples indeed," will deny that he is only slowly creeping on his way to the high attainment of tracing his salvation, entirely and closely, to the death of Christ as its only channel, and to the covenant love of Jehovah, as its primary source? In baptism, on the other hand, Christ is represented in the general aspect of his Office as a Saviour from sin, and its lessons are those which are given to the class of beginners—our need of cleansing from sin; Christ as the only "fountain opened for sin and uncleanness;" the necessity of an interest in Him; the infallible certainty of salvation to all who are found in Him; and the obligation resting on all who believe in His name to "walk in newness of life."

And surely those who are admitted to the table of the Lord are placed in closer and more manifest connection with the cause and the glory of the Lord than they ever were before. Even if the Lord's Supper were nothing more than a second seal it would have this effect. All the more, if it specially seals an advance of privilege. He who comes to the table of the Lord must come nearer than before to the Lord of the table. At the great love-feast there spread, the guests are seated, as at the family table, in the House of the King, and those who admit them point the eye of the world to them as the accredited children of Zion. Of the merely baptised they may say, "These have come into the house of the Lord, but we merely admitted them, in the charitable hope that they might prove what they professed to be." But of these others they must say, "We have tried them, and we accredit them as approved followers of Christ."

Is there not then good ground for maintaining that the way to the table of the Lord ought to be more strictly guarded than the outer door of His house? Must not the applicant for admission to it profess that he has been regenerated and justified already? Can he sit down at a feast without professing that he lives, has appetite for the food placed before him, and has an invitation from Him by whom it was provided? Is he not expressly commanded to examine himself as to these things, "and so," and only so, "to eat of that bread and drink of that cup"? And can the Church deal faithfully with him without instituting a closer scrutiny than before into his knowledge, experience and conduct, when he is now extending his profession and taking a nearer position to the Lord among His followers on earth? Can the Church be faithful to her Head without doing so? And was not this all that was done by the Ross-shire Fathers, though a supercilious sneer is very often the only notice taken of their conduct?

Whatever opinion may be formed of the grounds on which the practice of the Ross-shire Fathers was defended, it certainly has the advantage of being *the only mode according to which the rulers of the Church can suitably express their varied feelings towards applicants for sealing ordinances*. There will always be about the Church those who may be excluded and in the Church those who may be extruded without any breach of charity. Against these let the door of admission be shut. Within the Church also there have always been those who make a profession of religion which cannot be summarily rejected, but which can win no unsuspecting confidence. Let such be allowed to remain within her pale, but into full communion let them not be admitted. Let

only such as have accredited their profession be received within the inner circle, by the sealing ordinance of the Supper. This is the only course of procedure on the part of the Church rulers that can be suitable in relation to the three classes with whom they have invariably to deal; and this was the practice of the Ross-shire Fathers. Acting on their views of the distinctive characters of the two sacraments, they enjoyed a liberty in dispensing ordinances, which they cannot have who, acting according to different views, are under the painful constraint of being compelled either to exclude an applicant from membership altogether, or to admit him within the innermost circle around the table of the Lord.

Am I not justified in cherishing the hope of their being Christians regarding some professors whom I cannot confidently embrace as brethren in the Lord? Ought I to admit them into intimate fellowship till I become more satisfied than I am as to their acquaintance with the power of godliness? Surely I am not required summarily to reject all whom I cannot confidently receive as Christians, nor to be on terms of intimate fellowship with all whom, in the judgment of charity, I regard as such. And why should not the same liberty be allowed to the Church? Is she bound to exclude from her pale all whom into full communion she cannot admit? Yet much would be her bondage if the two sacraments were to be administered on the same footing. But such fetters were never placed by Christ's hand on the conscience of the Church. They who are in the state of bondage have themselves forged their chains.

The practice peculiar to the North has another marked advantage: *it is admirably adapted to meet the various feelings of applicants for sealing ordinances.* When a Christian applies for admission to the table of the Lord, who is enabled to express a hope of an interest in Christ, and in whom some seeming marks of grace are discerned, at once, but not because any judgment of his state has been formed, his request is complied with. But among true Christians there have always been differences as to the measure of their hope. All of them incline to seek communion with the Church, but some of them can only come with a trembling heart to ask for the privilege. One of these comes to a pious Highland minister in older times to speak to him about communicating. Does the minister insist on his expressing an assurance of his conversion before he grants him admission to the table of the Lord? Does he require him to satisfy him by a record of his experience that the change through which he passed was really spiritual and saving? Not at all. How then does he act? He

examines him closely, but wisely and tenderly; and in the measure in which he finds such views and feelings as seem to indicate a work of grace in his soul, he labours to remove his difficulties, and offers him all needed counsel and encouragement when giving him a token of admission to the table of the Lord.

* * *

Mastricht. Mosheim in his "Ecclesiastical History" speaks of Mastricht along with Voët, Andrew Rivet and Marisius as Dutch Theologians, who in the 17th century were in the highest reputation for erudition and soundness in the faith (P.833, sec. 30).

Principal Cunningham describes Mastricht's system of theology as eminently distinguished for its ability, clearness and accuracy (Hist. Theol. Vol. II, p.306).

GEORGE GILLESPIE

A Sketch of his Life and Times

By Rev. John Colquhoun, Glendale

(Continued from page 332)

Gillespie's Ordination. At the time of Gillespie's ordination the power of the bishops began to be on the wane, and the ministers became more determined that the Church of Scotland would be Presbyterian and not Prelatical. Johnston of Wariston records in his Diary for 11th April, 1638; "I heard Mr Andrew Blackhall (Minister of Aberlady) show the duties between a pastor and a people, and very sensibly touch all the corruptions of this time or of any in the Presbytery: then I saw him and the whole brethren of the Presbytery give imposition of hands, and thereby admission to the ministry to Mr Robert Ker to be conjoint minister with his father in the church of Pans (Prestonpans); blessed be the name of God for restoring this great liberty to the Church again, whereof they have been robbed by the Prelates these twenty-eight years past; and blessed be the name of God who used the un-ablest, unworthiest of all his servants to be an instrument in this restoration." Again, on 12th April, he writes; "Afternoon I got a letter from Mr George Gillespie to clear the Presbytery of Kirkcaldy of their legal doubts anent the admission of ministers against Tuesday next." In connection with this matter he has an entry under the 17th April as follows:—"On Tuesday, 17th April, I wrote over two treatises—the one dogmatic to be read to the Presbytery—the other dialectic anent the admission of ministers by Presbyteries; for the which from the bottom of my heart, I thank my God who designs to use me as

the sole principal instrument in His hand for the legal recovering of His Church's liberties."

