



THE
Free Presbyterian Magazine
 AND
MONTHLY RECORD.

(Issued by a Committee of the Free Presbyterian Synod.)

*"Thou hast given a banner to them that fear Thee, that it may
 be displayed because of the truth."—Ps. lx. 4.*

CONTENTS.

	PAGES.
THE NEW EVANGELISM,	441
A SERMON. By the Rev. James S. Sinclair, John Knox's, Glasgow,	444
THE KIKUYU CONTROVERSY: PRESBYTERIANISM AND EPISCOPACY,	454
THE BAPTISED FAMILY: MALAN,	460
THEATRICAL AMUSEMENTS. Extracts from a Lecture by the late Rev. J. B. Bennett, M.D.,	465
SUIPEIR AN TIGHEARNA: RIVETUS,	472
GAELIC POEMS. By the late Alexander Cook, Missionary, Saltcoats,	474
NOTES AND COMMENTS,	477
CHURCH NOTES,	478
THE MAGAZINE,	480

N. ADSHEAD & SON,

Printers and Bookbinders,

11 and 92 UNION STREET, GLASGOW.



PRICE TWOPENCE.

THE

Free Presbyterian Magazine

And MONTHLY RECORD.

VOL. XVIII.

APRIL, 1914.

No. 12.

The New Evangelism.

WE recently received a copy of a religious paper named *The Life of Faith*, and have looked through its pages. One or two good things are to be found here and there in it, but some of the chief articles seem to us misleading and dangerous in their references to the great matters of the conversion and salvation of the soul.

Two articles are devoted to the Chapman-Alexander Mission, which has been causing considerable stir and sensation in Glasgow and Edinburgh for some months back. The Mission was at the time in the capital—it has now returned to Glasgow—and one of the articles is headed, "Pentecost in Edinburgh." Good it would be if that historic city, which knew so much of gospel light and liberty in days gone by, would be visited with a day of Pentecostal power in the genuine conversion of souls, but it is to be feared that the present wave of emotionalism will leave it and its sister city, Glasgow, little better than it found them, if indeed so well. The leading figures in this Mission are the Rev. J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D., of New York, and Mr. Charles Alexander, also from the United States. Dr. Chapman is the preacher, Mr. Alexander is the singer, of the movement.

Now, as far as our information goes from this paper and other sources, we freely admit that Dr. Chapman says many true and useful things. He speaks much of sin in various forms, and warns transgressors of its consequences. He urges his hearers to repentance, and declares that without repentance there can be no salvation. He preaches, to some extent, the atonement of Christ, and holds up the Bible as the Word of God, while he also exhorts the people to private and family prayer. He appears sincere and earnest. His preaching is certainly better than much that passes for gospel in the general pulpit of to-day. But, notwithstanding the very best that can be

said about it, we believe it to be seriously defective. It proceeds almost throughout on the idea that the hearer can, by his own native efforts, if he chooses, respond to the exhortations addressed him and become a penitent believer in Christ. We certainly do not object to the addressing of solemn calls to repentance and faith to gospel hearers in general. Christ's own personal message was "Repent ye, and believe the gospel" (Mark i. 15), and they err who deny that faith and repentance are duties upon all. But it is a very serious error, on the other hand, to urge men to the exercise of faith and repentance as if they could spin these graces out of their own bowels, and not to teach them that, while they are under a solemn responsibility to repent and believe in Christ for salvation, they cannot of themselves exercise these graces, but must seek them directly from Christ Himself, who is exalted to bestow them. Now where this most important truth is omitted, the effect in general is that men and women whose feelings are touched put forth some mental effort of their own and exercise a kind of natural repentance and faith. They express regret for their past sins, chiefly those of an outward kind, they believe in what they have heard concerning Christ with their native powers of mind emotionally influenced, and generally express a high assurance of their personal safety. To the superficial observer this appears to be conversion, and yet there is no new birth from above. The sinner is not really changed in heart or made the subject of a new creation. It is possible that he may persevere in the maintenance of his false religion to the end of his days, but it more frequently happens that he cools entirely down and gives up religion altogether. How dangerous then is any kind of doctrine which directly tends to foster a delusive and ruinous faith!

Then, Dr. Chapman makes sensational appeals which in our judgment are entirely injurious. In Edinburgh, at one of his final meetings, he called upon every young man and boy "whether Christian or not" who could say, "If God should ever call me to preach, I shall respond," to come forward to the front of the hall, and nearly three hundred answered his invitations, when he remarked, "There are boys here who are going to get the call." In a similar way he invited every girl and young woman in the audience willing to say, "If ever God calls me to be a Sunday-school teacher or a foreign missionary, or to be more true at home, I will respond," and upwards of six hundred came forward. Now, what is the effect of all this but to impress upon these young men and women that their will and response are the determining factors in God's calls, and not the divine grace and power, and still more, to bring them under a distinct and solemn pledge absolutely unnecessary and misleading? The impression is given that a great and good work has been accomplished by influencing these young people in the manner described, when the whole affair is fitted to do immense harm.

Mr. Alexander is the leader of the praise. He gathers choirs of a thousand voices, and carries through at the evening meetings before Dr. Chapman begins to speak, a programme of hymns fitted to stir the emotions of the audience. The people are thus worked up by a natural process to a certain pliability of mind which makes them more ready to receive impressions from the preacher, and leads them very easily to imagine that they have been or are being converted. Though Dr. Chapman says some sound and useful things, we cannot understand his religious faith when he carries on his work with the aid of such musical and sensational performances as are conducted by Mr. Alexander. Such fleshly works and their fruits will be "burned" at the last day (1 Cor. iii. 12, 13).

A series of articles has also been appearing in *The Life of Faith* from the pen of a Baptist minister in Glasgow. The title is "The Harvest of the Streets," and the third of these articles appears in our copy of the paper. The writer gives a record of what are said to be "soul-winning triumphs" by personal contact and conversation with people on the streets of Glasgow. We have never read anything more credulous of the kind in our life. Mr. Last, the writer, makes it his work at various hours to give tracts and speak to persons, especially young men in the streets, and here he records case after case of what he calls "decisions for Christ" after fifteen minutes or half-an-hour's conversation. It would seem that those he meets have only just to say that they trust in Christ, and immediately they are put down as new converts to the gospel. Truly Mr. Last seems to be an apostle of salvation by natural faith. It is in the highest degree improbable that one single individual of his triumphs is savingly converted. What self-deception on both hands! If indeed the supposed convert is self-deceived—he may be only smiling inwardly at the credulity of his questioner.

We are all fully sensible of the need of a day of awakening and quickening power whereby many souls might be brought to true concern about their eternal salvation, and made instruments to show forth the praises of the Redeemer, but better a few conversions of a genuine stamp under real gospel truth than the thousands manufactured by the artificial and unscriptural methods of the new evangelism.

I THANK my God that I preach unto you so sure a Gospel, even the oracles of the eternal God; the earth and the heavens shall pass away, but this Word and oracle shall never pass away; therefore it is not a doubtful message that I carry unto you, for it is surer than the heavens and surer than the earth; and these eyes of yours, that have seen both the heavens and the earth, shall see the truth of this spoken here.—*Welch*.

A Sermon.

BY THE REV. JAMES S. SINCLAIR, JOHN KNOX'S, GLASGOW.*

~~~~~  
 "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."—

HEBREWS x. 14.  
 ~~~~~

THE Epistle to the Hebrews is largely devoted to a discourse upon the priestly office of the Lord Jesus Christ. The inspired writer undertakes to show that the priesthood of Christ was incomparably superior to the priesthood that obtained under the old dispensation. God had certainly appointed the Levitical priesthood, but He did not design that that priesthood should always continue. The Levitical priesthood was only appointed as a shadow or figure of better things that were yet to come. It shadowed forth the priestly work of the Son of God who was called to this office even from all eternity and who would appear "in the flesh" in due time.

Now, in looking at the words before us for a short time, in dependence on the Spirit of Truth, let us observe, in the first place, the Person of the High Priest who is here brought under our notice; then, in the second place, let us consider the "one offering" which He presented unto God; in the third place, let us observe the perfection which He produces by this one offering: and in the last place, let us notice the description that is here given of the persons who are perfected by His offering.

I.—Let us notice first, briefly, the Person of the High Priest who is spoken of in our text.

The High Priest is evidently none other than the Lord Jesus Christ. The inspired apostle sets forth the constitution of the person of the great High Priest whom God had appointed, and the work which He came to accomplish. If you study the first and second chapters of this Epistle, you will see a wonderful account of the person of the Lord Jesus. He is set before us as none other than the Son of God by a mysterious eternal generation. The Father said to Him, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." He is also described as a Son who is co-equal with the Father in the ever-blessed Godhead. For it is written that "Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of Thy Kingdom," while He is further addressed as the divine Creator of heaven and earth. "And thou, Lord, hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hand." Now, my friends, it is perfectly plain that the great High Priest of our New Testament profession is a divine person, "God over all blessed for ever." He exercises His priestly office in His

* Taken down by a hearer, and revised by the author.

divinity as well as in His humanity. It is the Son of God as a divine, eternal person, who has been called to the discharge of this important office. The Father, as representing the dignity and love of the ineffable Godhead in relation to the fallen children of men, called the Son to perform the work of a priest as a part of His great task as Mediator of the new Covenant. "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." Observe, further, that the Great High Priest possesses in the constitution of His Person a real human nature. In the fulness of the time, and with a view to perform His work of sacrificial obedience and suffering unto death, He humbled himself and became flesh—very man as well as very God. "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." The High Priest, therefore, as He stands before us in the estates of humiliation and exaltation is the eternal Son in human nature, the Word "made flesh."

