

THE
Free Presbyterian Magazine
and Monthly Record

Vol. 84

JULY 1979

No. 7

A Roman Catholic Professor in New College

The history of the New College, Edinburgh has been a chequered one. Originally set up as a Divinity College of the Disruption Free Church with a Senatus of outstanding professors, including such names as Cunningham, Smeaton, Bannerman and "Rabbi" Duncan, it was afterwards to fall into the hands of the Philistines. Even while it remained in the Disruption Free Church it was to prove one of the sources from which the leaven of unbelieving Higher Criticism was to spread throughout the Church.

In 1904/5, those who had formed the Free Church in 1900, won control of all the property belonging to the Disruption Free Church, including the New College in Edinburgh. The Royal Commission set up to re-allocate the spoil in defiance of the House of Lord's decision, decided to re-allocate the New College to the United Free Church which was the larger body. No more unreasonable decision could be imagined than the handing over of New College to those who had by their actions vitiated the testimony for which the Disruption Church had stood and in support of which the New College had been built. The final act in New College's varied history came in 1929 when the U.F. Church united with the Church of Scotland, and New College thereby became a divinity hall of the Established Church.

The result of all these transactions has been that New College has been staffed throughout the greater part of its history by men who had practically nothing in common with the professors of 1843, and who taught a system of Christianity radically different from that taught by the latter. Its history has been one of steady decline and departure from the faith once delivered to the saints. In fact so strong has been the antagonistic outlook to the fundamental doctrines of the faith that it has been reckoned that only with the utmost difficulty could a student of evan-

gelical outlook retain his beliefs and emerge unscathed from a course of study there.

Recently, as readers will know, a new development in the saga of New College has occurred. This is the appointment of a Roman Catholic priest, Father James Mackey, from a Jesuit University in California, U.S.A., to be Professor of Theology in New College. When news of the proposed appointment reached the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the opposition of delegates to the appointment was strongly voiced and a majority obtained against it. The appointment, however, was made in defiance of the will of the Assembly. This faces the Church of Scotland with a dilemma, as she is forced either to submit to the appointment and allow her divinity students to receive their teaching in theology from a Roman Catholic or to take steps to end the agreement existing between the Church and University by which a joint Church-University appointment is made for the Divinity Professorships.

The former Professor of Dogmatic Theology was Professor Torrence. He was labelled a "Reformed" theologian though he was in fact a Barthian and therefore taught a theology fundamentally different from that of the Reformers. The new Professor makes no pretence of being a Reformed theologian. According to Press reports he doubts some of the fundamental doctrines of the faith and therefore is in line with the modern theologians who teach the old heresies in a modern dress. The fact that he is a Roman Catholic is chiefly the matter which has aroused opposition to his appointment. It seems strange, indeed, that a professed Protestant Church should hand over to a Roman Catholic the responsible duty of teaching theology to her divinity students.

What has made the appointment more incongruous is that the Chair which he is to occupy has been re-named the Thomas Chalmers Chair of Reformed Theology, after the renowned Dr Chalmers, one of the founders of the Disruption Free Church. One could hardly envisage anything more hypocritical. We are sure, however, that no meaningless re-naming ceremony can give any degree of respectability to a Chair which has as its object the inculcation of heretical belief.

The Church of Scotland is now faced with a crucial test as to what action she will take in the situation that has developed. It is to be hoped that she will not allow things to remain as they presently stand. However, it will not be sufficient for the Church of Scotland to bring to an end the anomaly that has presently arisen. More than this will have to be done if the students are to benefit from their studies in her Colleges. She will have to purge her Colleges of those who have no true allegiance

to the Reformed faith and appoint in their place those who will be loyal to the Word of God. In this way, a new era might well dawn within the Church of Scotland through men being sent out from her Colleges to preach Christ and Him crucified to a people who sit in darkness and the shadow of death.

Sermon

by Rev. Hugh Martin, D.D.

"Make you a new heart and a new spirit" — Ez. xviii. 31.

*"A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you" —
Ez. xxxvi. 26.*

*"Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me"
— Ps. li. 10.*

It is proposed in the following discourse to enquire into the relations which subsist among these three verses, with the view of exhibiting the helplessness and responsibility of man in connection with the sovereignty and grace of God in the matter of the new heart (and indeed in salvation generally); if by the blessing of the Divine Spirit, we may lead you to despair of "man, with whom this is impossible," and with mingled anxiety and hopefulness to have recourse to "Him with whom all things are possible" (Matt. xix. 26) — "even God, who quickeneth the dead, and who calleth the things that are not as though they were" (Rom. iv. 17.).

That these texts are closely related to each other must be obvious even on the most cursory examination. The same expressions occur in each of them, and they all clearly point to one and the same subject of momentous interest. A further attention, however, will show, that while the subject is the same in *all* it is presented in a different light in *each*. In all, the one unvaried topic of regeneration is placed before us; but in passing from one to another, the point of view from which we look upon it is changed. In the first, it is presented to us embodied in a command, "Make you a new heart and a new spirit." In the second, it is embodied in an offer. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." In the third, it is embodied in a supplication, "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me." The first comes from God the Lawgiver; the second comes from God the Redeemer; the third comes from man the suppliant. The first is the loud and authoritative

voice of Majesty; the second is the still small voice of Mercy; the third is the humble, earnest voice of Entreaty. In the first, God presents His authority and demands His right; in the second, God presents His mercy, and makes offer of His gift; in the third, man presents to God His own offer again, and pleads for its fulfilment. The first is an utterance from the throne of justice; the second is an utterance from the throne of grace; the third is an utterance from its footstool. The first is a Precept; the second is a Promise; the third is a Prayer.

A true veneration for the word of the living God will at once deliver us from the sin and folly of looking on this as a random combination, the product of mere chance, and will dispose us to behold in it an exhibition of Divine wisdom, and the result of a Divine arrangement, fraught, we may well believe, with much practical instruction, and calculated to give comprehensive and satisfactory views of certain vital "truths once delivered to the saints." It is not with the materials of a curious speculation, savouring more of ingenuity than utility, that we are furnished in these verses, and in the threefold light which they cast upon the self-same subject. On the contrary, they are replete with principles which pervade the Word of God, and the life of God in the soul — principles which are the only real key to the harmony of Divine truth, written both in Scripture "and on the fleshy tablets of the heart." And it may deepen this impression on our minds, if we consider that the three verses chosen as the subject of illustration are not the only three in Holy Scripture so related to each other, but an instance only of a general rule — a specimen merely of a very frequent arrangement. It might be shown by a large enumeration of cases that every duty incumbent upon us, as the sinful creatures of the Most High, may be regarded in the same threefold aspect; *first*, as enjoined in a command to performance: *secondly*, as involved in a proffer of help; and *thirdly*, as acknowledged in a supplication for help. Let the following suffice.

Is it our duty to seek a knowledge of God — an acquaintance with His name, His character, His nature? Assuredly, for "this is life eternal" (John xvii 3), and thus only shall we "be at peace." Then the command is, "Acquaint thyself with God" (Job xxii. 21); the promise is "I will give them a heart to know Me" (Jer. xxiv. 7); and the appropriate prayer is that of the Psalmist, "Give me understanding according to Thy word (Ps. cxix. 160). If, following his example, "thou criest after knowledge and liftest up thy voice for understanding, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God" (Prov. ii. 3 and 5). Again, the duty of saving faith, so often neglected *in the character of a*

duty is presented to us in Scripture under the same threefold aspect. It is matter of precept, "This is His commandment, that we should believe upon the name of His Son Jesus Christ" (I John iii. 23); it is a matter of promise also, "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God" (Eph. ii. 8); the gift of God, promised "on the behalf of Christ," and bestowed in answer to the intercession of the "priest," now "upon His throne" — "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not" (Phil. i. 29 and Luke xxii. 32); and it is matter of daily supplication with all saints, "Lord, I believe, help mine unbelief" (Mark ix. 24). Another very interesting illustration of this principle, and one in which we do not need to bring the texts from different parts of the Word, is found in the sixth chapter of the Gospel of John, where Jesus is speaking of Himself as the true manna, the bread of life which cometh down from heaven. In the midst of this discourse He lays the following injunction on His disciples, "Labour for the meat which endureth to everlasting life" (ver. 27) — an injunction which He immediately follows up with the precious corresponding promise — "which the Son of Man shall give unto you"; and, rightly exercised under the teaching of their Lord, the apostles hasten to offer up to Him the appropriate prayer, "Lord, evermore give us this bread" (ver. 33). And not to multiply farther instances, let it be borne in mind, that not even the duty of prayer itself is exempt from this principle of triple relation. We have a commandment to "pray without ceasing" (I Thes. v. 17); but we have a promise too, "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself," even "the Spirit of grace and supplications," maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. viii. 26 and Zec. xii. 10); and the special prayer applicable in these circumstances we learn from the example of the apostles, "Lord, teach us to pray" (Luke xi. i).