These ordinations gave great offence to the King, and the action of the Presbytery of Kirkcaldy in ordaining George Gillespie at Wemyss would no doubt give great offence to the Archbishop of St. Andrews who was never consulted in the matter, but the ministers were resolute and they ordained him there on 26th April 1638, as Robert Baillie quaintly puts it, "maugre St. Andrews baird." It is a great tribute to the abilities of Gillespie and a testimony to the confidence reposed in him by his brethren that a few months after his ordination we find him preaching before the famous Glasgow Assembly of 1638. His text on the occasion, according to Baillie, was, "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord." Prov. xxi. 1.

Formation of the Tables. After the disturbance in St. Giles, which does not, in any way, seem to have been organised, we find resistance to Episcopacy taking a more definite and organised form. Two petitions were presented to the Privy Council; one from "the men, women, children, servants and indwellers, within the burgh of Edinburgh," and the other from "Noblemen, barons, ministers, burgesses and commons." The last of these petitions was a formal and constitutional document, the terms of which amounted to a demand for the trial of the bishops in a constituted court of law. They set apart representatives who, as commissioners, were appointed to watch over their affairs in Edinburgh. This body, however, was found to be too unwieldy, and a smaller number was chosen, which was divided into four sections. In one section there were to be as many nobles as cared to attend, a second section of four county gentlemen, a third of four ministers, and a fourth of four representatives of burghs. These soon got plenty of work to do. In reply to the Petitioners King Charles issued a Proclamation to the effect that he himself had ordained the Service Book, and that he would forgive the Petitioners who had framed the petitions "out of preposterous zeal and not out of any disloyalty;" that gatherings for that purpose should cease, and that all who had repaired to Stirling, where the Privy Council was at the time sitting, should leave within six hours under pain of treason. This Proclamation was to be kept secret to that no opportunity would be afforded of making a Protestation against it. However, the matter leaked out and, on the instructions of the Tables, Advocate Johnston of Wariston prepared a Protestation which was read immediately after the Proclamation was read at the Cross of Stirling. Similar action was taken in Edinburgh.

Of Protestations of this nature King Hewison gives the following explanation:—

“ A Protest was a formidable legal instrument in use in Scotland for protecting the subjects of the Crown from the sudden operation of unacceptable statutes. It meant entering an appearance in the highest law-court to ask trial of the legality of any new ordinance A Protestation is a most ordinary, humble, and legal act of preserving our right, permitted to the meanest of the subjects, in the highest courts, in assemblies, and Parliaments, wheresoever they are not fully heard, or being heard, are grieved by any iniquity in the sentence; which is granted by the law of nature and nations, and is the perpetual custom of this kingdom, to protest in favour of all parties having interest, and not heard, by an express act *salvo jure cujuslibet*, even against the Acts of Parliament. It was also a legal form of appeal to the King himself to see justice done according to the law.” *Covenanters, I. 259, 290-291.*

On the point that, in their Protestations, Wariston and those associated with him were acting according to law, and giving the clearest proof of being law-abiding, we have the view of Sheriff Robert Low Orr, K.C., M.A., LL.B., “ What was this Protestation about which the supplicants were so punctilious, and which the Privy Council strove so hard to evade? Had it any effect in law or otherwise? It may appear to us a technical and archaic formality, but it was regarded at the time as a highly important State paper. The legal advisers of the supplicants, some of the ablest lawyers in Scotland, were unanimous in their opinion that it should be prepared and presented, and they revised its language with care. . . . This procedure shows the desire to act in a law-abiding spirit and in accordance with the principles and precedents of Scottish Government. It was apparently borrowed from the legal practice of the day, when a litigant who thought he had not received justice “ took protestation for remeid of law,” appealing to the king and parliament for remedy. In effect the Protestors declared that the proceedings complained of were not in accordance with the law of the land and had therefore no legal effect, that they declined to regard them as closing the controversy, and that they appealed, passed the king mis-informed by bad advisers, to the king as dispenser of justice, and to the law of the land itself. That the Protestation was believed to produce a profound effect on the minds of the people is evident not merely from the supplicants’ persistence in making it but from the nervous anxiety on the other side to evade it. It fortified their position to make it appear that their claim was not something novel or arbitrary but only what the law entitled them to; it took off the weight and edge of the

royal proclamation when it was instantly and formally challenged before the world as violating laws which the sovereign had sworn to uphold." *Alexander Henderson : Churchman and Statesman*, p.110-112.

We see that their Protestation was an appeal from the king mis-informed to the king as dispenser of justice, but the last thing in the world which Charles would admit was that he was mis-informed; not only so but he and Laud were the chief cause of all the trouble, so that their Protestation was, in effect, a declination of the authority of the King in ecclesiastical matters. This could be nothing else but a declaration of war on the King's policy and, of course, they would have to bear the consequences.

The National Covenant. It now became very clear to the Tables that the whole kingdom would require to stand on the defensive and, as a preparatory step, they instructed Alexander Henderson and Johnston of Wariston to prepare a Covenant which was to be subscribed all over the country, binding themselves by the Great Name of the Lord to continue in the profession and obedience of the true religion, to defend the same, resist all contrary errors and corruptions, protesting that they have no intention or desire to dishonour God or do anything to diminish the King's greatness or authority "in the defence and preservation of the foresaid true religion, liberties and laws of the kingdom." On the 28th February, 1638, after prayer by Alexander Henderson in Greyfriars Church, the congregation with uplifted hands swore allegiance to the Covenant, and then began to subscribe it. Later on it was carried out to the churchyard where, by the aid of torches, it was signed by an immense crowd. Copies were sent all over the country, so that in a short time a great many people had an opportunity of signing it.

In connection with the signing of this National Covenant the exercises of Johnston of Wariston are interesting as he records them in a soliloquy with his own soul:—"After the afternoon sermon I got good in my thanksgiving in my family; then in my private retiring; then in my reading Psalms 84 and 85; then in my public prayer before supper, during the space of one long hour confessing my sins and the sins of the land at large; praising the Lord for all His favours; and particularly for four, for renewing of His Covenant with this nation, for the powerful and lively manner of renewing it in our congregation, for His providence to my family in calling us upon one day first to His Table wherein He gave Himself to us, and then to the oath where we surrendered ourselves to Him, which was as solemn a day of marriage between

the Lord and us *hinc inde*, in the greatest spiritual solemnities, as perhaps will not fall out in any age again; and for His particular indulgence in employing me, the unworthiest of all His servants, to have been an instrument, adviser, drawer up, and partly the author of it under the Lord, blessed be His Name for ever; and praying to the Lord for wisdom, ability, and grace to perform all the conditions of the Covenant on our part, and have our eyes open to see, in the outward works of God's providence and the inward of His indulgence, the Lord's performance of all His conditions thereof."