It is plain also, from many passages of Scripture, that He was active in His divine as well as in His human nature during the discharge of His priestly office upon earth. It was He who was "upholding all things by the word of his power," who "by himself purged our sins," and then "sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high" (Heb. i. 3). It is further declared that "Christ . . . through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God" (Heb. ix. 14). And again, the apostle proclaims, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians, that it was God's dear Son, by whom "all things were created that are in heaven and that are in earth," who "made peace through the blood of his cross."

II.—Let me now proceed, in the second place, to observe the "one offering" which He presented unto God.

1. You will clearly see from the context that the inspired writer is making a contrast between this "one offering" and the many sacrifices that went before under the ceremonial law. By this contrast he emphasises the pre-eminent worth and virtue of Christ's sacrifice. Let us notice two things in connection with those ancient sacrifices which will make plain the apostle's point in the matter—first, their intended use, and secondly, their special *inefficacy*.

(1) Let us observe, then, *the use* of those sacrifices. They were manifestly of divine appointment. We are not to think of them as some men do nowadays, who do not hesitate to suggest that they were the crude products of a barbarous or degenerate age. The so-called higher critics look upon the Jews as partaking of the same spirit with the heathen nations around them in the matter of offering bloody sacrifices, and of supposing that the Most High was needing to be propitiated, and could be propitiated by the sacrifice of slain beasts. They regard such a

manner of worship as a Pagan way of dealing with God on behalf of sin. Now, this is an absolutely erroneous view of the case, and proceeds from an unenlightened and unholy opposition to the principle of satisfaction to divine justice by an atonement. The same critics have no right view of the atonement of Christ. We joyfully accept the plain testimony of the Bible on the subject of atonement, and pity those who reject it. The witness of both Testaments is harmonious throughout. Nothing can be clearer than that the ancient sacrifices offered by the Church were directly appointed by God from the beginning. Abel and Moses are outstanding witnesses to the truth of this.

Now, the use of these sacrifices was two-fold. For one thing, under the ceremonial law, God declared that certain actions were "unclean." If a person, for example, happened to touch the dead body of a human being or the carcase of an unclean beast, that person was defiled, and would require to be cleansed by sacrifice from the defilement. Death is the fruit of sin, and so the people were taught the desirability of shunning all contact with the moral evil of sin, and the necessity of applying to the divine provision for cleansing when they came under its influence. An immediate use of those sacrifices was the removal of ceremonial defilement.

But there was another use, namely, to point out the way by which God would take away sin in the fulness of the time. By these sacrifices He impressed upon the people, in the first instance, the solemn facts that they were sinners, justly obnoxious to eternal death, and that they required an atonement of blood to be made for their souls; and then, secondly, that he had provided a remedy whereby sin could be taken away—even a priest and a sacrifice—in the person of the coming Messiah. Thus from the sacrifices of the ceremonial law, they could get a glimpse by faith beforehand of Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God, who would appear in due time to take away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.

It is very clear, then, my friends, that those sacrifices had very important uses. They were appointed by divine wisdom as means of spiritual and saving instruction to the children of Israel under an economy of shadows and figures of "good things to come." Though without efficacy to make real atonement for sin, they possessed an efficacy of teaching with respect to the future atonement by Christ.

(2) Let us notice the special *inefficacy* of those former sacrifices. The apostle points this out in the chapter before us. I take it that the Jewish people had fallen into practical error on the subject. Many of them rested in the shadows and figures. They brought their bullocks and goats to the altar and imagined that the blood of these was sufficient in itself to take away, not merely ceremonial, but positively moral, defilement. They failed to look beyond these offerings to the one great sacrifice which was to be offered by the Messiah in due time. The Apostle therefore reminds them of the constant frequency of the legal sacrifices

which proclaimed their inefficacy to take away sin. They had to be repeated over and over again. "The law . . . can never with these sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For, then, would they not have ceased to be offered?" God had no delight or satisfaction in these sacrifices in themselves—that He had such delight was the error the Jews were ready to fall into—His satisfaction was found in the great object whom the sacrifices "of the law" prefigured, even His own Son, Jesus Christ, who said "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." It mattered not how numerous the sacrifices were; they were entirely inefficacious to satisfy divine justice or purge the guilty conscience. The blood of irrational animals had been shed all down the centuries from Adam to Christ—a vast ocean of blood was poured forth—but all that blood could not make atonement for the guilt of rational beings, could not take away one single sin, the smallest sin that had ever been committed by any member of the human race. But, on the other hand, here is one offering—not a thousand or a million offerings, but one—and by this single offering, the innumerable sins of a countless multitude of transgressors were swept away in a moment into everlasting forgetfulness. He made an end of sins and brought in everlasting righteousness.

2. Now, let us observe more closely the nature of the "one offering" by which the Son of God has perfected for ever them that are sanctified. That offering was, in one word, Himself. Over and over again is it stated in the Scriptures that He "offered up Himself" to God. The offering here has particular reference to His surrender of Himself to the accursed death of the cross and His endurance of all the shame and suffering implied in that death. In an important respect He was giving Himself to God in a way of obedience and suffering during His whole life on earth, but nothing less than the suffering of death could make a complete atonement for sin. "Without shedding of blood there is no remission." He perfected his work of substitutionary obedience when He shed His blood upon the cross.

(1) Observe then, that *the material* of the "one offering" which Christ, as the High Priest, offered to God was Himself, or in other words, His human nature, consisting of soul and body. The word "Himself," in the fullest extent of its meaning, would embrace His divine as well as His human nature. But it was not possible, in the nature of things, that His divine nature could suffer, and when it is stated that He "offered up himself," it is not meant that He offered up His divine nature as a sacrifice to God. Still, at the same time, we must very carefully remember that His human nature was in union with His divine person during all the days of His obedience and suffering upon earth, and that when He endured the accursed death of the cross, His suffering humanity was all the time in vital union with His eternal Godhead. His Godhead was active, though not suffering, in all the

transactions of Calvary. In this way the infinite dignity of His divine Person gave immeasurable value to the obedience and suffering of that humanity which was in personal union with it.

The material, then, of the offering, as consisting of a human nature in personal union with the eternal Son of God, was of infinite worth and value. This may be illustrated as follows:—The body of a great king among the sons of men may be intrinsically no better in itself than the body of one of the meanest of his subjects, but, inasmuch as its possessor is a man of high dignity, it shares in the dignity. All he does in and by the body is regarded as done by himself, and possesses importance in proportion to the loftiness of the position he occupies in the world. Should he be willing to sacrifice himself in any way on behalf of his subjects, the sacrifice is rightly estimated at all the greater value owing to the dignity of his person. Thus we may see, by an imperfect illustration, the incalculable value of that sacrificial offering which the eternal Son, Jesus Christ, presented on the altar of His divinity to the Father.

(2) Let us notice, further, *the manner* of the offering. Christ offered His holy humanity in a way of obedience and suffering, with a view to satisfy the claims of law and justice. It was for these ends "He took part" of flesh and blood.

The Scriptures clearly teach us that this was the device of infinite mercy and wisdom for the redemption of a guilty people from sin and the curse. The Son of God comes forth from the Father and humbles Himself to assume into personal union with His Godhead, a real but holy human nature, taken from one belonging to the fallen race of Adam, and in the character of a surety and substitute for a company which no man can number of this race, He meets the claims of law and justice against them, which they were perfectly unable to satisfy, and offers a suitable and sufficient sacrifice on their behalf in the obedience and sufferings of His life and death.

It is to be observed, then, that while the obedience and sufferings of the bullocks and goats and other animals offered under the law were unintelligent, compulsory, and of no moral value, it was quite different with the Son of God, the glorious ante-type. His was an *intelligent* sacrifice in the highest degree, a most suitable substitute in the room of rational, though fallen beings of Adam's race. He possessed the human soul in all its faculties, and He was well acquainted with the will of Him who sent Him. "As the Father knoweth me," He said, "so know I the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep." He offered Himself, also, a *willing* sacrifice. He declared that it was His "meat and drink to do the will" of the Father. He hid not His face from shame and spitting, but willingly gave His back to the smiters and His cheeks to them that plucked off the hair. "The cup which my Father hath given me to drink, shall I not drink it?" His, still further, was a *holy* sacrifice. It is written

concerning Him: "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." He loved the holy law which His people had broken with all His soul and strength and mind, and hated sin with an infinite hatred. He bore all the sufferings inflicted upon Him with humble and holy acquiescence in the righteousness of the law which required them. Perfect purity characterised all His thoughts, words, and actions during all the period of His suffering unto death. "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (1 Peter ii. 22). And lastly, His was an *infinitely God-glorifying* sacrifice. He said, "I have glorified thee on the earth; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do" (John xvii. 4). He obeyed and suffered all that was necessary to be accomplished to the glory of the divine perfections. The sword of justice awoke against Him. The call went forth from the Father, "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, [and against the man that is my fellow," and He lovingly endured inexpressible sufferings in body and soul at the hands of men and devils and the righteous Judge of all. The sacrifice was enveloped in the hot but holy fire of God's infinite wrath, and the incense that ascended from it into the presence of Jehovah was perfumed with those graces of knowledge, filial submission, holy obedience, love to God's glory, and love to the souls of perishing sinners which characterised the adorable Jesus as Priest and Sacrifice. He magnified the law as a covenant of works, and unfolded the riches of the covenant of grace for the complete and everlasting redemption of sinners. Here, then, my friends, you may clearly see that Christ in His obedience and sufferings unto death is the "one offering" whereby you and I can obtain eternal redemption. Looking unto Jesus alone, we shall find in Him all that our souls shall need in view of death, judgment, and an endless eternity.

III.—But this leads me now to speak, in the third place, of the perfection He has accomplished by this one offering. "By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." What perfection is this?