In short, the Word of God is full of this important and beautiful arrangement. You will always find a promise adapted to the precept, and a prayer grounded on, and appropriate to them both.

Our intention, then, is to lead you to contemplate somewhat of the wisdom of God in this arrangement, to enquire into the practical spiritual purposes which it subserves, in the hands of the Divine Spirit, in awakening the soul and leading it to God, making good that paradox of grace which engrafts the most joyous hopefulness upon the convicted sinner's abject helplessness — the gracious Creator's strength being perfected in the guilty creature's weakness. In other words, let us examine the Divine economy of Precept, Promise, and Prayer, when

brought powerfully into contact with the anxious and enquiring soul.

I. And, *first*, as to the Precept. What place does it hold in this arrangement? What is its office? What good practical purposes does it serve?

"Make you a new heart and a new spirit." At first sight this command may appear to be worse than useless. Does it not enjoin a thorough impossibility? The practical and the possible seem to be utterly put to flight? "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" (Jer. xiii. 23). "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one" (Job xiv. 4). "In me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. vii. 18). But surely the power to make a new heart and a new spirit is a good thing — one of the best of things, the most wonderful, the most glorious, the most holy. It belongs not to me. I am "dead in trespasses and in sins" (Eph. ii. 1). I have as little power to make a new heart as I had to create my living soul at first. My present heart can be of no use to me in this matter, for it is "deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked. I cannot even know it" (Jer. xvii. 9). The law of God can be of no use to me, for it cannot accomplish this holy achievement, in that it is "weak through the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3), my fleshly heart being "enmity against it, not subject to it, neither indeed can it be" (Rom. viii. 7). The assistance of my neighbour can avail me nothing, for he cannot redeem himself, and as little he can help "by any means to redeem his brother. The redemption of my soul is precious, but it ceaseth for ever" (Ps. xlix. 7, 8). And, oh! surely this command is but a mockery of my helplessness? Is this not a cruel triumphing over my inability? What tendency can this have to remove the evil? Surely there is no step taken here to give a practical movement to my helpless soul.

Yes, there is. Your very meditations prove it. For —

1. This command has evidently *made you conscious of your helplessness*, and I call that a practical movement, a very practical movement — an invaluable result — and the indispensable prerequisite to all others. Would your thoughts ever have been directed towards your helplessness at all but for such commands as this? Would you ever have imagined it such that it cannot be mended or improved at all, but must be altogether removed and replaced, but for this injunction, "Make you a new heart?" Would you ever have imagined that you had wandered so far from God, but for the loud voice in the distance behind you crying, "Return, return?" Would you ever have known how thoroughly your soul is paralyzed in spiritual death but for the command, "Arise from the dead?" (Eph. v. 14). Would you ever have known how completely your

senses are sealed in spiritual sleep but for the authoritative voice of God? and even that, as you can testify, only like a dying echo, through your dream, crying, "Awake, awake, thou that sleepest" (Ibid). Say not that the precept is useless. If you have been aroused to earnest thought at all, the precept has already done you good service. If your meditations on this impracticable commandment — this "hard saying" — are at all honest and heartfelt, they are abundant testimony to the practical worth and working of the precept on your soul. It has led you to think of your helplessness. You have one invaluable lesson already. Follow on, for "to those that have shall be given." "Thank God and take courage." For —

2. This is not all that the precept can do for you. It will not only lead you to think of your weakness and helplessness, but it will tend to *show you how complete and thorough your impotency is, and to deepen the sense of this upon your soul*. For it will not do to have merely some vague and general idea of your inability; you must have a deep and pervading spiritual conviction of this truth. It must not be a matter of hearsay, but of actual experiment and experience. I can conceive a sick man confined to his couch, murmuring and fretting over the injunction of his physician, which prevents him from rising and walking through his chamber. He feels that he is indeed weak, but he knows not how much disease has debilitated his shattered frame; and he thinks it a hard restriction to be deprived of the liberty of trying his strength. If nothing else will convince him, let him get the proof of experience. Let permission be given him to walk across his chamber, and, as in the attempt he falls helpless into the arms of the friendly physician, whose wisdom he doubted, and whose advice he despised, he will at last acknowledge how thoroughly his strength has been prostrated. This is not to be supposed an accurate illustration in all points, for the natural man does not possess even those wretched remnants of strength which the case imagined involves — paralysis and even death itself are the favourite images of Scripture. Yet what I wish you to observe is, that in the sinner's spiritual experience, the command, "Make you a new heart," holds a place and serves a purpose exactly similar to the permission given to the sick man to try the measure of his bodily powers. You may have some dim notions of your helplessness. But bring it to the test of experiment. This precept gives you the opportunity: nay, lays you under the obligation to do so. Go and try to make yourself a new heart. Labour to regenerate your own soul. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." And then tell your success. Break off every old habit, if you can. Give up every outward act of sin. Mortify the deeds of the body. But have you changed your heart?

Have you given it new dispositions, new desires, new delights? In short, after labour the most painstaking, the most strenuous, the most unremitting, have you succeeded in yielding obedience to this commandment? Have you "made you a new heart and a new spirit?" No. But you have proved experimentally that it is wholly beyond your power. By the precept you have been taught experimentally what you but dimly surmised before, even your thorough, unmitigated, and hopeless helplessness. You had heard of that helplessness "by the hearing of the ear;" but now your whole soul feeleth it. You have now a far more deep and pervading and pressing conviction of this humbling truth; for the spiritual precept, and your efforts to obey it, have proved to you conclusively, because experimentally, that you are wholly "carnal, sold under sin" (Rom. vii. 14). Is not this another practical movement? "I had not known sin but by the law" (Rom. vii. 7). I had not felt my helplessness but by the precept.

3. But the precept can do you more service. It can originate another and perhaps a still more important practical movement. It may have already taught you how thoroughly helpless you are by nature. But this is not enough. Besides evoking the testimony of experience and consciousness, the precept *has power to touch the springs of conscience*; and without this it would indeed be utterly inefficient.

Let me commend the truth to your conscience in the sight of God who searcheth the heart. With what *moral* feelings do you regard this thorough helplessness? Is it not the case that you regard it, or are at least continually tempted to regard it, more in the light of a melancholy misfortune, which makes you very much to be pitied, than as a heinous crime which makes you very much to be condemned? Is it not the case that you look upon yourselves chiefly as sufferers in this matter, and scarcely, if at all, malefactors? Do you not think that your case calls more for sympathy than for blame — that you should rather be soothed than threatened? We appeal to you if this is not very often the case and current of your meditations. Because you cannot obey this commandment, therefore you imagine you are not responsible for disobeying it — because you are thoroughly helpless, therefore you imagine you are excusable. And thus the deceitful heart, ever tender to its own sores, and plausible in its own defence, contrives to shake itself clear of the irksome feeling of obligation to keep the impracticable commandment. In such circumstances, it is strange with what wretched sophistry conscience will submit to be baffled and silenced, and with what contradictory excuses its remonstrances are put away; so much so, that out of his own mouth

the sinner may be condemned. "If we were only in more favourable circumstances, we might and would obey this precept; but as matters stand, with the whole head sick and the whole heart faint, with "nothing in us but wounds and bruises and putrifying sores," surely we cannot be expected to come up to the high standard which this commandment sets before us." Now, in giving vent to such meditations as these (and it is to be feared they are not uncommon), do you really consider what you say? *If you were in more favourable circumstances, you would obey this precept?* What do you mean by *more favourable circumstances*? Your circumstances, spiritually considered, must be such that you have within you either the old heart or the new. No possible condition can be imagined between these two; and what, therefore, does this promise — so potent in silencing the conscience, and ending all debate, and putting all anxiety to flight — what does it amount to but simply this, that if you had the new heart already, you would then "make you a new heart and a new spirit" — you would do the work after it had been fully accomplished? Truly, if by such a proffer conscience were momentarily silenced, the deceitful heart ought in its turn to be thoroughly ashamed; and if these are its wretched delusions, it is surely high time it were for ever got rid of and replaced.