On the 27th March the Tables demanded, among other things, a free General Assembly, but it was only when Charles saw that he could not get anything by force that he consented to the calling of an Assembly which he had no intention of making a free Assembly. The story of the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 is well-known and it is not necessary to repeat it here. At this Assembly, which was presided over by Alexander Henderson, and from which the Royal Commissioner had withdrawn when he could not get his own way, the bishops were deposed, Episcopacy overthrown, and Presbyterianism re-established in the Church.

Scotland on the Defensive. King Charles raised an army which was to meet him on 1st April, 1639, at York. The reason he gave for this action was that the Scots had raised an army to invade England. The Covenanters denied this and hurried to make defensive preparations. They had as their military leader, Alexander Leslie, who had served Charles IX and Gustavus Adolphus, Kings of Sweden. The Scots army encamped at Duns, where some of the more prominent of the Scottish ministers acted as chaplains. Here negotiations were entered into for a peace, and Charles had the mortifying experience of discovering that those he had to treat with in the Scots Army were neither fools nor cowards, but men of integrity who were not afraid to stand firm even in the presence of kings, and so he had to yield and consent to the Treaty of Berwick on 18th June, 1639. The King, however, with the unreliableness so characteristic of the Stewarts, had no intention of keeping this Treaty, but looked upon it as a breathing space to afford him an opportunity of crushing the Scots into submission to his desires.

The General Assembly, to which the King agreed at the Treaty of Berwick, met on 12th August, when Traquair was Royal Commissioner. Alexander Henderson, as retiring Moderator, preached an appropriate sermon in which he clearly set forth Christ as the Head of the Church, and showed that this was in no way incon-

sistent with monarchical government in the State. Traquair cunningly tried to retain Henderson's services as Moderator, but, the latter perceived that this was but an attempt to introduce constant Moderators, and so would not agree and David Dickson minister of Irvine, was appointed. Traquair, in order to deceive the Covenanters, agreed to everything that was done at this Assembly, and what was done at previous free Assemblies, and also agreed to the nullifying of what was done at illegal Assemblies. He had, however, gone too far for the liking of the King and only regained the Royal favour by treachery and lies. The result was that the King planned another war of extermination. The first step towards this was that the Commissioners sent by the Scottish Parliament to London to testify their loyalty to the King, and to convey a thanksgiving from the General Assembly, were arrested and committed to the Tower on the charge of treason. The result was that the Scots had to prepare again for war and on 17th April, 1640, General Leslie's commission was renewed. Again the Scottish Army mustered at Duns, on 31st July, 1640, where, among the chaplains are to be found such famous names as Alexander Henderson, Robert Blair, John Livingstone, Robert Baillie, Andrew Cant and George Gillespie. The King's forces were defeated at Newburn Ford on 28th August, 1640, and on account of the dissatisfaction of the nation, together with a consequent lack of support to the King, Charles was forced to capitulate and the Treaty of London was signed on 10th August, 1641. The Scottish chaplains accompanied to London the Commissioners from Scotland who were parties to this Treaty, and the Church of St. Antholin, or St. Anthony, was placed at their disposal. Here Henderson, Baillie, Blair and Gillespie preached regularly, drawing immense crowds, who were anxious to see and hear men who played such an important part in the endeavour to bring about civil and religious freedom.

Soon after this a Call to George Gillespie, from the town of Aberdeen, came before the General Assembly, but he could not be prevailed upon to accept it, preferring Wemyss to Aberdeen. The following year, 1642, an application was before the General Assembly from Edinburgh to have him translated to one of the charges there. He was accordingly translated to Greyfriars Church and continued to be its minister until he left this world. In the Assembly of 1641 we find the members occupied with the consideration of a letter from some clergymen from England, who desired a closer alliance with the Presbyterians, and in answering it, the members indicated their desire to have "in both kirks one Confession, one Directory for Public Worship, one Catechism, and

one form of Kirk Government." This may be looked upon as the first public notice which we have of the aim which forms such a prominent part of the deliberations of the Assembly of Divines which afterwards met at Westminster.

The Government of the Church of Scotland. In 1641, while in London, Gillespie published his *Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland* to which he added a Postscript in answer to a Treatise lately published against Presbyterian Church Government. This was a reply to Bishop Hall's *Assertion of Episcopacy by Divine Right*. He divides it into two parts. The first part deals with the office of the Ruling Elder, showing the function of ruling elders and proving that in the Jewish Church they sat in ecclesiastical courts among the priests, and then gives four passages from the New Testament showing that they were recognised in the early Christian Church. He then argues for the office from antiquity, from the consent of Protestant writers, and from the confessions of opponents. In the second part he treats of Church Government; of the eldership of particular congregations, Presbyteries, Provincial and National Synods. He shows that the Church is a kind of republic, that Christ has committed spiritual power and authority to its courts, that the Jews had two ecclesiastical courts, the synagogue and the sanhedrim, the latter having jurisdiction over the former; further, he argues from Acts xv., where we have a synod of Apostles and elders, from geometrical proportions, and from necessity. In his Epistle to the Reader he gives his motive for publishing his Treatise:—"As, in publishing this assertion, I intend to satisfy the scrupulous, and to put in silence the malicious; so also to confirm the consciences of such as are friends and favourers to the right way of church government. 'Whatsoever is not of faith is sin' (Rom. xiv. 23), saith the Apostle, yea, though it be in a matter otherwise indifferent, how much more is it necessary that we halt not in our judgment concerning the government of the Church, but walk straight in the plerophory and full assurance of the same, from the warrants of the word of God—for as it is not my meaning to commend this form, because it is Scotland's, so I hope assuredly that my countrymen will not despise God's ordinance, because it is Scotland's practice, but rather follow them in so far as they follow Christ and the Scripture. This, therefore, I pray, that thy love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment that thou mayest approve the things that are excellent (Phil. i: 9). 'Consider what I say: and the Lord give thee understanding in all things.' (II Tim. ii: 7) Amen."

(To be continued)

ASAPH THE DOUBTER

Free Presbyterian Manse,
Stornoway,

12th December, 1940.

My dear Friend,

Asaph had a grand cure for his despondency and doubts. The way he was led to take was to ask Asaph, the Doubter, six questions and all to be answered according to the Chart, drawn by the Divine Designer, of the course taken by the heirs of Glory between the First Adam's fall and the Last Adam's completion of His Mystical Body.