It is to be noticed that the word, "perfect," is used in various senses in Holy Scripture. It is sometimes employed in a comparative sense. "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect," says the Apostle Paul in First Corinthians, second chapter. There he refers to the perfection of regeneration, or of spiritual maturity. Believers are "perfect," as compared with unbelievers; and some Christians are "perfect," in the sense of having reached a greater maturity of knowledge and godliness than others. Then the word is used in an absolute sense. "Be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect." The Lord Jesus here points out to His disciples the goal of absolute perfection which they were to seek as matter of attainment—perfect conformity to the character and will of their Father in heaven. I may say that the perfection

spoken of in our text appears to be complex in its nature, both absolute and comparative. Let us notice the respects in which the Great High Priest has perfected His people.

1. Christ, by His one offering, has perfected them *in relation to the requirements of law and justice*. He has made a perfect atonement for all their sins.

Those for whom Christ acted in His priestly office during the days of His flesh were under condemnation, and could by no means find access to the favour and fellowship of God unless the demands of the righteous law were satisfied. Now, the Lord Jesus, by His one substitutionary offering, has perfectly satisfied the requirements of God's justice. He endured the full penalty of disobedience in their room and stead, suffering for sins, "the just for the unjust, to bring us to God." His satisfaction may be called infinitely perfect, for it was the satisfaction of Him who was both God and man—"God manifest in the flesh." Such perfect satisfaction the law could never have received from any or all of the race of Adam, though they had continued in original innocence. Here is Immanuel—God in our nature—obeying His own law and satisfying His own justice. He has magnified the law and made it honourable before the whole universe. As covered with the merits of His obedience unto death, His people stand perfect in the presence of the law as a covenant of works. They stand perfect in the presence of the righteous Judge, who must exact all that that covenant requires from the guilty. God, as lawgiver, beholds the whole election of grace perfect in Christ. "He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. v. 21).

Such all of them were in Christ, as their representative, at the moment He finished the work which was given Him to do, but the truth of it had to be applied, individually and experimentally, to a vast multitude of them in the succeeding ages—a work, indeed, that will not be completed until the end of time.

2. Then, secondly, I observe as a consequence of this perfection in Christ, that they are personally made "*perfect as pertaining to the conscience*."

The sacrifices of the law could not make the worshippers thus perfect. They were quite insufficient to satisfy the requirements of an awakened and enlightened conscience. They were not intended for this purpose, though the spiritually ignorant were no doubt finding a superficial satisfaction and rest in them. The Lord desired that sinners should look through and beyond these sacrifices to "the Lamb" who was to appear in due time to take away sin "by the sacrifice of himself," and those who were savingly taught were longing for the coming of this Lamb of God in whose work they should behold a perfect remedy for sin and all its consequences.

Let us notice, then, that the Divine High Priest by His one offering has provided perfect satisfaction for the conscience.

The conscience is the vicegerent of God in man's soul. It has suffered considerably by the Fall, but when awakened and instructed by the Spirit of God through the word of truth, it does its proper work with power, and makes its voice to be heard by the poor sinner. The conscience then re-echoes the just demands of the law, and calls for satisfaction to these demands. Possibly the soul who has such a conscience may for a season run to a great variety of expedients wherewith to stay the law's requirements and pacify the voice within, but no real or abiding rest is found. The best works of fallen men are utterly insufficient to give the necessary peace, for they are corrupt in heart, if not in form. Thus it comes to pass that not till the poor sinner flees to Christ unreservedly as the one atoning sacrifice is he made perfect as pertaining to the conscience. Then, and then alone, does his conscience find the perfect satisfaction which is suited to its constitution and graciously provided by God in the gospel.

True it is that the children of God are not always able to retain this peace in experience. Darkness and unbelief and sometimes mistaken views of the way of life interfere with their happiness in this respect. But still they are not entirely cut off from Christ, though they lose their hold in conscious experience of their perfect acceptance in Him. The blessed Spirit leads them anew to His feet, and enables them again and again to act faith on His perfect sacrifice, and they can bear testimony at such seasons. "I find perfect satisfaction, perfect rest, perfect peace there. When I come as a poor sinner to the precious blood of atonement, and rest by faith on the word in which it is held forth, I am made perfect as to satisfaction for the present and hope for the future; I need nothing else and want nothing more than 'Jesus Christ and Him crucified.'"

3. Still further, my friends, let us observe that Christ has perfected His people in the sense that by this one offering *He has made perfect provision as to their complete sanctification*. Wherein does this appear?

Well, observe that His name was called Jesus, because He should "save his people from their sins." He died, not only to save poor sinners from the guilt of their sins, but from the power of their sins. He offered the one sacrifice with a view to make His people holy as well as just—with a view to regenerate and sanctify them as well as to pardon and justify them. He hath perfected in Himself the means whereby He shall make them perfect inwardly in their souls, as well as outwardly in their relation to God. The Apostle elsewhere tells us that "Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Ephes. v. 25-27). It may be said that the people of God are *potentially* perfected in Christ as to their sanctification as well as

their justification. Everything is in the glorious Redeemer that is necessary to make them holy even as God is holy. As the result of His finished work, Christ has received the Holy Spirit in His saving influences that He may send the Spirit forth to communicate all the blessings of the covenant to His redeemed ones, and thus gives them possession of the inheritance in all its perfect completeness. And if you read the succeeding context, you will see that sanctification as well as justification is in the immediate view of the Apostle. "Whereof the Holy Ghost is a witness to us ; for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, said the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them : and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more."

4. Let us observe, lastly, in this connection, that Christ has perfected his people "for ever." It is everlasting perfection He bestows.

This is pre-eminently the case in regard to His representative work on their behalf. He perfected them as to the requirements of law and justice by His one sacrifice, and that perfection can never be annulled, but will stand fast for ever. Similarly, their justification, on the ground of His righteousness, in a day of power, can never be changed. The act of justification on God's part is complete, perfect, unalterable, and everlasting. The inward changes they experience in their apprehension of their justification do not make void God's gift or alter their actual and gracious relationship. Their perfect justification is "for ever." Still, again, though they do not always enjoy inward peace in their consciences, through the inroads of remaining sin, yet they are beside the well of life and will never be vitally separated from it, but will be led again and again to betake themselves by faith to Christ crucified, and find the same perfect satisfaction and rest in their souls as they did at first. Then, their potential sanctification in Christ is also an enduring inheritance which will be enjoyed in its perfect fulness beyond death in the land of eternal uprightness.

IV.—Our fourth and last general head is the description given of the people who are perfected by Christ's offering, "them that are sanctified."

Now, friends, the word "sanctified" is used here and elsewhere in this Epistle, not so much in the sense of inward positive holiness, as in the sense of deliverance from guilt and defilement. Those "that are sanctified" in the sense of our text are not those who have been made perfectly holy in heart and life. Not such at all ; but those who, by grace, have come to "the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than that of Abel," and have been cleansed from reigning guilt and impurity. Every justified person is one of the sanctified in the sense of our text. "The blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John i. 7). Every poor soul, therefore, who has been led to the fountain opened for

sin and uncleanness is sanctified in the sense of our Apostle here. His conscience has been purged from guilt in a day of mercy, and he has been separated from a world lying in wickedness in his life and conversation. Now all these have been perfected by Christ in the manner already imperfectly explained. He has made perfect provision for their everlasting acceptance before God, and their everlasting enjoyment of all gospel benefits. They have a perfect High Priest who has offered a perfect sacrifice, and obtained a perfect redemption to meet their soul's necessities in time and for ever and ever.

Well, my friends, in conclusion, it should be a matter of serious enquiry with each one of us as to whether we are among the sanctified or not. Have we found out to begin with, that as fallen creatures we are among the unsanctified, the unholy, the corrupt, the guilty, the hell-deserving? Have we been led to see that if left to ourselves we shall be with wicked men and the devil and his angels at last? Have we been disposed and enabled to look to the Lord Jesus alone as our Saviour, Redeemer, High Priest and perfect Sacrifice? If so, then we are among them that are sanctified. We may sometimes feel as if it was only more corrupt and unholy we were getting instead of growing in grace, but if the sense of indwelling sin leads us to look to and depend more and more upon Christ as our all in all, and causes us to be more tender and watchful in our life and conversation, it is well. Your complete perfection is in Christ, and will be seen in all its glory and beauty at the last day. On the other hand, pause and consider, you, my hearers, who have no sense of these things pertaining to sin and redemption. If you do not turn to God in Christ by repentance and faith in the days of time, you will yet be perfectly conformed to the image of Satan, and shall suffer along with him in the place of never-ending misery. "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." The Lord in His infinite mercy open your eyes to see your sins, and to flee for cleansing, renewing and perfect pardon and acceptance to the great High Priest of our profession, now entered within the veil and yet drawing near to us in the Gospel. "Able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him." May the Lord bless to us His Word!

LET me love the men that are in the world, but never the things of it. If I have too great affection for any worldly thing, I may expect an answerable affliction. Whatever I make an idol of will be a cross to me if I belong to Christ, and a curse if I do not. Man was not made for the world, but the world for man. The more the things of this world are known they will be the less admired and prized. And, indeed, riches are but dust; honours, shadows; pleasures, bubbles; and men, lumps of vanity, compounded of sinfulness and misery.—*John Brown.*

The Kikuyu Controversy: Presbyterianism and Episcopacy.

BY THE REV. D. MACFARLANE, DINGWALL.

THE controversy as to which is the true Church is of old standing. It is as old as the time of Cain and Abel, and this question has been more or less agitated in the Church ever since. It shall continue to be so till the millennium, when the question shall be shelved for a thousand years. It shall at the close of that glorious period be revived once more for a short season, and shall be finally settled by the Judge of all at His second advent to judge the quick and the dead at the last day.