Do you still suggest that your helplessness sets you free from blame and responsibility? If you have any reverence for the Word of God, the precept ought at once to cure you of such perverse imaginings? For here you have the Lawgiver Himself giving forth His deliverance on your case, and His utterance is in the form of a *command*. It is not an utterance of pity, or of sympathy, or of lamentation, over your prostrate impotency. The Lord does not say, at least *here* he does not say, Oh that you were able to make you a new heart and a new spirit. On the other hand, this is an utterance of authority. It is an unhesitating and peremptory injunction from the God who rules in righteousness. You may have begun perversely to imagine that your helplessness had removed you from under His authority, and beyond the limits of His government. But it is not so. He is still the God with whom you have to do; with whom you have to do, not as sufferers merely, but as subjects still; and, in testimony thereof, listen to the voice of His *commandment*, "Make you a new heart and a new spirit." He comes to deal with you, not as *sufferers* whose *disease may* issue in death as its *result*, but as *rebels* whose *crime must* issue in death as its *doom*. He comes to tell you that you have not got beyond His dominions — that still He is your lawgiver and your judge. Could He be a judge at all, if rebellion carried you beyond His right and His power of

judging? Could he be a lawgiver at all, if entitled to legislate only for the righteous? Nay; "the law is not made for a righteous man," but for exactly such as you, "for the lawless" (I Tim. i. 9), for all those who, like you, are seeking freedom from the obligation of this very law, which commands you to "make a new heart and a new spirit." Surely, then, it is miserable affectation for a guilty sinner to sorrow over his helplessness as a misfortune, and then to think that all that can be expected of him is discharged, and he is responsible for nothing more. Let him learn rather to tremble over this helplessness as a crime, the very fountainhead and cause of all crimes.

Is this demand said to be unreasonable? This might be pleaded if there could be two opinions as to the source of our inability to obey, but not if it springs from our perverse and irrepressible and willing habit of doing evil — not if we are incapable of making a new heart, because our natural hearts have not only shown symptoms of enmity to God, but are very enmity itself. Is it possible for any one to affirm that the very depth of our iniquity, and the uniformity of our criminal habits, must set us free from the charge of all crime? Is it possible that the consciences of men can be so perverted and debauched? No: not so long as they are found "the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another" (Rom. ii. 14). Suppose it possible for some man, some monster in human form, to acquire the habit of murder, so that he could not refrain from assassinating every victim that crossed his path — that by habit, and a monstrous love for blood, he had become utterly incapable of obeying the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" — would any one tell me that this man's inability to obey excused him from the penalty of disobeying? Would not the doom of death be sealed upon this human fiend, amidst the loud execrations of outraged humanity? And is the case any different, or less urgent, when the just and righteous King of Glory sits in judgment? Shall His high and righteous bar be degraded by the admission of a plea which would be scouted as insane at a human tribunal? Shall the very strength of the grasp which the law has over the rebellious heart be pleaded as a reason why the Lawgiver should abdicate His throne, and denude Himself of all His claims? Nay, verily; not to obey is a crime — not to be able to obey is a second, rivetting and fastening the first as with iron. Rather it is a habit of crime plunging the soul in a sea of guilt.

Thus, then, the office of the precept is most vital and important. It first of all informs the sinner that all is not well, and points to the seat of the disease. Then it leads him experimentally to a knowledge of his miserable condition, his thorough helplessness and inability to save

himself. And lastly, it presses on his conscience a deep feeling of his responsibility and criminality. Thus he learns much of himself, and he learns much of the God with whom he has to do. He is taught to feel his own weakness and worthlessness. He is taught, also, God's authority and power. He is led to see his thorough subjection to the heavenly Majesty, and his not less thorough incapacity to do the duties of a subject. You may have been "alive without the precept once, but when the precept comes in spiritual power, sin revives and you die" (Rom. vii. 9). You die to all pride, and peace, and hope. You learn two solemn truths, which, when taken together, give you no rest till they mercifully shut you up to the only remedy. You know your helplessness; but you cannot sit down contented, for you know also your obligation and responsibility. You know your obligation; but you do not become legalists, for you know also your helplessness. You feel that you cannot obey; but this does not set all at rest, because you feel that you must obey. You feel that you must obey; but neither does this settle all, for you also feel that you cannot. It is "as if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him" (Amos v. 19) "Fear, and the pit, and the snare, are upon thee, O inhabitant of the earth. And it shall come to pass, that he that fleeth from the noise of the fear shall fall into the pit, and he that cometh out of the midst of the pit shall be taken in the snare" (Is. xxiv. 17, 18). In neither can you remain. You struggle from the pit of helplessness, because you feel you are bound over to obedience. You avoid the snare of legalism, because you know you cannot render the obedience required. Oh! what a source of unspeakable spiritual agony is there here! And so must it still remain, while the "inhabitant of the earth" looks not beyond the earth for deliverance. But look up, and lift up the head, O wearied sinner — look away from thyself; long enough has that poor self of thine agonized thee — truly thou wilt find no help there. Look "up into the hills whence cometh thine aid;" and then, baffled with thy weak and helpless attempts to "make thee a new heart and a new spirit," and prostrated, too, with the thought that it must be done, turn now from the terrible precept and listen, "Be still and know that it is God." Thus saith the Lord, "A new heart also will I give thee, and a new spirit will I put within thee."

(To be continued)

All grace grows as love to the Word of God grows. — Philip Henry.

A Letter from Holland

Dear N.,

My mother has died!! I have not had one evening left. The decease of my mother was very remarkable. Saturday, the 16th of December, my mother got a heart attack, and was brought to the hospital. When she was at the Heart Department, she was laid among all kinds of apparatus. When she was there for only ten minutes, my father and brother had a very anxious moment. The heart of my mother stopped. They saw it on a monitor. Three nurses ran to my mother. One started to knock on her breast as fast as she could with two hands, the other began to blow air into her mouth with an apparatus and the third gave her electric shocks with another apparatus. Happily these things helped.

Saturday evening and Sabbath and also Monday morning, she was improving well. The doctor said, "wonderfully good", but Monday afternoon she got fever, and in the evening it was going wrong — she got moisture in the lungs and a new heart attack and a heart rhythm of 170-180 per minute and some other things. At nine o'clock in the evening the hospital 'phoned my father and brother. My mother wanted to have my brother beside her to support her and my father. My brother 'phoned me immediately when he understood what was wrong. I 'phoned my youngest sister and her husband and went to the hospital.

My mother has always visited the church, read good books (very often M'Cheyne) and was very good to us. I can't conceive a better mother than she. But she never told us that she was regenerated, had found the Lord Jesus or had been reconciled with God. When my father and brother entered the room she cried out "I am going to die!" and when I entered, she cried, "M., I am going to die!!" N., when I still live thousands of years, I can never forget that voice and those eyes, so anxious. When my sister entered, she cried out the same. We tried to calm her, but nothing helped. "Now I must appear before the Judge of heaven and earth, and I cannot," she said. "Shall not you despair," we said, "I cannot anything else," she said. "For the thief on the cross, was also grace," my father said. "That favour is not for me," she answered. This lasted about three quarters of an hour. In this time she also cried out "Lost, lost, forever lost! Too late, forever too late." The agony of her soul was hard to behold. We were praying and trembling all the time. After that my father prayed loudly for her. When he said "Amen," she said, "Now I see there is a perfect deliverance, even by the approaching of

death." She said "When I get a lengthening as Hezekiah, I should call to the Lord by day and by night. O when I got only 15 days, how should I call." After that the Lord said with power in her heart "in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God" (Philippians 4:6). She said unto my father "this I get from the Lord," and repeated the text loudly. He said "Now, that is great." My youngest sister cried out "Mother, is your soul saved by now?" "No," she answered, "but I shall seek Him and I shall find Him: that He Himself has promised." In this time she often prayed loudly "Look upon me with favour from on high." A while after, she said, "I see an abyss and that is dreadful, what is that deep, when you come therein, that is dreadful, but at the other side I see a height, a bliss, and O now I am set at the side of the bliss!" A while after — "And in the bliss the Lord Jesus revealed Himself to me and I have embraced Him and I have pressed Him to my bosom, I held Him fast; what is He good what is He dear!!" After that she asked my brother to call for us all, to take leave of us.