Quest. (1): Will the Lord cast off for ever? Quest. (2): Will He be favourable no more? (3): Is His mercy clean gone for ever? (4): Doth His promise fail for evermore? (5): Hath God forgotten to be gracious? (6): Hath He in anger shut up His tender mercies? The Asaph who had the substance of the things hoped for and the evidence (title deeds) of the things not seen gave Asaph, the Doubter, the whole length of "Selah" so that he would have ample time to answer all the questions and write a good examination paper. The result of the examination was that Asaph, the Doubter, after stating at the end of each question a "no" and an "utter impossibility" and that it would be bordering on blasphemy to entertain such dishonourable views of the Lord's dealings, made a clean confession that the dismal, unbelieving thoughts which he had allowed to pass through his mind were his sin, unthankfulness, ingratitude, in a word, his infirmity. When he went on in his examination paper to say that the Lord was a God that did wonders, that His mighty power had been shown among the heathen; especially when he confessed that God's way was in the sea and that we could not fathom Jehovah's footsteps, but for all that He guided and preserved His people in the midst of all their trials and perplexities, why Asaph, the more than conqueror through Him that loved him, had to write 100% on the examination paper and that with the full approval of the Divine Education Authority and of the Divine Director Himself.

I hope you are well in soul and body, also your mother and all the friends. There is nothing for our present condition as a generation but that He will make the waves of the sea, a way for His ransomed to pass over.

With our kindest regards to all,

Yours very sincerely,

Malcolm Gillies.

NOTES OF A SERMON

Notes of a sermon preached on Monday, at Inverness Communion, June, 1917, by the late Rev. D. Macfarlane. Taken down by a hearer.

“Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion: for the time to favour her, yea, the set-time is come.” Psalms cii, 13.

It is not mentioned who composed this psalm. And from what is said about Zion it was in dust, and it is supposed it was when Zion was burnt in the time of captivity. The Psalmist begins this psalm with a very mournful complaint. He was withered like grass, so that he forgot to eat his bread. Whatever personal trouble he might have had, his affliction was caused by the state of the Church at that time, but he took courage to himself that there was no change with God. This was the fountain of his comfort. We shall speak shortly from these words as follows: First the prediction spoken—“Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Zion”; second, the time when He would have mercy upon His Church; third, the effect of God arising to have mercy upon Zion.

The heathen shall fear the name of the Lord. That will be the effect. We ought to be concerned about ourselves personally if we are His people. We will then be concerned about His Church. There is a period that the Church will be built up. This is a prediction and the Psalmist took courage that God would arise and have mercy upon Zion, which was very low at that time, and His people were very few, as a little flock when Christ was in the flesh. When God would arise to begin His work, at times one would think God was sitting at ease, and as if the enemy would have the mastery. When He was to arise, it was to favour Zion, it was to flow out of His own good will, spoken of as a favour, and God does this for His own name's sake; and when He promised to blot out iniquity for His own sake, it is not because any deserve it, God is in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, and for His sake, He pardons sin. The self-righteous will not be reconciled to this. And then you see He says: “I will arise”—that implies that Zion is in a miserable condition, and God is rich in mercy. Paul said to the Ephesians, when they were dead in trespasses and sins, He for His great love wherewith He loved them, even when they were dead in sins, quickened them together with Christ. “By grace ye are saved.” Mercy looked to misery. It comes by the way of the blood, when God has mercy upon sinners. God gives many promises. He will not leave the Church in that low condition, He will arise.

Secondly, we are to speak of the time, the due time, His own time. "Your time is always ready, but my time is not yet come." Well Christ was promised early to the human race. The fulness of time was to come to redeem them that were under the law, not only by His coming, but by His death. Paul said, "Christ died in due time for the ungodly." A debt to the bank may be there for months and you hear no word, but you hear when the time comes for the bill to be paid. When the due time came, God the Father reminded Him the hour was come in which He promised to lay down His life. There is also a set time when God converts His people. When that time came, O then Paul was called effectually. As it was with him, so with every individual that is to be brought into the fold of Christ. Let us go back to Old Testament times, bondage in Egypt!

Israel were groaning for years and were almost giving up hope of deliverance, but they were brought out of Egypt, and brought to the land of promise. Well, there is not only a set time for conversion but a set time for our death, and you or I cannot pass it, and we must remove out of this world to eternity: and it will be a great loss to those who die out of Christ. Again you find that there was a set time when the Jews were to be delivered out of captivity. See the Church was very low when they could not sing the songs of Zion. He sent them to Babylon to chastise them, and to punish them. When they were brought to repentance, He brought them back. In New Testament times, I now refer to the Reformation. How long were they in bondage? More than 1,000 years. As some historians say, from the 15th century, the candle of truth burned as He arose. He began to raise up instruments, Luther arose to have mercy on Germany. When did He do it? When His mercy came. We are not to lose heart as if things could not get better, for that is unbelief. There was a revival of the doctrine's of God's Word. He uses means and the means is His own Word. When that seed is sown we must not lose hope. God will bless His own Word. As in the case of Timothy, from his childhood he was taught by his mother and grandmother, and Paul calls him his son, Timothy. Well these were times in 1842 when great revival took place in Scotland, and the cause was very low then under a dead ministry, a minister in Cambuslang, although preaching the truth there were no conversions following; and they kept a prayer meeting, and there began a shaking among the "dry bones." And you see how God did this at the set time. God prepared them for the Disruption of 1843. God arose again in the year 1860. I remember myself, a good number were truly converted—that was when God's time came. The Lord

blessed the labours of those that kept the prayer meeting. Again, in the year 1893, God arose when His truth was cast aside by many and many were in bondage—but a door was opened and there was a revival. But there is a greater time coming, that is the Millennium. God will arise and have mercy upon His Church. The darkest time is before dawn. We have the darkest time in the visible Church, and it is so thick—you find it in the pulpits and you find it in the pews. God has not changed, His promise must be fulfilled: “Thou shalt arise and the time to favour her is come.” Satan will be bound for a thousand years, and although sin will be in the Lord’s people, yet it will not be so powerful. The power of God will be so great, the ungodly will be in the minority. This prediction will be fulfilled. He will do good to His people, and a sign of this time will be “Thy servants take pleasure in her stones.” Well they take pleasure when the Church is prosperous. Ah! That is a good sign when they take pleasure in it. God will answer the prayer of the destitute. God takes care of their prayers and answers them.

Thirdly: But then the effect, the Lord having mercy upon Zion. The very heathen will be dismayed. But, when He comes to arise all the heathen will be under the influence of the Gospel. As it is said of Job, “He feared God and eschewed evil.” This shall be the effect then—filial fear and reverential fear to obey God. Noah being warned of God, he feared and built an ark. All the kings of the earth will fear the Lord. According to this we believe all the kings and queens of the earth shall be godly. Well then, there is a better time coming. And kings shall be nursing fathers to the Church and they shall be giving the revenue of their kingdom to support the Church. They will be all of one mind. Well, let us take this with us then, when the cause is now. Let us love His House, His Word, His people.