In New Testament times this controversy was carried on between Christ and the Jews, who, though they crucified the Lord of glory, maintained that they were the only Church of God in the world, and unchurched all others outside the pale of their own communion. At the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century the question was discussed between Protestants and Papists, and though the latter persecuted unto death 60,000,000 Christians, they held that they were the only true Church of Christ on earth, and they unchurched and excluded from salvation all others outside the pale of their own Church. At the time of the Oxford movement in 1833 the question was controverted between Protestants in the Church of England and the Tractarians, who are now designated "High Church Anglicans," *alias* "Ritualists," and the controversy is still going on in the Church of England and other Churches at home and abroad.

The question raised by the ritualistic Bishop of Zanzibar is a direct attack upon Presbyterian and other non-Episcopal Churches. It ultimately resolves itself into the question of the *validity of Presbyterian ordination*. The Bishop holds that the ordination of Presbyterian ministers is not valid because not performed by a Bishop, and that Presbyterian Churches are not branches of the Church of Christ! This controversy is not to be settled by the opinions of men, but by the Word of God. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." Presbyterianism is supported by the Word of God, whereas Episcopacy has no warrant or authority in Scripture.

We can prove from Scripture that Presbyterian Churches that adhere to the Word of God as their only rule of faith and practice are branches of the Church of Christ, and we can prove from the same source that Ritualistic Churches are not branches of the Church of Christ, whatever they may profess. The Christian Church in the days of the apostles is the model to which we must bring all Churches that profess the Christian religion, in order to ascertain which are branches of the Church of Christ and which

not. In examining the Christian Church in the days of the apostles we shall notice:—

1. Its office-bearers. We find that there were two classes of office-bearers, elders and deacons. The elders were of two sorts—teaching elders, whose function was to teach and to rule; while the function of the other elders was to rule in conjunction with the teaching elders or ministers. In certain circumstances the ruling elders might teach also. The deacons' work was in connection with the finances of the Church, especially the money contributed by the members of the Church towards the relief of the poor (Acts vi. 1-6). Now, this is exactly the order that is followed in Presbyterian Churches. But in the Episcopal Church there are at least three orders of office-bearers—bishop, priest, and deacon. The name, bishop, in the days of the apostles was synonymous with the name, presbyter. The names, bishop and presbyter, did not mean two offices, but two aspects of the one and the same office. The Presbyter was an overseer (as the word, bishop, means) of his own congregation, but he had no jurisdiction over other pastors and their congregations (1 Peter v. 2). Peter himself, though an apostle, was a Presbyterian, and he was addressing, not bishops in the prelatie sense but Presbyterian ministers as to their duties towards their congregations. As for the name, *priest*, it has no warrant or authority in the Christian Church. In all the New Testament Scripture the name, *priest*, is not once mentioned, either in the original or in a correct translation, to denominate an office-bearer in the Christian Church. The only Priest of the New Testament is Christ, "the High Priest of our profession" (Heb. iii. 1). The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews proves this beyond doubt. It is surprising that men who profess to believe the Word of God should be so blind as not to see that all human priesthood was abolished and superseded by the priesthood of Christ. But some men are wise above what is written in the Scriptures, but their wisdom is foolishness in the sight of God. The retention of the name, priest, under the New Testament dispensation has been productive of many other errors, as the past history of the Church shows, which should be a warning to us. The sacerdotalism in the Church of England is one of the evil fruits of retaining the name, *priest*, in that Church.

2. Its doctrines. What were the doctrines taught in the Christian Church in the days of the apostles? We are not left to conjecture. We have these doctrines in the Acts of the Apostles and in their Epistles, and in the Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. They taught "all things whatsoever Christ had commanded them" (Matt. xxviii. 20). But Episcopalians teach many things which Christ never commanded. This is true, especially of Ritualists in the Church of England and in the Scottish Episcopal Church, who teach the commandments of men for doctrine, which Christ condemned as making void the law (or Word) of God. Presbyterian ministers who adhere to the

doctrines of God's Word, as contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, preach the same doctrines that were taught in the Christian Church in the days of the apostles. They preach "the faith once delivered to the saints," without adding to it or taking from it. Who will call them "heretics and schismatics" for this? None but anti-Christians. But who will believe anti-Christians? No person who believes God's Word.

3. Its worship. The worship of the Christian Church in the days of the apostles consisted of reading and expounding the Scriptures, singing of Psalms by the lips or voice without the accompaniment of an organ, and prayer spoken and not read from a prayer-book. This is the mode of worship practised in Presbyterian Churches that adhere to the Scriptural creed of the Church. This is not true of the Episcopal Church, especially the ritualistic portion of it. They have uninspired hymns, organs, read prayers, read sermons; so that a schoolboy might conduct the most part of public worship at a less salary than is paid to ordained clergymen. In Ritualistic Churches they have also *altars, crosses, incense, the mass* in the morning, under the name of "holy communion," the *abominable confessional* and *absolution, prayers for the dead, images of Christ, the Virgin Mary*, and other saints. So that there is no difference between them and the Church of Rome but the name. In fact, they are Romanists in disguise, and when it suits them they go over to the Church of Rome, like Cardinal Newman and many others. They have no resemblance whatever to the early Christian Church. They are therefore "heretics and schismatics," and should not be tolerated in a Protestant Church except as hearers only. Any person may come to hear the Gospel. But they would not remain long in a Protestant Church as hearers only. What they want is *office* in the Church, as bishops or archbishops, so as to make such changes in the Church as to undo the work of the Reformation, which brought unspeakable blessings to England, Scotland, and other countries of Europe. It brought an open Bible and a preached Gospel, by means of which many were translated from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son. Satan was angry at this, and he is now trying to show his revenge. He knows that the Bible is the powerful means of destroying his kingdom. Hence his hatred of the Bible and its doctrines, and his efforts, through the instrumentality of deluded men, to get it displaced by "the commandments of men," superstition, and idolatry. "The Lord rebuke thee, Satan."

4. Its government. So far as we learn from the teaching and practice of the apostles the government of the Church was neither papal nor prelatic. It could not be papal because there was no Pope then; nor could it be prelatic, for Prelacy did not exist at that early period of the Church's history. Christ was their only Lord and Master, and all they were brethren, holding equal status in the Church. An ambition for superiority appeared among

them, but Christ nipped it in the bud; and it took at least two centuries before the presbyter was, on mere human authority, exalted above his brethren. This was the origin of Episcopacy. Episcopacy was the *root* from which the Papacy sprang. Any person reading Church history may see this. The Bishop was the father of the Pope, and strange to say, the poor father must now obey his son, or he will get his whipping.

Guided by the light of New Testament Scripture, we may confidently say that the government of the Church in the apostolic age was *Presbyterial*. The pastor, who was always a Presbyterian, not only preached the doctrines of God's Word to his congregation, but also ruled them in conjunction with ruling elders. This governing body in the congregation is now called the *Kirk-Session*. One congregation is in Scripture called a church, but as the apostles went on to preach the Gospel, according to Christ's command, and as the Lord added, through their preaching, to the Church such as should be saved, several congregations were formed and pastors were ordained over them—the ordination being performed not by a Bishop but by the *Presbytery* (1 Tim. iv. 14). The governing body of these several congregations consisted of the pastors of the congregations, together with their representative ruling elders, to whom matters in dispute were referred and by whom these matters were settled according to the law of the Church—the Word of God. As these congregations were not different denominations but branches of the *one Church*, it was meet that the governing body, which is called the Presbytery, should take an interest in all the congregations within their bounds and under their jurisdiction. But as the Church grew and congregations increased in numbers and widely apart throughout the land, and several Presbyteries formed, a higher Court of appeal was necessary, to which all matters of controversy were referred for final settlement. In our Presbyterian Church we call this highest Court the *Synod or General Assembly*. We have this highest Court of the Church not as a mere matter of human arrangement or expediency, but on the warrant of New Testament Scripture. In the fifteenth chapter of Acts we have a precedent for it. This meeting, convened at Jerusalem, was a General Assembly, for there were representatives present from all congregations of the Church concerned in the case submitted to the Court, and the case was decided by the unanimous consent of the "apostles, elders, and the brethren."

The government of the Christian Church is not monarchical—founded on a supposed *apostolical succession*. Both the Church of Rome and the Episcopal Church claim apostolical succession, but without any Scripture warrant or authority. For the apostles, as inspired men, were no ordinary office-bearers in the Church; their office was unique and temporary, and came to an end when they left the world. They had their commission direct from Christ—the Head of the Church—and they were ordained to

their office by Christ. This was true even of the Apostle Paul, which he proves when his apostleship is called in question. But no other office-bearer in the Church since Christ's ascension to heaven has been called, set apart, and ordained to his office in like manner. The only apostolical succession that can be claimed now is that of *doctrine*. The apostles left the doctrines they taught behind them, which we have in the Scriptures of the New Testament; and the ministers who hold and teach these doctrines are the true followers of the apostles, while those whose teaching is contrary to these doctrines have no claim to be the successors of the apostles, whatever they may profess. Ritualists should be the last to claim apostolical succession, for they teach the very opposite of what the apostles taught. They teach and practice idolatry, which Christ and His apostles condemned, and which God's prophets of old condemned, and which all Christ's true servants now condemn. It is evident from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments that idolatrous Churches are not branches of the Church of Christ. Ritualistic Churches are idolatrous; therefore they are not branches of the Church of Christ.

While we are in full sympathy with our fellow-Protestants in England, and doing all we can, by prayer and otherwise, to help them in their struggle against the Romanising work that is going on in their Church, we desire to point out some of the mistakes they made at the time of the Reformation, the bitter fruits of which they are now reaping.