The following moment of entering the room, is also never to be forgotten. When we came in she immediately began to call "I have seen the Lord Jesus and I have flown to Him and I have embraced Him and pressed Him to my bosom, and I have spoiled Him as a little child and I held Him fast. O, how good is the Lord Jesus, but the abyss is dreadful." After this she gripped our hand, the one after the other and said "Promise me, promise me now immediately that you shall ask for it, every day and night shall continue to ask for it and shall not wait until the latest moment as your mother has done, because when you come in the abyss, that is dreadful. But your mother is so happy, I am so happy, I have seen the Lord Jesus and I have flown to Him. I have seen the abyss and that one is dreadful and I have seen the bliss and there stood the Lord Jesus. I have flown to Him over the abyss, but I did not fall in it, because He stood at the other side." She warned us for seeking earthly things, because they are corruptible and worthless. There is nothing in them. When she had taken leave of everyone, she said "I hope it will be done soon." My sisters and we all wept, but especially my sisters fell over her and wept very hard and said, "Mother, dear mother, we can't miss you." But my mother had no tear and answered, "O, you can miss me, you can't miss the Lord. He can take care of you all." My sisters said, "You have always been so good for us." "What," she said, "I have educated you wrong. I have done everything wrong. I have been a bad mother." My father said "Had you ever thought, that your name was

written in the Lamb's Book of Life?" "No, never," she said, "Such a bad woman, I am the most ungodly woman of the world." Two hours before she died my wife was called by her. She spoke to her "Now I am feeling what you are feeling when you have asthma, but it does not matter when I must die oppressively, I am so happy. Now I shall keep that child forever in my arms." When death approached, she said, "Life, eternal life, eternal life." The latest 15 minutes she lost consciousness on account of tightness and died, oppressive to the body but as for the soul, redeemed forever!

With kind regards,
M.

A Speech on Union

by the Rev. Dr John Kennedy of Dingwall

(From the *Inverness Courier* of October 6, 1870)

The Rev. Dr Kennedy, of Dingwall, said — I would find it much easier, so far as my own feelings are concerned, to refrain from saying anything on this occasion, and if I might be allowed I would give up the time to some of the strangers I expect to address us. I can scarcely be said to have taken finally and publicly my position on the Union Question up till now; but that was certainly not because I had not formed a very decided opinion on the subject. I was at the outset very strongly opposed to entering on negotiations with a view to Union. I was so on several grounds. I looked on the desire for an incorporating union of the Churches as another expression of the indiscriminating charity that found development in the formation of the Evangelical Alliance. I looked on that alliance as the expression of a sentiment produced by putting first what God put last — the love of one's neighbour before love to God, expressed in a careful regard and faithful adherence to His truth. I was also suspicious on another ground. There were some hands busy in originating this movement that were not unused to laying snares for the Church of Christ in Scotland. I could not forget this, and remembering it, I could not but suspect what the result of a movement so originated would be. Besides this, I disliked the movement because it bore a dishonest aspect to me at the outset. Had there been such a previous growth of love between the Churches as found expression in frequent and hearty co-operation, I would have regarded the proposal to incorporate as something that was sincere; but I must freely say that to

me any such pronounced expression of feeling was utterly impalpable, and I looked on the progress of a movement towards incorporation as therefore a dishonest thing. I must also say that I could not contemplate the movement as one wearing either a spiritual or religious aspect. I considered it more of a political movement than anything else. These were my feelings at the outset; but I was afraid that my impressions might be prejudiced, and I resolved to give the question all due consideration, to admit light from all quarters as I studied it; and it was with that view I entered into the Union Committee. I certainly did so, not with the expectation of contributing anything to the final settlement of the question, but merely for the purpose of obtaining information for my own guidance as to the exact state of opinion and sentiment among the negotiating bodies. As the result of that light, and from watching the result of the movement, I have now come to the firm conviction that the impressions which I had at the outset were well founded.

Let me only indicate a few things that have emerged during the progress of the movement that have sufficed to convince me. In the first place, it has been the means of causing alienation among brethren equally entitled to our respect in point of piety and intelligence. You may tell me that no great object is gained without some agitation, but when the sifting truly comes from God, surely the end of it is to separate the wheat from the chaff. It is an enemy's hand that sifts so as to scatter the wheat, and the result of this movement has hitherto been to separate those whom the Lord has united in his holy Providence. I have seen that to some extent it has had a most injurious influence on the minds of those who are leading it. We did not expect before 1863 that some of the leaders in the Union movement would have declared in our Assembly that the doctrine of Establishments was outside of the Confession, and that there is nothing in our Confession with which the doctrines of Amyraldism are not consistent. But yet they have said so; and if the Union movement has brought them this far, who can tell what it will do during its further development? Thirdly, I have observed that this Union movement has made men impatient of definite beliefs, that it has developed in the most remarkable way the revolt of proud intellect against authority in matters of religion, and that this is now as manifest, alas! in the Free Church as it is in the scientific world. I know of few more alarming symptoms of the state of feeling of the times in which we live. I have attained to the firm persuasion that the impression which I formed at the outset was the right one, and that my duty and the duty of all who love the truth, is to do what in them lies, by all lawful means, to

oppose the consummation of this Union.

I did not at first take a great interest in the discussion of the question of the doctrine of the civil magistrate. I was not trained as those who took part in the Voluntary controversy were in that important question, and I felt prepared to take my stand in opposition to this Union on the ground of the differences existing regarding the fundamental doctrine of the Atonement. I was persuaded then, and I am still more persuaded now, that Amyraldism does prevail in the United Presbyterian Church. I came very early into contact with that phase of doctrine, when I was searching with my eternal all at stake, before God, and in view of eternity. I leant upon it and it failed me; I was deceived and almost ruined by it; and I am under vow to God, from that day forth, to testify by all means against it; and I hope I am ready to die rather than to countenance such views as these. This is not the time to discuss it, and it would be unseemly and unseasonable that I should enter on a discussion of it at present, but I feel prepared to prove, first — that the doctrine of the double reference of the Atonement cannot be held without right views of the nature of the Atonement being endangered in every mind that holds it; and I am prepared also to prove that these doctrines cannot be preached without sinners being encouraged to have hope in the good-will of God, apart from a personal Saviour in whom alone the love of God to sinners can find expression, in whom alone a sinner can find an interest in that love, and apart from whom he can neither enjoy its provisions nor its embrace.

But I am prepared now to take my stand as well on the ground of the doctrine of the civil magistrate. I have been compelled to study it, and I am now thoroughly persuaded that if our Church abandons her position as called to testify both to the crown rights of Christ as King of nations and as King of Zion, she will be guilty of a grievous sin. It has been sometimes said that the important doctrine is the doctrine of the Church's independence; that compared with this the doctrine of the duty of the civil magistrate is quite subordinate; and that, therefore, if the one is held — and it is maintained the Voluntaries hold it in common with us — the other may surely be left an open question. But the more I have studied the matter the more thoroughly am I persuaded that the two are inseparable — that it is impossible for the Church to maintain Scripturally her testimony on behalf of the Church's independence, without at the same time holding fast to the truth as to the duty of the civil magistrate to the Church of Christ. These two things are joined by God in His Word; they were inscribed on the banner of our Church when it was

displayed in behalf of the truth, and they were held and pled together during the witness-bearing of our Church in the Ten Years' Conflict. On what ground is it that the Church is entitled to spiritual independence — to be exempt from all control in managing the affairs of Christ's house? On this ground — that the Lord Jesus hath appointed in the hands of the Church officers a government distinct from the province of the civil magistrate; on the ground of that appointment her right to spiritual independence rests, and she must claim her right from the civil magistrate as an act of allegiance on his part to Christ as King of nations — and only on the very ground on which she can claim to be recognised and sanctioned as a Church of Christ can she claim her right to spiritual independence in relation to the civil magistrate. That, to my mind, is as clear as the light of noon-day, and I am now persuaded that if the Free Church drops her testimony in behalf of Christ as King of nations, and ceases to tell the civil magistrate that it is his duty to recognise and sanction the Church of Christ in the land, she will have dropped her whole testimony.