May He bless to us His Word.

THE LATE NORMAN MACLEOD, ROSEMARKIE

A desire was recently expressed that a short account of the late Norman MacLeod should be sent for publication in our Church Magazine, and I cordially comply with the request.

The late worthy servant of the Lord was born in Quidinish, Harris, in March, 1888. In his early days, he led for a time a sea-faring life, but later on, entered the Government service in the Lighthouse department. He was latterly stationed at the

Chanoury Light and, on retiring, went eventually to reside in Rosemarkie.

There is reason to believe, from remarks which he made to his sister—who is the wife of our Missionary in South Harris—that it was while at the Lighthouse on the Flannan Islands he came under concern of soul and came to exercise saving faith in the Saviour. He remarked to her that, when he was on the Flannan Islands, he saw the majesty of the Creator in the waves of the sea—and, on another occasion, told her of the sweet communion which he had with his Saviour on the island. He used to frequent the ruins of a building there for private devotion.

He desired to come forward with a view to admission to full membership for a considerable period before he came. At length, on a Saturday morning, the portion in Ps. 18; v. 29 was evidently impressed so strongly upon him that he could not stay back;—“For by thee I have run through a troop; and by my God have I leaped over a wall.”

He had the above experience on the 6th day of August, 1949. He was received by the Kirk Session, and from then onwards, he was certainly heard with acceptance at prayer-meetings, and when called to speak at Fellowship meetings. We believe that the Lord's people were repeatedly refreshed in hearing him on such occasions. He was most diligent in coming so far to attend the services in Dingwall, and brought others with him in his car. It is scarcely needful to refer to his love for his Bible, and for the reliable books, except to remark that he had a special place for the two volumes of John Morrison's poems, and of the well-known poem of John's sister on “The Reapers of Boaz.”

Norman MacLeod's latter end was peace. The last words uttered by him in this world were:—

“Yea, though I walk through death's dark vale,
Yet will I fear none ill,
For Thou art with me, and Thy rod
And staff me comfort still.”

D. A. McF.

SEARMONAN

Leis an Urr. Tearlach C. Mac an Tòisich, D.D.

Searmon xxiii.

“Far nach eil greugach na Iudhach, timchioll-ghearradh, no neo-thimchioll-ghearradh, duine borb, Sitianach, daor no saor: ach is e Criosd na h-uile.” Col. iii. 11.

Tha'n t-Abstol ag earalachadh nan Criosduidhean ann an Colose a bhi gnàthachadh na h-inntinn agus an spioraid, agus a

bhi nochdadh a mach a ghluasad, a bhitheadh iomchuidh dhoibh ma dh'eirich iad maille ri Criosd. Anns a cho-theagasg a tha dol air thoiseach tha e toirt rabhadh dhoibh an aghaidh a bhi labhairt bhreug—an aghadh ceilg anns gach cruth, nithean nach b'urrair a bhi na bu mhi-chuimhte ri cur dhuibh a t-seann duine maille r'a ghnìomharan agus an duine nuadh a chur umpa. An sin tha e ag ràdh, “Far nach eil,”—na anns nach eil—“Greugach na Iudhach, timchioll-ghearradh, no neo-thimchioll-ghearradh, duine borb, Sitianach, saor no daor; ach is e Criosd na h-uile, agus anns na h-uile.” Is e so aon dhe na briathrabh is iongantaich, agus is làn de bhrìgh, a tha air an toirt a stigh 's a cheud àite gu bhi foillseachadh a mach firinn mhòr àraidh ann an solus soilleir, na gu bhi daingneachadh air mhodh chudthromaich earail àraidh, ach aig an dearbh àm, làn de bhrìgh, a tha ruigheachd thairis air a cheud cho-chur. Gu bhi gabhail na'm briathran leo fein, “Is e Criosd na h-uile, agus anns na h'uile,” faodaidh sinn a ràdh gu'm bheil firinn Dhé uile, agus diadhachd gu h-iomlan, fein-fhiosrachail agus ann an cleachdadh, air a gabhail a stigh annta. Ach is e'n nì tha mi rùnachadh, le còmhnaidh Dhé, a bhi toirt a mach trì firinnean sonraichte a dh'fhaodas e bhi air a mheas a tha iad a teagasg anns a cho-cheangal 's am bheil iad. An toiseach, Nach eil cùntas air a ghabhail de dh'eadar-dhealachadh bho'n leth a muigh ann an gnothuch tearnadh an duine—cha'n eil iad air an gabhail ann an cùntas le Criosd 'n a dheiligidhean ri daoine. 'S an dara àite, 'S e Criosd a mhàin a nì chùis. 'S an treas àite,—Tha aig a shluagh na h-uile nì agus r'a sheachnadh Ann-san—air son siorruidheachd. Tha na firinnean so ga'r treorachadh an toiseach gu bhi labhairt air na nithean a dh'fheumas sinn sgur a bhi taiceachadh orra ann an doigh air bith; 's an dara àite, a' nì dh'fheumar na h-uile nì a mheas 'n a chall a chum a chosnadh; agus 's an treas àite, an lànachd neo-chrìochnach a tha ann an Criosd, agus beannachd do-labhairt agus siorruidh a shluaigh.

I. Cha'n eil eadar-dhealachadh air bith bho'n leth a muigh gu feum air bith ann an gnothuch tearnadh an duine.

“Cha'n eil Greugach na Iudhach.” Cha'n eil eadar-dhealachadh ann an cinnich air a chùntas ann an dòigh air bith. Cha'n eil an t-Iudhach a chionn gu'n d'thainig e bho Abraham, nì's motha air a ghabhail ris ann an Criosd na'n Cinneach. Na'n gabhadh e fois 'n a theachd bho Abraham, ag ràdh, “Tha Abraham agam mar m'athair,” cha bhitheadh e ach nì b'fhaide bho rioghachd Dhé. Cha'n eil teagamh, an àm an t-Seann Tiomnaidh, nach robh eadar-dhealachadh a' measg nan cinneach, ann an cuid de shuidhichidhean, a cùntas mòran. Cha robh speis

aig Dia riamh do phearsachan, ach thoilich E coimhneas sònraichte a nochdadh do shliochd Abrahaim a charaid. Chuir E air leth Dhà Fein iad; agus 'n a measg chruinnich E gu sònraichte a mhuinntir shaorta. Ach le foillseachadh Chrìosd anns an fheoil agus le a bhàs, bha balla-meadhonach an eadar-dhealachaidh air a bhriseadh sìos; agus a nis, 'n a Eaglais, "Cha'n eil Greugach na Iudhach, cha'n eil daor na saor," oir "tha iad uile 'n an aon ann an Iosa Crìosd."