1. The *form* of Church government they adopted. At the Reformation they rejected the Pope but retained the *popedom*. They put the government of the Church in the hands of one man—the King—who is the head of their Church, and who, through the Prime Minister, appoints bishops and archbishops to vacant charges in the Church. If those bishops and archbishops are Romanists they will intrude Romanising clergymen on Protestant congregations against their will, and thus deprive the people of the power of choosing their own pastors—a privilege that belongs to all Christians. And if the people complain that the pastors thus forced on them teach Romanism instead of the Gospel of Christ, and appeal to the bishops and archbishops for redress, they shall not be listened to. This is actually the case now in the Church of England, and this is one of the evil effects of the form of Church government they adopted at the Reformation. We have not yet observed that the Protestants in the Church of England, who are oppressed in a high-handed manner by their superiors, have come to see the real root of the evil, and therefore we wish to call their attention to it. In Presbyterian Churches the people have the power of choosing their own pastors, and if these pastors after their ordination preach Romanism or any other error, contrary to their ordination vows, the people have the right and the privilege of appealing to the Courts of the Church, with the result that the offending pastors must give up their heretical teaching or

be deposed. We have seen a Romanising clergyman tried at the Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, found guilty, and deposed. If the Archbishops in England were true Protestants they might deal with the Romanising Bishop of Zanzibar and other Romanisers in the same way. But will they do it? We fear not. But the people should demand it, and if the archbishops in any way encouraged the Romanising of the Protestant Church of England, the people should oppose them and appeal to the civil law of the country for justice. The Church of England is by law established. It is to be borne in mind that it was not *men* that were established, but the *Protestant doctrines* of the Church. Therefore no Romaniser should be permitted to enter the pulpit of the Church. The only place for such in the Church, whether he be a bishop or an archbishop, is as a hearer only, and if he is not pleased, let him leave and join a Church in which he may find as much idolatry as he can swallow.

2. The Church of England at the Reformation retained some dregs of Popery, such as the *sign of the cross* in baptism, *kneeling* at the Lord's Supper, *bowing* at the name of Jesus, *baptismal regeneration*, the names, *priest*, *bishop*, and *archbishop*, observance of *Christmas*, *Easter*, and other "holy days"—all which are unscriptural, and tend to Romanise the Church. Besides, she holds that she has power to *decree rites and ceremonies*. If so, why find fault with Ritualists?

We point out these mistakes in a Christian spirit and in brotherly love, believing that the Protestant Church of England is a branch of the Church of Christ, and that the ritualistic party in it, but not of it—represented by the Bishop of Zanzibar—is *not a branch of the Christian Church*.

"THOU that repentest not, look to the thing before thee, an eternity of wrath, ready to embrace thee everlastingly, a fire of hell abiding thee, and a worm that shall never die to gnaw thee eternally, and an eternity of torment to punish thee. O, eternity, eternity! Who will not be astonished to think on that eternity? O soul! why shakest thou not, and tremblest not, when thou hast mind of that eternity? Are these fables, think you, when I am telling you of these things, when I preach to you of eternity, and when I speak of a heaven and a hell to you, is it not the oracle of God? And is it not this truth, which the Son Himself that was from the beginning, and came out of the Father's bosom, and was upon the counsel of God, and knew all that was in the Father's heart? Is it not He that hath spoken this, for He has told you that there is a fire that shall never be quenched, and there is a worm that shall never die; and He that brought the glad tidings of salvation to a sinner that repents He has brought the same news from heaven that one day he shall throw all impenitent sinners into a lake that burns with fire and brimstone eternally."—*John Welch*.

The Baptised Family:

OR AN INQUIRY INTO THE CONDITION OF CHILDREN
IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY CAESAR MALAN, DOCTOR IN THEOLOGY.

~~~~~  
"For me and my house, we shall serve Jehovah."—JOSHUA xxiv. 15.  
~~~~~

(Translated for the first time from the French.)

(Continued from page 429.)

CHAPTER VII.—THAT WHICH WAS ONCE ORDAINED BY THE LORD CONTINUES IN FORCE AS LONG AS THE LORD HIMSELF DOES NOT REVOKE IT.

Samuel.—"It is true that God has not formally abolished that which He said concerning the infant children of His ancient people; but, on the other hand, neither has He repeated it nor confirmed it—things which I think He would have done if it had been His will to continue it."

The father of the family.—"Yet once more, Samuel, I must say that your mode of reasoning astonishes me. What! You, dear friend, reckon that what the Lord appointed of old is now revoked because He has not proclaimed it anew! In that way the commandments, the precepts, the doctrines, the promises, the consolations, wherewith the books of the prophets are full, are to us as though they were not, because they have not been reproduced and repeated in the Gospel! So that it is open to us, under the Gospel, to fear the coming of a second flood, because the promise which God made to Noah was not repeated in formal terms! What strange teaching, my brother!"

Samuel.—"My reasoning, I must admit, was not sound. Yes, I understand that the things which God ordained remain; at least until He has revoked them by a word as specific as that whereby He instituted them. It was thus, as I perceive, that He put an end to the Levitical ordinances: He formally revoked them."

The father of the family.—"Well, then, dear brother, if such a relation of parents to their children as had place in the primitive Church had no vital connection with the Levitical law, which alone was revoked, why should you say that that ancient relation has come to an end if God Himself has not said so?"

Samuel.—"I freely grant that I am not at liberty to do it. And yet it seems to me that if the Lord Jesus had meant that the children of believers, under the Gospel, should be members of His Church, and that they should bear the seal thereof, He would have said so, for the thing was important."

The father of the family.—"Ah, well! Now look if this reasoning is sound. Tell me, Samuel, if you believe that the Fourth Commandment is yet in force under the Gospel?"

Samuel.—"Yes, surely; and that for two positive reasons. First, that the ground on which the commandment is based—to wit, 'that God rested'—is to-day just what it was from the beginning of the world; and, second, that this commandment does not belong to the Levitical ordinances, and that therefore it has not been revoked with them."

The father of the family.—"And do you also think that the substitution of the Lord's Day instead of the day we call Saturday has been in accordance with the divine will?"

Samuel.—"Assuredly, since at the same time that the commandment to sanctify the seventh day is maintained intact, the analogy of the faith, in regard to the resurrection of the Saviour, is preserved. Besides, I can't believe that the Church apostolic would have made this change if the thing had not been according to the mind of the Holy Spirit, who directed them."

The father of the family.—"Nevertheless, my brother, although *that thing* also was *important*, the Lord did not say it over again, for not only did He not formally repeat the Fourth Commandment, but besides He did not make mention of the change of day. Why, then, on your way of reasoning do you keep the Sabbath, or transfer it to the first day of the week?"

Samuel.—"I own indeed that my reasoning has had something halting in it, seeing that if I am satisfied in respect of the Fourth Commandment, with the inferences upon which I have been proceeding, I ought also to admit their force in regard to the parallel case which now occupies our attention."

The father of the family.—"So I too think, and that is why I, without fear, affirm that now, under the Gospel (as was always the case under the same Gospel) the children of believers belong to the Church, because (1) the establishing ordinance which concerns them has never been revoked; (2) the ground upon which that ordinance was based is now the same as it had been at the beginning; (3) the consecration of children in this sense is in keeping with the analogy of the faith; (4) and lastly, because the apostolic Church counted them as saints,* a thing they did not do without the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Now, taking up these reasons *seriatim*, I ask in connection with the first of them, Where is it said in the Scriptures that God has withdrawn or abolished the blessing put upon the children of believers from the beginning, and notably in the family of Abraham, both before the Law was given and after it was given? You will not find it anywhere. It is not then permitted me on any account to imagine it.

I conclude then in regard to this first head that the blessing, because not revoked, continues, and therefore to-day, as then, it is of divine institution that the name of the Lord should be called

* Compare Eph. i. 1 with Eph. vi. 1; also Col. i. 2 with Col. iii. 20.—J. R. M.

on the child of a believing parent, to whom God to-day, as then, says, "I am thy God and the God of thy seed after thee, and my promise is for thee and for thy children." Let a Seth then, or an Abraham now re-appear, and his family, sealed with the name of Jehovah, will be named "the sons * or the children of God," and by that name they will be separated from the impious who slight and reject this sacred seal.

Besides, I observe that, even under the dispensation of the Law, the consecration of children was not based on any purely Levitical ordinance, but had for its ground a spiritual reason, to wit, that the name and the glory of Jehovah was put upon them (Micah ii. 9), and this was accompanied with a seal which had a spiritual import (Romans iv. 11). Moreover, I find that two commandments of the moral law directly concern them, for does not the Second Commandment pronounce a blessing or a curse upon them from generation to generation, and does not the Fifth Commandment enjoin upon children a duty, and add a promise to them that keep it?

I conclude therefore, in the second place, that infant children are within the Church of God, to whom belong the name, the glory, the commandments, and the promises of God; and that they are within the Church not in virtue of an ordinance which has had an end, but in virtue of a spiritual reason which remains to-day what it had ever been.

I go still farther: fifteen centuries have passed since the time of Moses, and there appear, first, 'he that should turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers,' and, next, the Lord Himself, who, having within the Church received the baptism of water before He received that of the Spirit, sets forth several things which are so far from abolishing that consecration of children which obtained in the primitive Church that they rather confirm and give the institution a new lustre. Thus in keeping with the prophecy which had been spoken concerning Him, 'that he would gather the lambs in his arms' (Isaiah xl. 11), I hear him bless the little children whom he took up into his arms, and on whom he laid his hands (Matthew xix. 13; Mark x. 13); and, according to the analogy of the faith, I conclude that these children whom He welcomed and whom He blessed are not outside 'the flock of His pasture.'

I understand Him also to say concerning these children (who, being Jews, had already been consecrated), that the kingdom of heaven appertained to them, and, according to the analogy of the faith, I conclude from this that the Gospel dispensation, which is this kingdom, does not cast them out from its bosom.