I am so persuaded of this now that I am free from all hesitation as to what the path of duty is. I know that it hath been said that while this is made an open question there is no pressure brought to bear on my conscience, or the consciences of any other in the United Church, but I must be careful not only about my own consistency, my own peace of conscience, my own good name and usefulness — I must be careful also about the testimony of my Church — and I cannot in my Church position omit my testimony to any truth which my Church has abandoned. It has been said that this is not a practical question; that surely we don't mean to say that there is any prospect of our claims to establishment and spiritual independence being acknowledged by the State. No, I have no such hope; but am I therefore to drop my testimony to the truth? Am I to cease to testify to the truth because I can reap no temporal gain thereby? Am I to cease to tell the civil magistrate his duty because he has ceased to feed me with his loaves and fishes? No: I feel all the more imperatively called to testify to that truth. I like the self-deniedness of the opportunity of this testifying for my Lord and Master, and no persuasion will drive me, I hope, from a position so honourable. I think that when the Lord gave us our position in 1843 he gave us a place of peculiar honour and eminence. I can conceive nothing nobler than the position which our Church occupied when she presented her claim of rights to the Government of this country, and at the same time expressed a resolution to receive no emoluments as the price of her liberty to serve

Christ alone. From that position let her not be moved until the Lord as distinctly call her to abandon, as He called her first to occupy it. That time has not yet come; that time shall never come. If she abandon that position, she has ceased to hold fast the truth which the Lord entrusted to her; and when she has ceased to do that, her crown shall be taken from her.

It has recently been said at a public meeting in this town that to make this matter an open question is no new thing; that there are open questions in our Church already; that there are allowed differences of opinion not a few; and that to make this matter an open question is only something to which we have been long accustomed. To this I answer, first — that the matters about which there is allowed difference of opinion among us now, are not to be compared in importance with that which it is proposed to make an open question. Second, that if there are differences of opinion among us it would be a more seemly work for the Church to be harmonising the views of her office-bearers and members, rather than adding to disagreement and differences. I answer, thirdly, that to allow differences of opinion, which casually arise among us, is a very different thing from constituting the Church on the basis of open questions. And what, friends, is to be the gain for making the sacrifice which we are asked to make? What is to be the benefit received for dropping our testimony in behalf of the crown rights of Christ as King of nations? The answer is — Union with other Churches. And what is the benefit of that Union? True, if it takes place the united Church will be greatly larger than the Free Church is now, and if bigness be a benefit then there will be some gain; but, for the life of me, I cannot see what other benefit than that will result. If we had not love enough among us to allow us to co-operate heartily in the work of the Lord before, is it likely when we are crowded together, bristling with open questions, that we shall get on better? If there are matters about which we differ, let these lie as open questions between us; do not bring them in among us to be sources of irritation and difference in years to come. We have more than enough of that already.

Instead of this being regarded as a desirable thing, I cannot refrain from stating it as my conviction that I fear our Church is too large already. I cannot but state my persuasion that we have more need of sifting than we have of heaping — and I would look on a movement that had a sifting effect as more likely in these times to be in accordance with the mind of God than a movement towards the agglomeration of Churches without unity in the truth. Is that army strong because its

wings have been thrown in upon its centre till all divisions, and distinctions of divisions, and regiments, have been blotted out, and you have a great united crowd? No; surely an enemy by skilful strategy has caused that union. He produces by fusion union, that by confusion he may bring weakness. That is the light in which I look upon the proposed Union of the Churches in the land in which we live. I see with alarm the continued progress of this movement. We are at this moment arrived at a most critical stage. The question sent down to Presbyteries is this — is there any objection in principle to the formation of this Union on the basis of the Standards as accepted by the Churches? Let us suppose that the majority of Presbyteries find that there is no objection, what will be the next step? I cannot tell; but I can tell what may be the next step. The Assembly of 1871 may form an overture based on this finding of the Presbyteries, and send it back to them in terms of the Barrier Act. Supposing the Presbyteries approve of that overture, the Assembly of 1872 may declare that there is no bar in principle to the formation of this incorporating Union. By doing so they will have settled the question of principle, and thereby altered and vitiated the constitution of our Church before the question of expediency is taken up at all.

We have thus arrived at a critical position, a time when we are required to count the cost wisely. I have for years been forecasting such a crisis, and I was afraid too that the skilful leadership on the other side would put us into the position of being subjected before the public to the odium of causing as well as to the pain of enduring a disruption. I know not what the result shall be, but I would just like to say, in conclusion, that when we speak of disruption, we speak of a most serious matter. I would be very far from taking any step that would seem to be courting such a calamity; but surely the leaders of our Church, by this time of day, and in the light that now shines on the question, must see that if they go on in the course they are pursuing, they must evidently cause a disruption. It is no justification of their conduct to say that they do not desire to separate from the brethren in the minority. We are not craving any innovation; we are not demanding anything which it is unconstitutional to grant us. We are continuing to occupy the good old ground. The change is on the other side; the pressure is brought to bear by them on us. And why this pressure? Is it because the new friends they are so anxious to get will prove so much better than the old friends they seem so anxious to lose? It may be so; but will it be said by any man that those who are constraining us to contemplate such a thing as a disruption, are any better than those they are constraining to leave them, in anything

that constitutes the true strength of a Church? And are they of opinion that they will get on far better without us, and that we never can get on without them? If they are, they are quite mistaken in both. Let them separate us from them, they will find no cause to rejoice in the work of their hands, and many names will haunt their memories and embitter their reflections, as they think of the men whom they have rudely severed from their communion. And we, if we be faithful to the truth, will find that a few, wielding the sword of the Lord, can be stronger than a multitude; and that, if our days of trial come, the God of truth and mercy will not leave nor forsake us.

Breaking Down the Carved Work

By Rev. John Colquhoun, Glendale, Skye

(Continued from page 181)

At the Disruption, the Church emerged in its purity, after a long and painful struggle, from State control in spiritual matters, carrying with it all that was dear to the religious people of Scotland, and one would expect that, in some measure, its struggles would be less frequent and less disquieting. This, however, was not to be the case. Her previous conflicts were with the civil power, and that power using its influence and usurped authority to foist upon the Church a form of government and worship which was contrary to the Word of God, and repugnant to the religious convictions of a people well-versed in that Word and deeply taught by the Holy Spirit. Now, however, the enemy of souls changed his tactics, and manifested himself from within the Church. As early as 1849 men who had borne the burden and heat of the day, during the Ten Years Conflict, found it necessary, in the Free Church Presbytery of Edinburgh, to transmit a motion to the Assembly on the subject of innovations in public worship. The burden of their complaint was that efforts were made to have the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper dispensed to the communicants in their pews instead of going to tables appointed for that purpose, as was customary since the Reformation; that the Sacraments were dispensed apart from the preaching of the Word, which had a Popish tendency that the efficacy of the Sacrament depended on its mere administration, and not on the blessing of God on the Word read and preached. This may be looked upon as among the first indications that the carved work was in danger, and that, consequently,

there was a great necessity to keep "to the law and to the testimony."

This work of decay in the noble fabric of the Free Church, however, went on, for in 1863 we again find that doughty champion of purity of worship, Dr Begg of Newington, introducing an overture into the Edinburgh Presbytery of the Free Church for transmission to the General Assembly, on innovations in public worship, in the following terms: "That the General Assembly shall adopt some effectual plan to prevent the introduction into any of our congregations of unauthorised innovations in the public worship of God." In speaking to the overture he pointed out that there were matters in respect of worship which were put by Divine authority beyond the reach of the Assembly itself and that, therefore, they could not change them, or sanction a change. This is in accordance with what he stated on another occasion in the General Assembly when the question was debated as to whether or not the Free Church would have intercourse with the Presbyterian Church in England, which was on the point of introducing instrumental music into the public worship; "I trust that, in any arrangements which may be made for our future intercourse with Churches, we shall take care, without pretending to dictate to them, to make it quite clear that, as a Church, we are as determined to maintain the great principle that God's Word alone shall guide us in our worship, as we were determined at the time of the Disruption that God's Word alone should guide us in the government and discipline of our Church. The principle is the same in both cases. You may say it is the will of congregations; you may say it is the will of Church courts; but I hold that, if you come down from the very high ground of being regulated in such matters only by God's Word, and not by man's will, not only as to government and discipline, but also in the matter of public worship, we descend from the ground on which we notoriously stand as the Free Church of Scotland." — *Memoirs of James Begg. D.D., II, p.258.*

In 1871 the General Assembly sanctioned the use of a hymn book in public worship, which was substituted in 1881 by another which was held to be a better one. Thus in the face of strong opposition the inspired manual of praise was practically shelved, and hymns of human composition were given a preference which they have to the present day in the Church of Scotland except in remote congregations in the Highlands of Scotland, and in congregations throughout the land which have disowned the authority of that Church. A somewhat strange argument was used by the supporters of a hymnary, that, if its use was not sanctioned, there would be a demand for the introduction of instrumental

music, while the opponents of hymns maintained that hymns were the forerunners of organs, a prediction which was soon verified, for in 1882 the Assembly decided, in opposition to the findings of previous Assemblies, that there is nothing that they were aware of, in the law or constitution of the Church, which makes the use of instrumental music unlawful. Thus, as far as public worship was concerned, the carved work of the Reformation was broken down by the axes and hammers of the innovators.