"Cha'n eil timchioll-ghearradh no neo-thimchioll-ghearradh." Cha'n eil a *bhi coimhead* na *gu'n a bhi coimhead òrduighean* a cùntas nì air bith anns a chùis so. Dh'fheumadh timchioll-ghearradh, nì a b'e comharadh a chùmhanta, agus an deigh sin comharadh o'n leth a muigh, air a bhi ceangailte ri eaglais Dhé, am feadh agus a bha e air àithne, a bhi air a choimhead leo-san air an robh eagal Dhé; ach cha toireadh e duine aon cheum a dh'ionnsuidh gràs tearnaidh, agus, ma bha neach a gabhail fois ann, bha e ga dhùnadh a mach bho shlàinte. Bha e ghnàth fìor "nach Iudhach esan a tha mar sin o'n leth a muigh, agus cha'n e sin an timchioll-ghearradh a tha gu foillaiseach 's an fheoil; ach is Iudhach esan, a tha mar sin 's an taobh a stigh: agus is e sin an timchioll-ghearradh a tha 's a chridhe, agus 's an spiorad, cha'n ann 's an litir, aig am bheil a chliù cha'n ann bho dhaoine, ach bho Dhia." Agus ro-phriseil agus mar a tha òrduighean Dhé uile, tha e fathasd fìor nach eil Baisteadh agus Suipeir an Tighearna a cùntas nì air bith anns a ghnothuch so. Faodaidh an comharadh a bhi aig neach agus gun am fìor nì bhi aig; faodaidh an comharadh a bhi dhìth agus am fìor nì bhi ann.

"*Duine borb, Sìtianach.*" Cha'n eil eadar-dhealachadh eadar a mhuinntir aineolach agus neo-fhoghlumaichte agus a mhuinntir fhoghlumaichte a cùntas nì air bith. Tha eadar-dhealachadh mòr eadar an duine fineachail na neo-fhoghlumaichte agus an duine aig am bheil inntinn air a teagasg agus aig am bheil buadhan mòr; agus tha'n t-eadar-dhealachadh sin gu ceart air a ghabhail an cùntas anns an t-saoghal so co-cheangailte ri nithean an t-saoghail. Ach ann an gnothuch na slàinte tha iad a seasamh anns an aon suidheachadh; seadh, "cha'n iomadh glic a tha air an gairm." Feumaidh an duine glic tighinn a nuas bho àirde gu bhi mar leanabh, mar dhearbhadh amadan, na'n rachadh e stigh do rioghachd Dhé; agus cha dean uile aineolas, air puingean eile, gràs a bhacadh bho ruigheachd air an duine aineolach.

"Daor na saor." Cha'n eil eadar-dhealachadh bho'n leth a *muigh*—bochdainn na beartas, suidheachadh iosal na mòrachd, tràillealachd na saorsa—air an gabhail an sùim. Cha do chuir

soisgeul Chrìosd as do na h-eadar-dhealachaichean sin. Tha e fathasd a toirt àite do'n mhuinntir a th'ann an ùghdaras agus dhoibh-san a tha'n an iochdarain, an saibhir agus am bochd, an duine saor agus an Crìosduidh a tha 'n a thràill. Cha do chuir soisgeul Chrìosd as gu ball-dìreach do thràillealachd; ged a tha theasgasg dhe leithid de ghné, agus nach urrain an obair so, masladh tìr Chrìosdail, seasamh fodh chomhair na fìrinn, ma tha'n fhirinn a thaobh na slàinte choitchionn a faotainn cùrsa reidh agus gu'n i bhi air a cur an gainntir. Ach tha'n soisgeul a gairm air a mhuinntir àrd a bhi air an isleachadh, agus air a' neach a tha ceangailte misneach a ghabhail; 'n uair a tha e'g ràdh nach eil "daor na saor" ann; 's e 'n neach a tha saor an tràill is isle ma tha e deanamh seirbhis do'n a pheacadh; tha'n tràill air a dheanamh saor le Crìosd 'n a oighre air Dia.

Cha'n eil na h-eadar-dhealachaidhean sin bho'n leth a muigh a cùntas nì air bith ann an gnothuch slàinte an duine; cha'n eil suim air a ghabhail dhuibh le Crìosd. Cha'n eil E deanamh eadar-dhealachadh air bith eadar aon pheacach agus peacach eile. Tha'n aon soisgeul air a shearmonachadh dhoibh uile. Cha'n eil speis aig Crìosd do phearsa seach a cheile 'n uair a bhuilicheas e gràs air peacaich. Cha'n eil E air a ghluasad aon chuid le mòrachd an duine mhòir na le suidheachadh iosal an duine shuaraich a chùim a thoirt seachad; nì motha tha e deanamh eadar-dhealachadh anns an rathad anns am bheil E gabhail pheacach; agus cha dean E eadar-dhealachadh air an latha mhòr (ged a dh'fhaodas gu'm bi eadar-dhealachadh tomhas glòir anns an t-saoghal neamhaidh). A' nì a tha fìor a thaobh eadar-dhealachaidhean agus nithean a thatar a coimhead bho'n leth a muigh tha e fìor a thaobh gach nì a bhuineas dhuinn a thaobh àite agus sochair anns an Eaglais. Tha e fìor a thaobh gach nì dha'm bheil sinn buailteach, ar deanadasan, ar 'n oibre, ar 'n ùrnuighean. Feumaidh sinn a bhi air ar casg bho na nithean sin uile, an cùntas mar aolach a chùim agus gu'n coisneadh-mid Crìosd. O! ciod e cho riatanach 's tha'n teagasg so. Cia cho simplidh 's a tha'n fhirinn, agus gidheadh cia cho lionmhor 's a tha iad nach tug àite dhith riamh, gu'm bheil na daoine mòr anns an t-saoghal so, ann an sealladh Dhé, anns an dearbh shuidheachadh ris a chòmhlàn chumanta de pheacaich. O! ciod e na nithean gu'n seadh air an socraich daoine an dòchas gu'n gabhair riutha le Dia. Is leoir e do aon neach gu'm buin e do eaglais a tha e smuainteachadh gur i'n fhìor eaglais, do neach eile nach eil e mar dhaoineibh eile, gu'n d' ith agus gu'n d' ol e an lathair Chrìosd.