* I suppose Dr. Malan would support this statement by a reference [to] Genesis vi. 2, it being the commonly accepted view that "sons of God" here mean the descendants of Seth. Personally I am not satisfied that *Benē elohim* (sons of God) mean anything else than "the strong ones."—J. R. M.

He says also concerning those little children that, 'they may be received in his name,' that is to say, as He Himself puts it, 'because they are his disciples' (Matthew xviii. 5 ; x. 42), or as it is put in Mark ix. 41, 'because they belong to him,' and, according to the analogy of the faith, I conclude from all this, that, so far from being separated from their believing parents, little children belong to the people on whom 'the name of Christ is called,' and that they are thus of His 'disciples.'"

Samuel.—"Of His 'disciples,' say you? How can a little child be a disciple?"

The father of the family.—"Why not, if this discipleship is of divine authority, and one upon which we must enter not at all by choice or by acquisition, but by grace and by authority? Were not the little children of the slave family [see chapter ii.] *disciples of liberty*, in order that they might be instructed therein, although they had not the very knowledge thereof at the time? And we ourselves, Samuel, are not we ourselves disciples of the fulness of the knowledge which is in Christ, although in many respects we are yet strangers, both as to knowledge and feeling, to those mysteries which yet hold us under their power?"

Samuel.—"It is then the sovereignty of God and the majesty of His dispensations that you regard all the time?"

The father of the family.—"Yes, always ; and I reckon that it is a misunderstanding of discipleship when one thinks that one is such only when one personally consents to be such. When the Lord determines that His promise shall come to a tribe of men, and that the families of this tribe shall know it, it is this determination of God which constitutes them disciples, and they are not such only when they shall have actually laid hold of the promise, or when they shall have professed to have believed it. It is then, without doubt, that they become 'believing disciples,' 'obedient disciples,' 'true disciples,' 'disciples set free,' as the Lord Himself puts it (John viii. 30-33), but it is not then that they become enrolled in the number of the people upon whom the name of the Lord is called, for this was true of them when God caused it to be so."

Samuel.—"That view is new to me. I had always understood that a disciple meant a believer, or at least one that was actually being taught."

The father of the family.—"But your view has been defective, in so much as it overlooks the supremacy of the divine institution. Thus, for example, under the Law the little child was, along with its parents, under the pedagogy of the Levitical ordinances. He was the disciple in this sense even from the very beginning of his life. He was under that law—he was under those doctrines, those ordinances, those promises—and he had all this not from personal choice but from the divine appointment ; and in that the Jewish child differed essentially from the children of the Moabites or of the Greeks, who were but disciples of falsehood."

Samuel.—"That is very clear to me as to the Law, but is the case the same when our reference is to the spiritual doctrine of the Gospel?"

The father of the family.—"Let us be frank, dear Samuel, and do not let us forget that the Law also was spiritual in all that constituted the essential truth of it, its doctrine and its promises."

Samuel.—"I thank you, good friend; you have done well to reprove me."

The father of the family.—"Consider then, in this connection that when the Lord Jesus set forth the severe parable, as I may call it, of the vinedressers (Matthew xxi.), He declared to the rulers of the Jews "that the Kingdom of God should be taken from them, and should be given to a nation that should render the fruits in their season." That nation, as you know, were the Gentiles, and that Kingdom of God was the dispensation of the Covenant of Promise, even such as the Jewish people had been in possession of—the Levitical ordinances, which were only accidental, only a transitory circumstance in the constitution of the Kingdom, being here left out of account. Now, in this Kingdom, and according to its fundamental constitution, children were not separated from their parents, and were under obligation to carry on them the name of Jehovah—and so, according to the analogy of the faith, I without doubt conclude that in this Kingdom of God, now as then, the children are with their parents, and on them ought to be called the name of Jehovah."

Samuel.—"What shall I answer you? The induction is certainly simple and natural: can I then refuse assent to it?"

(To be continued.)

A Letter from Rev. J. B. Radasi, Rhodesia.—Rev. Neil Cameron has received a letter from Mr. Radasi, in which he refers to his visit to Lovedale and the young people there belonging to our Mission:—"I saw the two boys and the young girl from our Mission here being trained as teachers. They were all very well spoken of by the authorities at Lovedale. May the Lord bless them and keep them and give them grace that they might be a blessing to their people here if spared to return again! Our people are praying for them there, and we also hope that you will not forget them in your prayers. We are thankful that you have not forgotten us in your prayers. . . . I got the enclosed P.O. for £1, sent me by a friend in Kingussie. You will kindly thank the friend for me. Kindest regards to you, Mrs. Radasi joining.—Yours very sincerely,
JOHN B. RADASI."

"WHEN you send your prayers, be sure to direct them to the care of the Redeemer, and then they will never miscarry."—*Matt. Henry.*

Theatrical Amusements.

EXTRACTS FROM

A LECTURE BY THE LATE REV. J. B. BENNETT, M.D.

DURING the winter of 1846-47 a series of Lectures on a variety of literary, moral, and religious subjects was delivered by ministers before the Young Men's Christian Association in London. The following extracts are taken from one of these Lectures, the subject being "Theatrical Amusements." We are not otherwise acquainted with the sentiments of Dr. Bennett, but the present Lecture contains very sound and impressive remarks and appeals:—

I avow that I do not come forward as an undecided man on the subject of theatrical amusements. I do not come forward for the nice balancing of argument against argument, leaving to you to determine, without attempting to bias you. I come before you as one whose mind has been made up, to advance, as far as God may enable me, the truth on this question. I have long known what the theatre is; and if there be those here who are in the habit of attending it, I would say to them—perhaps there is not one more devoted than he who addresses you was for some years of his life; there was a period when I passed three or four nights every week in the theatre, and when performers were my intimate friends; I would retrench my meat, drink, and clothing to indulge in them. When I was led to see what I believe to be their evil tendency, there was scarcely anything that ever cost me such a sacrifice to give up, and had I not been deeply convinced that it was incompatible with religion, I should not have been led to do it. I come before you then as a decided and determined man upon the subject; as one who has been engaged in this controversy; as one who has suffered in this cause. My dear friends, should you think but little of my authority, perhaps you may think a great deal of Sir Walter Scott's, who, although a defender of the stage, has recorded this, "that Christianity from its first origin was inimical to the stage."

Now the question manifestly is, "Are the entertainments of the stage such as can be employed to the glory of God?" Are the amusements of the stage such as we could reflect upon with composure when we come to lay the head on a sick-bed or a dying pillow? Are they such as we believe that Christ, if He were now living on this earth, and who lived as our great example, that we might tread in His footsteps, would Himself tread in? Perhaps this may seem revolting! there may be many who would shrink from the idea of Christ being present at a performance going forward in one of the theatres of this metropolis. Let this notion have a still deeper practical operation on your minds. Do you shrink from that? Should you, as a

follower of Christ, go there? We have sometimes put this question, and very earnestly, What feelings do you connect with dying in a theatre? I would ask those who hear me, who are frequenters of theatres, to call to remembrance the scenes, the associations, the company with which they were mingled, and I would ask them, If sudden death should come on them, how would they be prepared to meet their God? I hold in my hand some notes which I have written; I shall take the liberty of reading them, as they contain some appeals to the consciences of those who are undecided.

Amongst other appeals to the consciences of those who are undecided on the question at issue, I would strongly urge the inquiry, whether they could contemplate with complacency, or without dismay, the possibility of being suddenly summoned from the theatre to stand at the bar of God. An able advocate of the stage, aware no doubt that this single consideration would be sufficient to induce in any reflective and conscientious persons a prompt acquiescence in the conclusion to which I wish to lead them, attempts thus to neutralize its influence: "When we are asked if we contemplate with complacency the possibility of dying during the performance of a play, we answer readily, No. We are shocked at such a supposition, but there are many other situations in which death would be equally undesirable: no one would wish to be summoned to his last account when sitting at table in familiar exercise of hospitality, when walking in the streets, or even in the unconscious hour of slumber. We wish to call our scattered spirits home, and to have time for awful preparation; and for this reason we supplicate for deliverance from sudden death." Especial attention is due to the concession made in this passage, which, coming from such a source, is striking and impressive. "We answer readily to the question, 'Would you be willing to die during the performance of a play?' 'No, we are shocked at such a supposition.'" The question then is, "Are those other circumstances under which it is urged death may unexpectedly come, so analogous with those connected with the stage, that to die in the theatre is not less unsafe, or more terrible than to die sitting at a table, walking in the street, engaged in business, or during sleep?" To this question I reply by a strong and unhesitating negation. I maintain that there is a wide and manifest difference between the situations referred to. It should indeed be deeply felt that death, under any circumstances, is an awful event, and beyond doubt, when it suddenly occurs, its awfulness is greatly augmented. Nothing can be more lamentable than the indifference with which some regard or affect to regard the closing scene; nothing more revolting than the flippant levity with which they speak of it; and I cannot refrain from recording my solemn conviction that the stage is one of the most powerful means of producing and fostering this unhappy state of mind. Many of the most esteemed, and in other respects