This, however, was but an indication of what was going on, and of the determination of men who had sworn to uphold the Constitution of the Free Church, to deface its testimony, and wreck it so as to be unrecognisable. For long there had been efforts put forth in the direction of Union with the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The Erskines and their colleagues long after the Secession of 1733 held by the Establishment Principle but their followers gradually veered round to the Voluntary Principle, which principle was held tenaciously by the United Presbyterian Church. It was, no doubt, in order to bring the Free Church into line with Voluntarism that Dr Rainy and his supporters began their Disestablishment Crusade, and thus make it possible for Union between the two denominations to be effected. Year after year, by increasing majorities in the Assembly, they seemed to be drawing nearer their goal. From the point of view of doctrine it was impossible for the two bodies to be united because of the Arminianism of the United Presbyterian Church and the Scriptural Calvinism set forth in the Subordinate Standards of the Free Church, and, no doubt, this weighed with the union-mongers in the Free Church. They realised that if Union took place those who remained outside the Union could claim the whole of the property of the Free Church. This consideration caused the Union negotiations to drop in 1871, for it was made clear in the opinion of counsel engaged by the anti-Unionists that "a majority of the Free Church, however large, may not lawfully alter the constitution of the Church in the face of a protesting minority of its members." This, apparently, was the red light which showed to the Voluntaries of the Free Church their danger.

They had not, however, abandoned their plans for Union. The Word of God tells us that "the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." A good deal of worldly wisdom manifested itself in ecclesiastical circles at this time, and the union-mongers could wait for a short time and their opponents would then be off this earthly scene. No sooner were the doughty champions of the constitution of the Free Church, such as Dr Begg and Dr Kennedy taken

to their Heavenly rest than the innovators, led by Dr Rainy and his henchmen, began to undermine the constitution by endeavouring to change the relationship of the Free Church to the Confession of Faith. They asserted that there were aspirants to the ministry who had "difficulties and scruples" about many of the statements in the Confession and that it was not right of the Church to be deprived of the talents and abilities of these men. One may make the observation that it must have been extraordinary talents and abilities which they possessed when the Church was asked to depart from her constitution, and thus dishonour God, in order to retain these aspirants to her ministry. The creed of the Church was considered too rigid, and yet it was based four-square upon the Word of God. However, they were determined not to take this into their consideration, and means had to be devised to relieve the tender consciences of these modern sons of Anak in whose sight others were as grasshoppers. The result was the passing of the Declaratory Act of 1892, an Act noted for its Arminianism, and so devoid of any literary merit as to show its framers to be men of very mediocre talents and abilities. Its adoption by the Church marked another instance of the havoc done to the carved work by the axes and hammers of men whose appreciation of the glorious truths of the gospel was conspicuous by its absence. Any one who wished, could now preach the most glaring heresies, sure of the protection of the courts of the Church, and thus the Church became instrumental in ruining a countless number of immortal souls. It was a time for the friends of Christ to be up and doing, and, if deeds speak louder than words, these friends were comparatively few. It was left to one man in the General Assembly of 1893, and that man perhaps the weakest among them, to protest and separate. The Rev. Donald Macfarlane, then of Raasay and afterwards of Dingwall, was but a feeble instrument who had learned, through the teaching of the Holy Spirit, to cease from man whose breath is in his nostrils, but was honoured, in his weakness and lack of influence, to be a witness for Christ, and the Lord upheld him in his stand. The carved work was again set up, in what afterwards became known as the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and, in the midst of opposition and scoffing it is still to be seen, not only in Scotland but also in foreign lands, proving the truth of what is written, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

That this was coming was apparent to any one who had eyes to see the signs of the times. The notorious Robertson-Smith case, which took up the attention of the General Assembly from 1876 to 1881, by this time had become past history. This Professor, more bold than others of his

kind in the Free Church, gave utterance to views which reflected on the infallibility and inspiration of the Scriptures, and when brought before the Church courts, it became very evident that he had many friends. Principal Rainy, with that astuteness which was characteristic of him, did not support him openly but, no doubt, was favourable to him though that favour did not go to the extent which Robertson-Smith had, evidently, reason to expect, awakening in that unhappy man a bitterness which he expressed many years afterwards when he said to Dr P. Carnegie Simpson, the future biographer of Principal Rainy, at least ten years after the close of the case, "You are a young man — you are going into the Free Church — do not trust Rainy — he is a Jesuit." *Life of Principal Rainy. Vol. I. p.396.*

That the Declaratory Act of 1892 was passed with a view to Union with the United Presbyterian Church is denied by none, but that it led to breaking up the Free Church into fragments is apparent to all. As was pointed out already, the Rev. Donald Macfarlane tabled his Protest and separated when all hope was gone of rescinding the obnoxious Act, and was followed by a considerable number who formed the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland. When the Union was effected in 1900 a minority remained out of it, declaring themselves to be the Free Church of Scotland, so that instead of two separate denominations in Scotland there were three, each claiming to be the Free Church of the Disruption. Two of these appealed to the civil courts over the property and Caesar in the House of Lords allocated the property to the minority, but Caesar in the Royal Commission divided the property between the two contending parties according to the numerical strength of each, while the party who were the real representatives of the Free Church of the Disruption, being more interested in what was of real and more lasting value than property, were left to depend upon the God whom they served, and He did not fail them. As God built houses for the mid-wives in Egypt who did His will, not obeying the command of the king, so He built churches and manses for the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland as these were needed, and preserved among them His own witness, and a conscience void of offence toward God. Numerically small as they are and conscious of many imperfections the carved work of the Church of God, in all its aspects, is still preserved among them as it was at the Reformation, notwithstanding all that a hostile world, outside the professing church and within the professing church, has done against them since 1893.

(To be continued).

Deputy's Report to Australia and New Zealand

By Rev. Wm. MacLean, M.A.

I arrived in Auckland on Friday, 16th March. Quite a number of the congregation were at the airport meeting me including Mr and Mrs E. Christensen in whose hospitable home I stayed as in former years before a minister was settled in Auckland. I supplied Auckland for four Sabbaths, and visited all the families in the congregation. When visiting Mrs MacLeod and family in the manse it was hard to realise that Mr MacLeod was no longer with us in this world. He finished his course in this world with joy, leaving behind him fragrant memories. Mrs MacLeod took me to the cemetery where his mortal remains await a glorious resurrection. On his grave stone are the words which he himself requested to be inscribed — "There shall be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and the unjust." Although deprived of a devoted pastor, the attendance at the Sabbath services is about one hundred. The services are conducted by the elders.

Owing to an air strike which was called off on the Wednesday I was to leave for the Gisborne communion. I was not able to arrive until 9 p.m. As the weekly prayer meeting is at 7 p.m., and the airport being near the town, a large number of the congregation were there to welcome me. The Rev. E. A. Rayner was assisting along with me at the communion. I don't think I ever saw Mr Rayner looking so well. The Question on the Friday was John 1:13 and 14. "But as many as received Him to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which were born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God." There were twenty men at the communion who could be called upon to speak. All who were called made it clear that they were giving all the glory of their salvation to Christ. One of the brethren told us of the Red Indian who in bye-gone days came before a Kirk Session in Canada seeking admission to the Lord's Table for the first time. In the course of his being examined, he said in connection with his conversion that he had done his own part, and that Christ had done His. On being asked to explain what he meant by his doing his part and Christ doing His part, he answered, "I did all the sinning and Christ did all the saving." It was a most refreshing Fellowship meeting. Mr Rayner opened the Question and Mr van Dorp closed it.