(R'a leantuinn)

LITERARY NOTICES**Books Commended**

It will be recalled that during our last Annual Synod Meeting in May, the present writer suggested that one of the ways by which we could commemorate the Quater-Centenary of the Reformation was by republishing Dr. McCrie's "Life of John Knox," adding that when it was published in 1811, its perusal was the means of awakening young men, resulting in a widespread revival of vital godliness. Its present-day republication might have similar blessed consequences. We were happily surprised when a gentleman offered immediately to pay for the cost of publication, which amounted to £521 8s 9d, by way of loan, till the sale of the copies paid for themselves. We are deeply grateful to the Christian gentleman, and the book, Dr McCrie's "Life of John Knox," can now be had from Mr John Grant, Palmerston Villa, 4 Millburn Road, Inverness, for 8/- per copy, postage 9d extra. The printing and publishing have been excellently done, as was to be expected, by the Wickliffe Press, London. There have been many biographies of John Knox, including caricaturing ones by the Jesuits, but this is the authoritative standard one, and is an unsurpassed, if not unrivalled, classic among biographies. As John Knox is the greatest Scotsman, and the greatest benefactor of his native land, who ever lived, it ought to be in every home, worthy of the name Protestant and Christian. His name is as enduring as Scottish history.

There is also to be had from Mr John Grant at 6/- per copy, postage 7d., the book of eight papers read at the Synod, and entitled: "Papers Commemorating the Quater-Centenary of the Reformation," which also ought to be in every home, as it embodies in brief, but comprehensive, compass, the state of the professing church previous to the Reformation, under idolatrous, superstitious, tyrannical and immoral Popery; the mortal struggle in overthrowing that evil system of corrupt, perverted "Christianity" in our native land, and the blessed fruits which followed, and which are still being reaped, not only in Scotland, but the wide world over. It ill becomes one to praise oneself, and so excluding the criticism of my own paper on John Knox, I can highly commend the other seven papers, which show painstaking, elaborate reading and research, condensed, as it were, into handy tablet form, avoiding the necessity, for the reader, of wading through ponderous volumes of history, and yet giving a clear comprehensive view of the subjects and periods dealt with. The present writer tried to avoid being involved, by giving the names of other ministers more

competent to write on the great Scottish Reformer, but my brethren were insistent, especially and emphatically the late worthy Rev. James S. Tallach, who indicated that he would have consented to write one of the papers himself were it not that he would not be here to read it. Some of us thought he meant that he was going as a deputy overseas, till he emphatically stated that he was now taking each day as he got it, but that certainly "I will not be here when these papers are read," thus proving that, however grievous the loss to us, he had the mind of the Lord, for before the time of the Synod came round, Rev. James A. Tallach had gone, in the language of Samuel Rutherford, as poetically rendered by Mrs Cousins "to join Hallelujah with yon triumphant band."—J. P. M.

CHURCH NOTES

Communions

January—Fifth Sabbath, Inverness. *February*—First Sabbath, Dingwall; third, Stornoway; fourth, North Uist, Kyle of Lochalsh. *March*—First Sabbath, Ullapool; second, Ness and Portree; third, Finsbay, Lochinver; fourth, Kinlochbervie, North Tolsta. *April*—First Sabbath, London, Breasclete, Portnalong and Fort William; third, Greenock; fourth, Glasgow; fifth, Wick. *May*—First Sabbath, Kames and Oban; second, Scourie; third, Edinburgh and Broadford. *June*—First Sabbath, Tarbert, Applecross; second, Shielraig; third, Lochcarron, Glendale, Helmsdale, Dornoch and Uig; fourth, Gairloch and Inverness. *July*—First Sabbath, Lairg, Raasay and Beaulay; second, Staffin, Tomatin and Tain; third, Halkirk, Rogart, Flashadder and Daviot; fourth, Achmore, Bracadale, North Uist and Plockton. *August*—First Sabbath, Dingwall and Vancouver (Canada); second, Portree and Stratherrick; third, Bonar, Finsbay and Laide; fourth, Vatten, Thurso and Stornoway. *September*—First Sabbath, Ullapool and Breasclete; second, Strathy; third, Tarbert and Stoer; fourth, Applecross. *October*—First Sabbath, Tolsta, Lochcarron, Fort-William; second, Gairloch and Ness; fourth, Greenock, Lochinver; fifth, Wick. *November*—First Sabbath, Oban and Raasay; second, Glasgow and Halkirk; third, Edinburgh, Dornoch and Uig. *December*—First Sabbath, London.

Meeting of Synod

The Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland meets in the Church, Inverness, on Tuesday, the 23rd of May, 1961 (D.V.). Rev. Alexander Murray, M.A., Applecross, the retiring Moderator, will conduct Public Worship at 6.30 p.m.—Robert R. Sinclair, Clerk of Synod.

Induction at Raasay

On 14th March the Western Presbytery met in Raasay Church for the purpose of inducting Rev. D. J. Macaskill, M.A., late of Lochcarron, to the pastoral charge of the Raasay Congregation.

The Moderator of Presbytery, Rev. D. A. Maclean, M.A., presided and preached from Acts XX, 28. There was a large congregation present. After Mr Macaskill was inducted he was addressed by the Clerk. Raasay Congregation has, in the past, been honoured by the Lord in that their minister was the only one in the Free Church Assembly of 1893 who tabled his Protest against the notorious Declaratory Act, and became a polished shaft in the hand of the Lord to set up the Free Church of Scotland on its original Constitution. Our sincere desire is that Mr Macaskill's labours will be greatly blessed and that many souls will be given him for his hire.—John Colquhoun, Presbytery Clerk.

No Coigach Communion

Rev. D. N. Macleod, Ullapool, wishes it to be known that there will be no communion held at Coigach this year.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DONATIONS

Mr W. D. Fraser, 34 Dunearn Street (Ground Flat), Glasgow, C.4, General Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks:—

Sustentation Fund.—K.M.L.D., £5; J. M. L., £5; H. J. C., £10; R. H. Conway, £5; W. Sutherland, Skelpick, Bettyhill, £2; D. Nicolson, Inverarish, Raasay, £2; Miss B. J. MacKay, Seaforth, Canada, £8; Mrs MacKenzie, Grosse Ile, Michigan, £50.

Home Mission Fund.—Miss Cameron, Drimnin, 10/-; R. H. Conway, £5; H. J. C., £5; Mrs MacKenzie, Grosse Ile, Michigan, £60.