least objectionable plays, have a direct tendency to lead their admirers to something like apathy, if not recklessness, both as regards their own lives and the lives of others. Thus, as Mrs. Hannah More expresses it, "constituting in their full measure and proportion towards supplying a sort of regular aliment to the appetite (now dreadfully increased) for duelling and even suicide." There is great weight, too, in the observations of Dr. Plimpton, who, notwithstanding his strong attachment to the stage, says, "Murder and suicide are indeed two of the greatest engines of the drama, and it is to be feared tend very much to diminish the horror and impiety of them in the human mind." One instance, at least, is upon record of suicide attributed to the example of the stage; to these may be added the frequent exhibitions of deaths, in which the person departing out of this life into another is represented with views very different from those in which a Christian should consider himself, looking back like a sinner, penitent for his past sins, and humbly trusting in the merits of a Saviour for his pardon, but in many cases without any reference to past sins or future hopes; or in others, presuming on fancied virtue, and going, as it were, to claim his reward from a Deity of infinite justice and goodness. But however the disciples of the stage may think or speak upon this subject, every man who has the volume of revealed truth as his guide, must feel the momentous importance of the stroke of death. To be severed for ever from all earthly ties and connexions, to enter the mysterious world of spirits, to stand at the bar of an omniscient and inflexibly just Judge, to receive the sentence that shall fix the condition of the soul for weal or woe beyond the possibility of revisal; these are among the thoughts that operate with thrilling energy on every reflective mind in relation to the prospect of removal from earth. Even they who are "delivered from the bondage of the fear of death," and can rejoice in the experience of the apostle Paul, "To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain," are nevertheless very far from contemplating the event with familiarity or indifference; but however strong in faith and joyful through hope, they are bowed down in the deepest solemnity at the prospect, and would, generally speaking, pray to be delivered from sudden death. Entertaining such feelings, I shall, I trust, be acquitted of any disposition to lower down the proper standard of that "awful preparation" necessary to a safe and happy departure from this life; although I declare my belief that a man may be suddenly summoned from the midst of such scenes as the writer alluded to has enumerated, and yet leave to his bereaved friends the most precious balm for the stricken spirits—the undoubted assurance that he has died safely and entered into the rest that remaineth for the people of God; whilst no such an amount of certainty could be possessed with regard to one who died in the midst of scenes so strongly opposed to true Christian feelings, as many of those in the theatre are. A

lady once put this striking question to the Rev. John Wesley, "If you were sure that you must die to-morrow night at ten o'clock, how would you spend your time?" His prompt and characteristic reply was, "How, madam? I would preach to-morrow morning at Gloucester at five o'clock; I would preach at Tewkesbury at twelve; return and preach at Gloucester at six; spend a cheerful and profitable hour with my friends after the labours of the day, and then I would retire—

'My body with my charge lay down,
And cease at once to work and live.'

This work he had engaged to do next day, and he felt no need to make the slightest deviation from it. And well would it be for us all, my Christian friends, if we could take up the same language as John Wesley used if the same question were put to us; and sure am I that there is not one who hears me, who, if the question were put, "If you were sure to die to-morrow?" would answer, "I would go to the theatre to-night," and deem that, in so doing, you were making a fit preparation for eternity. You know the fact, my Christian friends, and it is an appalling fact, that individuals among the auditory have frequently died in theatres; and more, there are not a few cases even of actors dying upon the stage itself, cases which actors themselves admit to have taken place. Now, if this mode of life is such as will not bear the scrutiny of an awakened and enlightened conscience, no doubt the entrance of sudden death is not only undesirable but terrible in the extreme; and believing, as I deliberately and conscientiously do, that the profession of the stage is one that will not come unhurt from the ordeal, I can easily understand why a theatrical writer should be shocked at such a supposition as the possibility of dying during the performance of the *Stranger*, or the superintendence of the rehearsal of *Giovanni in London*; but I will add, from the brief records of my own experience, that many, while they felt the deep solemnity of death, had no painful apprehension as to when or how they should be called away, and who from day to day entered upon their lawful avocations under the conviction that to be diligent in business is a duty of imperative obligation, in no degree incompatible with being "fervent in spirit, serving the Lord," and that they were best prepared for their removal from earth when they were found faithfully discharging the duties of the hour, whatever the duties of that hour might be.

Indeed, even the friends of the stage sometimes admit, though unintentionally, yet as fully as could be desired, that its amusements are incompatible with serious thoughts. An example of this kind occurred some time since at Dublin. We all remember, for who can forget the awful desolating storm of January, 1839. It so happened that the performance at the Theatre Royal on the following evening was for the benefit of the African Roscius, but

even the thoughtless were startled by the tragic effects of the hurricane: the theatre on that night was comparatively empty, and the receipts considerably below the expenses. I will here introduce an anecdote of the late Rev. James Hervey, the well-known author of the *Meditations*, etc. He was on a certain occasion travelling in a coach in company with a lady who dwelt with enthusiasm on the delight she experienced in attending the theatre. Amongst other things she observed, "I enjoy a threefold pleasure in the amusement; there is the pleasure of anticipating the performance, then the pleasure of witnessing it, and then there is the pleasure of thinking and speaking of it afterwards." Mr. Hervey observed, "There is a fourth pleasure to which you do not advert." "What can that be?" she eagerly asked. "The pleasure, madam," replied Mr. Hervey with solemnity, "which it will give you on your deathbed, to reflect on the time and money which you have thus expended." The lady was surprised, and said no more at the time; but it is added that she felt and owned subsequently the convincing force of the remark. Oh, if persons could only be brought to view the subject now as they will view it when they come to die, little argument upon it would be needed. There is another point to which reference must be made here; it is one of great interest and moment. If it is shocking to think of one of the audience dying during the performance, should we not shudder to think of a player being summoned suddenly from the stage to the awful tribunal of God? This is an event of which various instances are upon record: In October, 1758, Mr. Joseph Peterson, while performing the *Duke* in *Measure for Measure*, had just uttered the words—

"Reason thus with life:
If I do lose thee, I do lose a thing
That none but fools would keep: a breath thou art,"—

when he fell into the arms of Mr. Moody, and never spoke more. A gentleman of the name of Bond, while performing *Insignau* in *Zara*, fainted away in the scene where he discovers his daughter; the audience rapturously applauded what they thought to be fine acting, but in a few minutes it was found that his eyes were closed for ever. Mrs. Jefferson, an actress of great personal beauty, while looking on a dancer, who was practising at the Plymouth Theatre, was seized in the midst of a hearty laugh with a sudden pain, and almost instantly expired. In August, 1798, a similar circumstance took place in the Liverpool Theatre: Mr. John Palmer, while performing the part of the *Stranger* in the famous or infamous play of that name, fell, heaved a convulsive sigh, and breathed no more. The Dublin Theatre has also been the scene of such an occurrence at a period so recent that the circumstances connected with it must still be vividly remembered by many. Mr. Fuller, a popular comedian, during the performance

of the farce of *Brother and Sister*, had just sung a foolish song, incidental to his part, when he staggered to the side-scene, and fell dead. The sight of a dead body under any circumstances will bring a feeling of solemnity to the well-regulated mind; but there are probably some persons still living who have not yet forgotten the depth of the impression made on them by a spectacle so awful, incongruous, and hideously revolting as a dying or dead body with painted cheeks, attired in the tinsel and splendour of a rich stage-dress. There occurs to my mind just at this moment an address spoken not long ago by a leading actress at Edinburgh—it bears directly on this point. It was on the occasion of her own benefit, when she came forward in *propria persona*, and, amid many other allusions to her professional efforts, she tells the audience that

“While most women only die to tease you,
I act most kindly, dying still to please you;
One night the dagger rids me of my woes,
The next some potent poison quite o’erthrows
My spirit; and a third night sees me slain
By a vile bullet piercing through my brain:
*No saint, in short, leads such a life as I,
For half is spent in learning how to die.*”

This was received with rapturous applause. I could not help saying, when I read this, Poor thoughtless girl, flower-crowned victim at the shrine of pleasure, frightful would be the contrast to your feelings, as well as your circumstances, should—which God forbid!—the stroke of death come on you, without a preparation widely different from that which you advert to. But what shall we say of the audience calling themselves Christians, who greeted such language with loud applause? Let me but echo the words of an excellent writer: “Glance upon those who claim a name for philanthropy. If they still insist on upholding the theatre, the pious and the kind entreat them to withhold their treacherous patronage, as they value God’s law, as they have compassion on immortal souls, as they would not have voices in torment breathing curses on their destroyers.”

Perhaps I may here take the opportunity of drawing your attention to the important fact that a great majority of Christian writers have always been opposed to the *stage*. If we were to select the most eminent of the present day from the different denominations; if we were to select those names that would occur to us as belonging to men of devoted piety, high moral attainments, and eminent practical usefulness, we should find them without exception bringing their testimony to bear on the same point as I have been endeavouring to bear upon to-night. I stand up as a sturdy and uncompromising advocate of private judgment; I do not mean to withhold that right in its fullest and most expansive degree on the present occasion; yet, my dear friends, there is something to be said here. Although I hold the

right of private judgment, and although I concede that right in its most extended exercise to every individual, there is danger on the other hand of paying too little attention to the authority of the wise and the good; and if there be among those friends to whom I am addressing these observations any, and I hope, if any, but few, who do not concur in what I have said, I will say to you, If I can bring before you to a certainty, that the greatest men of the present and past day have professed themselves in the most earnest manner against the stage, it is not then, my dear Christian friends, asking too much of the young to suspect the conclusion that he or she feels inclined to come to against this array of testimony? Is it too much to ask you to suspend your judgment until you have examined more thoroughly into the case?