The morning prayer meetings at 8 a.m. were, as usual, well attended, with an average attendance of sixty. There was a new communicant — Mrs Ken MacPherson. It is encouraging to see the number of young men who are professing in the Gisborne congregation. I conducted the services on the Sabbath after the communion. While I was in Gisborne, I was, as in Auckland, hospitably entertained by the families of the congregation.

On Wednesday, 25th April, Mr and Mrs Jim MacPherson accompanied by two of their boys, the two youngest in the family, took me down in their car to Havelock North, where Mr and Mrs Cox, formerly of Hastings, now reside. Havelock North is a few miles from Hastings, and about 140 miles from Gisborne. Both Mr and Mrs Cox and Miss Jocyn Cox, who was on the staff of the Mbuma Hospital, were present at the Gisborne communion. Mr Jan van Dorp and Mr Robert Vette, who are in charge of the Westminster Standard Publications, also drove down to Havelock North. As the notice of the services sent in by Mr Cox to the local paper did not appear, there were no strangers present at the service held in the evening. I stayed as formerly in the hospitable home of Mr and Mrs Cox. On Thursday, the following day, Mrs MacPherson and the boys returned home to Gisborne but Mr MacPherson, Mr Jan van Dorp, Mr Vette and myself drove down to Palmerston North. That evening I preached in the hall of the Lutheran Church as in former days. There was an encouraging attendance. It was in this hall I preached in June 1967 the sermon on "The Good Hope of the Life Everlasting" (I Peter 1:3-4), which has been translated into Dutch, Arabic and Chinese. On Friday we proceeded south to Wellington where I conducted the services on the Sabbath. I stayed, as in former days, in the hospitable home of Mrs MacKenzie, a native of Borne, Lewis. I was also handsomely entertained by friends in Wellington. On Monday I parted with my companions in travel whose fellowship and kindness I much appreciated, and crossed the Tasman by the afternoon flight to Sydney. On Tuesday, 1st May, I had a service in the hall of St John's Church in Paramatta, where the services are now being held in Sydney. As in former places, so in Sydney it was indeed refreshing to meet with old and new friends.

On Wednesday I travelled up by 'plane to the Grafton communion where I received an affectionate welcome from the Grafton friends, among them Mr Donald J. Shaw, who is now in his 87th year and looking much the same, alert and agile, as when we parted on 2nd February 1976. Miss Irene Bailey who, along with her late devoted friend Miss Flora Shaw, donated their beautiful mansion to the congregation as a manse, was

able in spite of all her bodily infirmities, to be out at all the services. The Lord was good and gracious to us at the Grafton communion. There was one new communicant, Mr Murray MacAlpine, a young married man, in his early thirties. On Thursday, 11th May, I boarded the Brisbane Express from Sydney in Grafton at 5.20 a.m. and arrived in Brisbane about 10 a.m. Mr Alistair Shaw of Hurstville, Sydney, was meeting me at the station. Mr and Mrs Shaw travelled up to Brisbane after the Grafton communion to visit their son Richard. That evening I held a service in the hall where services are periodically held by Mr Rayner. As it was the time of the school holidays Mr and Mrs Green and family with whom I used to stay were away on holiday at the time. There were only eight present, six men and two women. In spite of the fewness of the numbers present, I was favoured with a measure of liberty in speaking from the words, "Verily verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God." Before leaving Sydney I conducted the services in Grafton on the Sabbath after the communion. I would take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to Mr and Mrs Shaw and Richard for their generosity and to the other friends while I was in Brisbane; to Mr and Mrs Rayner and to Mr and Mrs J. A. T. van Dorp during my stay in their hospitable manses; to Miss C. M. Shaw, with whom I stayed in Sydney and who showed me great kindness; to Mr and Mrs Christensen, Auckland, who are certainly not forgetful to entertain strangers; and last but not least to the beloved friends in Grafton.

During my sojourn in both New Zealand and Australia the Lord in His infinite goodness favoured me with excellent health, except for the first few days after my arrival when I was suffering from the effects of the inoculation for smallpox I had in Ness some days prior to my departure.

It was encouraging in Australia and New Zealand that there are evidences of young people being brought to a saving knowledge of Christ, and to note in the different congregations I visited a desire to walk in and keep to the old paths. May the Lord hasten the day when the isles shall wait for His law and the little one become a thousand and the small one a great nation. The last verse quoted, "the little one shall become a thousand," I was informed, was the promise the late Rev. Donald Beaton had for the Cause in Australia.

In bidding farewell to all the friends in Australia and New Zealand, the warmth of whose affection and kindness I shall ever cherish, I would quote the closing verses in the General Epistle of Jude, "Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our

Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen."

Notes and Comments

The Pope in Poland

The Pope's visit to Poland has been followed closely by the media and put over with the usual sycophantic deference which is ever shown to the Roman Catholic Church. Accordingly his visit has proved a good propaganda exercise for the R.C. Church, as well as a softening up exercise in preparation for the establishment of a Church-State Concordat in Poland. If the Vatican was able to establish concordats with dictators like Hitler, Mussolini and General Franco, there is no reason why the same should not be done with a Communist power.

Poland has had a chequered history and this is not to be wondered at in view of its persecution of Protestants in Reformation times. No country showed more blind zeal on behalf of Romanism. The Pope now appears on the scene to preach liberty to a nation that has known little of freedom in its history. But the Pope has no liberty to offer them, only the bondage and darkness and superstition of Roman Catholic belief. To attain to the Pope's 'liberty' would only mean for the Poles a passing from one bondage to another. May the day speedily come when the eyes of the Polish people will be opened to see the glory of Zion's King. Only then will they turn away with loathing and disgust from the delusions of the anti-Christian papal system.

Zimbabwe-Rhodesia

The elections in Rhodesia have resulted in the emergence of a black dominated Government under the Premiership of Bishop Abel Muzerawa and under the Presidency of Mr Josiah Gumedi. Whether this Government will receive international recognition or not is not yet clear although Britain and America appear to be moving in this direction. However the difficulties of the new Zimbabwe-Rhodesia are not over as the forces under Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe continue their terrorist activities. Also Mr Sitole's party refuse to take part in the new Government. Tribal loyalties have a considerable effect on the situation. Bishop Muzerawa being a Shona has received the support of the majority of the electorate who belong to the Shona tribe. The Matebele people, on the other hand, are not so ready to support the Government.

It is to be hoped that out of the confused situation, the Lord will be pleased to bring order and that the nation may prosper in an atmosphere of peace and reconciliation. We pray that the Lord's Cause may prosper in that land and may not be in any way hindered by the setting up of the new Government.

Abortion Reform

It is gratifying to know that an attempt is being made in the present Parliament to reform the Abortion legislation and to try to reduce its worst excesses. Any effort in this direction is to be welcomed and we wish it all success. It is clear, however, that what is required in this field is not merely reform of the Abortion legislation of recent times but its total abolishment as being opposed to civilised behaviour, far less to Christian morality.

The advent of abortion in its present form in the medical field — an unnatural and mongrel development — has proved a calamity as well it might. It has undermined the high standards of medical practice previously prevailing through hardening the consciences of doctors who have succumbed to the new legislation. Easy abortion is also paving the way for its natural corollary, that is, 'euthanasia', as it is euphemistically called or, as it may be more properly termed, 'killing off the unwanted old'.

The enormity of what is presently being practised in the hospitals of Britain in the name of medicine, and allegedly on the grounds of compassion, can be seen in the light of the divine law which obliges men as rational human beings to do all in their power to preserve their own life and the lives of others. Failure to fulfil these obligations is murder — and in this instance murder of the basest sort. The instances of Pharaoh and Herod in Scripture bear witness to the baseness of what is being done at present. They insisted on slaying children who had been born into the world and the blot on their names has been left on the page of Scripture. In the light of this, what are we to say of men who, while professing to be helpers of mankind and sustainers of life, abuse the trust humanity has placed in them, by slaying the children in the womb. What a weight of the wrath of God must lie eternally upon their souls if they repent not of their deeds.