Foreign Mission Fund.—Friend, Alness, £5, per Rev. J. P. M.; W. Sutherland, Skelpick, Bettyhill, £1; H. C. G., Inverness, £2; R. H. Conway, £5; F/Sgt. and Mrs Hardy, Alberta, £10; Deed of Covenant, Psalm 72 v. 17, £10; W. Bain, Larbert, £1; H. J. C., £10; Miss B. J. MacKay, Seaforth, Canada, £8; Mrs MacKenzie, Grosse Ile, Michigan, £60; Portree Sabbath School, for use of children in Mission schools in Africa, £70; R. H. Conway, £10, for Clothing Fund; Mrs MacDiarmid, Drumnadrochit, 10/-; Mark 13 v. 10, 17/6, both for New Testaments for Mpilo Native Hospital; Mrs Dunbar, Edinburgh, £3, for Tracts for young Africans.

The following donations for Mbuma Mission Hospital: "Ardheslaig," £2; Dingwall Congregation, £33 2s 3d, for Maternity Block; Glendale ex-teacher, £3, for Maternity Block; Raasay Friend, £1; North Tolsta Congregation, £27 10/-; Rev. and Mrs Macdonald, North Tolsta, £10; R. H. Conway, Stevenston, £10; North Tolsta Friends, £1, £1, £1, £1, £5 and £3; Ness Congregation, £20; Nurse MacKay, Ness, £5; Friend, Ness, £5; Friend, Gisborne, £5; Stornoway Congregation, £85; Helmsdale Friend, £1; A. M., Strathy, £1; Strathy Congregation, £10; Wick Congregation, £34; Halkirk Congregation, £30; Thurso Congregation, £5; Halkirk Friend, 10/-; Wick Sabbath School, £5, for medicine for sick African babies; Glasgow ladies, £28 6/-; "Anon." St. Jude's, £250, for bed to be named "Mrs J. M. Nicolson Bed"; Kames Congregation, £22 2s 6d; Old Edinburgh Friend, 10/-; Miss MacA., Edinburgh, 10/-; Staffin Congregation, £8 5/-; Friend, Ness, per Rev. W. M., £2.

Dominions and Colonial Mission Fund.—Mrs MacKenzie, Grosse Ile, Michigan, £8 2s 3d.

Home of Rest Fund.—M. M., Stornoway, £4; M. N., Portree, 10/-; Torridon Friend, £1; Miss M., Glenelg, £1; last three per Rev. W. G.

Mr J. Grant, Publications Treasurer, 4 Millburn Road, Inverness, acknowledges with many thanks:—

Publications Fund.—Edinburgh Friend, 8/-; "A Friend—The Lord is to be praised," Greenock, £3; Mrs C. MacKeller, Laggan, 15/2; J. Van Dorp, Gisborne, £10; Free Presbyterian, Shildaig, £1; G. MacKenzie, Hinchley Wood, £3, also 10/- for books sent to Hospital Libraries.

Received on behalf of the Trinitarian Bible Society.—J. M. L., 10/-; North Harris Congregation, £16 0s 9d.

Welfare of Youth Fund.—Miss G. Matheson, Plockton, 10/-; Miss I. B. MacKenzie, Ullapool, £5.

Free Distribution and Magazine Fund.—Mr D. J. McL., Stornoway, 5/-; Mr A. MacL., Sleat, 10/-; H. J. C., 15/-; Miss B. J. McK., Seaforth, Ontario, 3/-; Miss M. M. Strome, 5/-; Miss J. McK., Scorraig, 5/-; Mrs I. T., Harris, 5/-; Mr D. McK., Leverburgh, 14/3; Mr W. C., Struan, 3/-; Mr K. L., Arrina, 5/-; Mr M. McL., Seilebost, 5/-; Miss B. McR., Ardin-easkan, 5/1; Mr R. McL., Nigg, 5/-; Miss C. F., Ardrishaig, 3/9; Mr G. M. McK., Esher, £1 10/-.

The following list sent in for publication:—

Bayhead, North Uist, Manse Repairs Fund.—Mr A. Macdonald, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, Friend, Greenock postmark, £3; John MacIver, Uig, Lewis, £2 10/-, both per Rev. A. M.; Mrs Robertson, Columbia Street, Vancouver, £5; for Communion expenses, Anon, £2, and Friends, Claddach, Kyles, £2.

Bracadale Manse Extension Fund.—Mr D. Morrison thankfully acknowledges, Mr J. MacSwan, £2; Miss A. Nicolson, Ose House, per A. W., £2; Well-wisher, £2; Friend, Staffin, per Mr D. MacC., £3.

Fort-William Church Building Fund.—Friend, Diabeg, £5; M. N., Portree, per Rev. J. A. MacD., 10/-; Ewen Stewart, £5, for Car Fund.

Glendale Congregation.—The Treasurer acknowledges with sincere thanks, Well-wisher, £2, for Sustentation Fund; Collection taken at lecture given by Mr J. Van Woerden, for Foreign Mission, £61 13/-.

Glasgow, St. Jude's, Congregation.—Mr D. MacPhail, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, Mr A. Chaplin, £3, for Manse Fund.

Ingwenya Mission, Southern Rhodesia.—Rev. A. Macdonald acknowledges with sincere thanks, Lochcarron Sabbath School children, £7; Canada, £7; Mrs MacLachlan, Edinburgh, £5, for Mbuma Mission Hospital.

Kinlochbervie and Scourie Manse Purchase Fund.—Mr D. A. MacLeod, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, Miss Joan Fleming, London, £5; Mr James MacLeod, Achness, £20; "Interested," Glendale, £5; F. P., Plockton, £10; Portgower Friend, £1; D. M. K., Inverasdale, £1; Mr Wm. Ross, Ottawa, £10; Mrs Joan Macaskill, Inverkirkaig, £2; M. MacGregor, Hurtsville, Sydney, N.S.W., £4.

London Church Building Fund.—Rev. J. P. MacQueen acknowledges with sincere thanks, A Friend, £10. Mr J. C. Campbell, Treasurer, acknowledges with grateful thanks, Anon, £2; Anon, £1.

London Congregational Fund.—Rev. J. P. MacQueen thankfully acknowledges, Mr M. MacGregor, Hurtsville, Australia, £2; London, S.W. postmark, £1.

Oban Congregation.—Mr J. Martin, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, £5 from Loch Awe Friend, per Rev. M. M., for Congregational Funds.

Shildaig Congregation.—Mr J. Gordon, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, Mr and Mrs C. Urquhart, Luibmore, £3, for Sustentation Fund.

Stratherrick Congregation.—The Treasurer acknowledges with grateful thanks, £5 from Mr R. Macdonald, Grantown, for Sustentation Fund.

Waternish Congregation.—Mr A. Campbell, Treasurer, gratefully acknowledges, £5 from Mrs Macaskill, Waternish, for Foreign Mission Fund.