The man whom the Pope delights to honour

When Haman was asked by King Ahasuerus, What shall be done unto the man whom the king delighteth to honour? — he thought in his heart,

To whom would the king delight to do honour more than to myself? But it was not ungodly Haman, the enemy of the Jews, that the king wished to honour, but the godly Jew, Mordecai, who had saved the king's life, and Haman much to his chagrin had to escort Mordecai as he rode on horseback through the city clothed in the royal apparel and having on his head the crown royal. Haman had also to proclaim before him, Thus shall it be done to the man whom the king delights to honour.

In stark contrast to this the Pope's choice does not rest on a poor Mordecai. The man whom the Pope delights to honour is an Irish dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church, Archbishop O'Fee of Dublin, whom it has pleased the Pope to make a Cardinal. What has Archbishop O'Fee done to receive such recognition from one who avers he is Christ's Vicar on earth? Has he, for instance, been diligent in proclaiming Christ's evangel to the poor, oppressed people of Southern Ireland, and so merited such recognition of his services. No, these are not his credentials. Rather is it because he has been a faithful son of 'Holy Mother Church' in keeping the people in Eire in the delusions of Roman Catholic belief and practice, and has been a fervent supporter of a United Ireland — that is, an Ireland united under Roman Catholic domination — that he has been commended to the favour of the Pope. This is the man whom the Pope delights to honour.

Church Notes

Church Extension Charge

Communion — The Kirk Session wish to intimate that, as in previous years, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper will be dispensed in the British Legion Hall, Perth, on Sabbath, 26th August 1979, D.V. The usual services will be held. The ministers expected are Rev. D. Campbell, M.A. and Rev. John Tallach, M.A. (D.V.).

Manse — In the April 1976 issue of the Free Presbyterian Magazine an appeal was made for financial help towards the purchase of the Church Extension manse. Recently the Deacon's Court received information that the manse, situated at 167 Glasgow Road, Perth, is being repaid from the proceeds of the Forsyth legacy.

The Court takes this opportunity of publicly acknowledging their gratitude to all throughout the Church who have contributed to this fund. They also wish to intimate that no further donations are required as the manse fund is now closed.

Thanks are also due to the Finance Committee for their co-operation in the purchase of the manse.

Donations from many friends are continually being received for the Extension Charge itself. These are much appreciated. It is encouraging to those more immediately involved in this work to be assured of this practical interest in the Church Extension enterprise. The prayers of the Lord's people are also earnestly solicited for the furtherance of the Redeemer's kingdom on this side of the country.

Lord Advocate becomes a Baron

The appointment of Mr J. P. H. MacKay, Q.C., as Lord Advocate in the new Government and as a Privy Councillor has been welcomed throughout the Church. It is gratifying to know that Mr MacKay has been further honoured through his appointment as a Baron in the Queen's birthday honours list.

The prayerful good wishes of the people of the Church, we know, are warmly extended to Lord MacKay in connection with these appointments. Our desire is that the Lord may make him eminently useful in our nation at the present time and that he may prove a witness for Christ and His Cause in the high places of the land.

In this appointment we are reminded of the notable part played by another lawyer in the struggles of the Second Reformation. That was Archibald Johnstone, Lord Warriston, whose name will ever be held in high esteem by those who value what is good. "Warriston belonged to a class rarely to be met with now: he was a religious statesman. The standard of his policy was the Word of God: his great and governing aim, the divine glory." So wrote the younger McCrie. We are sure that in this Lord MacKay would desire to follow in his steps.

Acknowledgment of Donations

The General Treasurer, Mr Wm. D. Fraser, 20 Daleview Ave., Glasgow G12, acknowledges the following donations with sincere thanks:—

Home Mission Fund: Mrs MacK., Ullapool, £20 for Church Extension.

Jewish and Foreign Mission Fund: Mrs MacK., Ullapool, £25; Collection at lecture by Rev. B. B. Dube in Portree, £159.60; Anon., Ontario, \$20.00. The following per Rev. D. Ross: Anon, Dingwall, £10 for Congr. purposes; J. McK., Beaulieu, £50 for books; Gillanders,

Alness, £10; D. M., £1; Mission Meetings: Stornoway, £107.75; Ullapool, £87.70; Inverness, £179.00; Towards Mission Work — Anon., Skigersta, £5; Anon., N. Tolsta, £10; R. MacL., £10; Towards Religious Books — Ladies Mission Meeting, Inverness, £200.00; Mr & Mrs MacL., £20; Mrs J. C., £10.00.

Dominions and Overseas Fund: Mrs MacK., Ullapool, £25; Anon., £400, both for Reformation Study Centre in Italy.

Home of Rest Fund: Mrs MacK., Ullapool, £50.

The Publications Treasurer, Mr R. W. M. MacKenzie, C.A., Hilton of Cadbol, Fearn, acknowledges with sincere thanks the following donations:—

Publications Fund: Fort William Congr., £1.

Welfare of Youth Fund: J. D. M. per W. H. M. MacKenzie, £3.

Free Distribution Magazine Fund: Mrs J. M., Dumbarton per Capt. Henderson, £1.

The Treasurers of the following congregations acknowledge with sincere thanks the following donations:—

Aberdeen: Friend, Portree, £10 per Bookshop, Portree.

Barnoldswick: Glasgow Friend, £5 per T.C.; Friend, Inverness, £20 per Rev. L. MacLeod; Stornoway Congr., £282.00; Friend, Portree per Portree Bookshop, £5; M. R., Glasgow, £10; Mrs MacK., Ullapool, £20 per W. D. F.

Dumbarton: Mrs J. M., £1 for Magazine Fund per J. H.; Inverness Friend, £10 for Manse Fund per T. M.; Friend, Inverness, £5 per T. M.; N. McC., Glasgow, £5 per I. C.; R. A. C., £5 per I. C.; Glasgow-Raasay Friend, £5 per J. H., last four for Dumbarton Church Extension.

Greenock: Correction to last month. Insertion should have read:—"From the estate of the late Mrs Margt. Garland Boyle, £3,801.72 for the Greenock Congregation of the F.P. Church, per Black, Cameron & Campbell, Solicitors, Greenock.

Fort William: Friend, Harris, £6 per Rev. J. A. MacDonald.

Glendale: A Friend, £10 per Portree Bookshop for Glendale Congr.

Kyle: Friend, £100; Mrs MacK., Ullapool, £20 per Gen. Treas.; Glasgow-Raasay Friend, £5 per Mr M. MacLeod, all for Kyle and Plockton Manse Fund; Mrs MacD., Duirinish, £4 for Sust. Fund and £3 for Home Mission.

North Harris: A Friend, Hyndland, Glasgow, £24 (Sust. Fund, £10, Aged & Infirm Ministers Fund, £3, Jewish & Foreign Mission Fund, £3, General Building Fund, £3, Car Fund, £5); A. Friend, Glasgow, £13.60 for Church & Manse Repairs; Wellwisher, Meavag, £20 for Manse & Church Property; Friend, South Harris, £5 (Church & Manse Property, £2, Car Fund, £3); Friend, North Tolsta, £5 for Car Fund; Friend, Kyles-Scalpay, £5 for Congr. Purposes; A Friend, Inverness, £5 for Church & Manse Property, last five per Rev. A. MacKay.

Oban: C. N., £20 for advertising per J. Morrison; Friend, Portree, £10 for Church Fund per Bookshop; M. G., £10 for Property Fund per A. Paterson; J. C., £5 for Sust. Fund (envelope in plate); Mrs F., £10 for Church Funds per J. Morrison.

Portree: K. M., Bayfield, £5 for Home Mission (in Church plate).

Staffin: Miss J. MacD., Glasgow, £5 for Sust. Fund (envelope in plate); Two Inverness Friends, £5 per Rev. J. McD.; Friend, £10 per Portree Bookshop both for Congr. Purposes; Friend, £5 for Sust. Fund; Anon., £40 for Church Windows, both per M. M. I.

Stornoway: Friend, £30 for upkeep of Mini-bus; Two Friend, Inverness, £15 for Stornoway F.P. Congr.; Friend, Glasgow, £50 for Sust. Fund, all per Rev. J. MacLeod; Anon., £6 for Taiwan; Anon., £10 for Fede Viva.

Watnlish: Mrs M. H., £5 for Sust. Fund; £1 for Home Mission Fund.

Wick: Friend, Skye, £5 for Wick Funds per Rev. R. R. S.