I will read two or three testimonies of individuals whose names are known to many of you—individuals who have strongly and unequivocally expressed their opinions with regard to this matter. (I would here just observe to you, that although I read from a printed pamphlet, it is my own, it was printed some years ago, so of course I can make free with my own child.) I will first call your attention to the opinion of a high, noble, and honourable name; I hope that there is not one who does not honour the name of Wilberforce. May I ask my young Christian friends to listen to that universally-esteemed philanthropist, William Wilberforce's testimony with regard to the stage. "There has been," said this esteemed man, "much argument concerning the lawfulness of theatrical amusement. Let it be sufficient to remark, that the controversy will be short indeed if the question were to be tried by the criterion of love to the Supreme Being. If there were anything of that sensibility for the honour of God, and of that zeal in His service which we show on behalf of our earthly friends, or of our political connexions, should we seek our pleasure in that place where the debauchee, inflamed with wine, or bent on the gratification of other licentious appetites, finds most congenial to his state and temper of mind; in that place, from the neighbourhood of which (now unjustly termed a school of morals) decorum and modesty and regularity retire, while riot and lewdness are invited to the spot, and invariably select it for their chosen residence; where the sacred name of God is often profaned; where sentiments are often heard with delight, and motions and gestures often applauded, which would not be tolerated in private company, and which far exceed the license allowed in the social circle, without at all trespassing on the large bounds of theatrical decorum; where, when moral principles are inculcated, they are not such as a Christian ought to cherish in his bosom, but such as it must be his daily endeavour to extirpate—not those which Scripture warrants, but those which it condemns as false and spurious, being founded in pride and ambition and over-valuation of human favour."

(To be continued.)

Suipeir an Tighearna: Rivetus.

*Teagasg, a chum gu'm bitheadh iadsan le'm b'àill 'tighinn gu
h-ìomchuidh gu bord naomh an Tighearna air an
ullachadh roimh laimh;*

LEIS AN URR. ANDREAS RIVETUS.

(Air eadar-theangachadh o'n Laidinn airson a' cheud uair.)

(Air a leantuinne o t. d. 435.)

AN NAOTHAMH CAIBIDEIL,

*Annas am bheil (a reir doigh riaghailt choitchionn) seoladh air a
thoirt dh'an chreidmheach, cia mar a dh'fhaodas e cainnt a
chur air na nithean ud a thaobh am bheil e mothachail
gu'r h-iad gu h-araidh na nithean iad leis am bheil e a
nis air a chur thuige.*

A N deigh dh'an chreidmheach na nithean ud a smuaineachadh aige fein, agus an deigh dha e fein fhaotainn anns an t-suidheachadh inntinn a chaidh ainmeachadh, air dha 'bhi air tì tarruing am faisg do Dhia, faodaidh e feum a' deanamh dhe'n riaghailt aideachaidh air peacanna a leanas, air neo air ni-eigin cosmhuil ris a so: riaghailt a thaobh, nach e a mhain gu-m beachd smuainich e 'na chridhe agus 'na smuain air, ach mar an ceudna air an cur e cainnt le a bhillibh, chum as mar sin gu'n gluais e e fein suas ni's mo:

O mo Dhia, feuch tha mise 'ga mo thaisbeanadh fein ann ad lathair-sa, mise, 'tha 'nam chreutair ciontach, ann an lathair rìgh-chaithir d' fhireantachd-sa, rìgh-chaithir, d'ur a smuainicheas mi uimpe, a tha ag aobharachadh dhomh a bhi air mo lionadh le uamhunn, agus sin airson lionmhoireachd mo pheacaidhean, agus tha do lathaireachd 'ga mo chur air chrith. 'Sann a dh' iarruinn, n'am faodadh e a bhi, gu'r h-ann a tharruinginn mi fein air falbh uat, agus gu'r h-ann a ghabhainn comhairle mu theicheadh uat, 'nuair a bheachdaicheas mi orm fhein mar neach, nach e a mhain gu bheil mi ruisgte de fhireantachd agus de naomhachd, ach mar an ceudna, gu bheil mi comhdaichte le aingidheachdan, agus mi mi-mhaiseach le salchar peacaidh. Bha mo thoiseach air a thruailladh, agus rugadh m' aingidheachd comhladh rium, agus eadhon, comhladh ris a' bhainne, dheothail mi e, a' tarruing puinnsean marbhtach orm fhein, ni a tha a nis 'g a mo losgadh agus 'ga mo chaitheamh anns an taobh a stigh dhiom. Chuir mi truailidheachd ri truailidheachd, agus chuir mi ann an lionmhoireachd iad, cha'n ann a reir aireimh mo bhliadhnachan, ach mo laithean, seadh m'uairean, agus mo mhionaidean. Och, mise, cia trom an t-uallach 'th'air mo ghuailean-sa, ionnus 's gu bheil mi tuiteam fo a thruime. Co a bheir fuasgladh dhomh? A' d'aghaidh a mhain pheacaich mi, agus rinn mi olc a' d' shealladh, na mo smuaintean, 'na mo bhriathran, agus 'na mo ghniomharan.

Bha uile bhuill mo chuirp 'nan armachd eucoir do'n pheacadh, dh' an d'rinn mo shuilean agus mo chluasan agus uile bhuidhean mo chuirp seirbhis. Thilg mo thuigse dh'orch' mi an coinneamh mo chinn, chog mo thoil cheanairceach ann an aghaidh do thoil naomh-sa, agus bhris m' aignidhean, mar shruth dian, troimh na h-uile balla-daingneachd a chaidh a chur suas ann am aghaidh. Ciod a ni mi, mo Thighearn Dia? C'aite an teich mi? Cha'n'eil an t-aite sin ann anns nach faigh Thusa mach mi cha'n'eil, air neamh, no air talamh, no ann an ifrinn shios. An iarr mi Thu fhein? Ach tha mi fo namhunn air eagal 's gur h-ann a loisgeas d' fhearg ro-cheart ann am aghaidh-sa, 'tha toilteaneach air fearg. Ach na tig ann am breitheanas gu d'oglach; oir ann ad fhianuis cha'n fhireanaichear duine beo air bith. Deonaich domh cridhe briste da rìreadh, agus miann naomh as deigh ath-leasaichidh beatha; nithean ris am bi suil agam uat do bhrìgh 's d'ur tha Thusa 'gan tiodhlacadh gu saor orm agus 'gan oibreachadh annam, gu bheil mi mothachadh agus gu bheil mi fiosrach air Thu a bhi a' labhairt agus a' teagasg mar gu'm beadh comhladh ri mo chridhe: "gu bheil maitheanas agadsa chum as gu'n strìochdamaid ann ad eagal duit"; agus, "O Thighearn, eisd, O Thighearn maith, O Thighearn cluinn agus dean, na dean moille, air do shon fein, O mo Dhia": air sgath an Tighearn sin a thug Thu dhuinn 'na Fhear-saoraidh. Air a sgath-san deonaich gu'r h-ann a chithinn do chathair-rioghail air a teanndaidh, dh'am mo thaobhsa, o a bhi 'na cathair ceartas lom, gu a bhi 'na cathair trocair agus grais. Abair Thusa, "Is mise, mise fein esan a dhubhas d'eu-ceartan as, air mo sgath fein; agus do lochdan cha chum mi air chuimhne." Tha na briathran so 'ga mo thogail suas, agus ag aobharachadh dhomh a bhi a' stiùireadh mo ghlaodh thugadsa, oir, ann an aite leanamh-feirge, tha Thu 'ga mo ghabhail airson mic, troimh shaorghrais na h-uchdmhacachaidh. Feuch uime sin, agus amhairc air do Mhac Fein, a thug E fein suas mar phris mo shaorsa-sa, a thug air falbh peacaidhean an t-saoghail, agus thug gu tur air falbh agus a chuir air cùl mo pheacadh-sa, neach a tha a nis a' tabhairt domh seul agus earlas air beannachd a cho mor, aig a bhord fhein. Theid mi air m' aghaidh uime sin, agus suidhidh mi sìos a' measg nan uidhean: ach a mhain le rùn naomh air mo bheatha a bhi air a h-atharrachadh gus a chuid is fearr, comhladh ri fuath do mo sheachraineam uile, agus beo-iarrtas air gu'm faodadh Esan a bhi beo annam a thug E fein air mo shon gu bas, agus nach b'e mise a so suas a bhitheadh beo, ach gu'm bitheadh Crìosd beo annam, agus a' bheatha a tha mi a nis a' caitheamh 's an fheoil, gu'm bithinn 'g a caitheadh tre chreidimh Mhic Dhe, a ghradhaich mi, agus a thug E fein air mo shon. Air a sgath-san agus annsan tha mi a' tighinn le earbsa gu rìgh chaithir nan gras, agus nì mò tha an geur-cheartas, a fhuair riarachadh 'nam Fhear-saoraidh, a' cur crith agus eagal orm; m' Fhear-saoraidh a tha toileach E fein a thabhairt domh gu saor, chum as gu'n deanamh E a chuid fein dhìom gu sìorruidh. Dean,

a Thighearn, gabh sealbh air do sheirbhiseach gu h-ìomlan, agus na ceadach dha a so suas a bhi air a tharruing air falbh uat, an deigh dhuit a tharruing a' d'ionnsuidh, na ceadach dha a ris tuiteam ann an daorsa do na mhuinntir sin gur h-ann o'n aintighearnas a shaor Thu e. Dean, oir is e an tì dh'am maith Thu moran, a bheir gradh mor. Gabh tiodlac an neach a tha a' tabhairt suas na h-uile nì dhuit, eadhon e fhein a bha air thuasgladh agus air a chur saor leat fhein. Deonaich gu sineadh e a mach lamh naomh, agus 'th'air a glanadh ann an neo-chiontas, gus na soithichean naomha a ta fa chomhair, agus air dha beathachadh air na biadhan slainteil so, gu'm bitheadh e beo gu sìorruidh. Amen.

(*Ri leantuinn.*)

Gaelic Poems.

BY THE LATE ALEXANDER COOK, MISSIONARY, SALTCOATS.*

I.—IOSEPH.

GED gheibhinnse onoir, 's ged gheibhinnse stòr,
 Cha bu mhòr leam mo chòir, mur faighinn thu féin.
 B' fhearr suidh' air an òtrach, ag iarraidh do ghloir,
 Na cathraichean òir, le d' mhallachd 'n an déigh.
 Tha mòran a' sireadh 's a' sgrìobadh an òir,
 'S Ochoin! cha 'n 'eil sòlas idir 'n a dhéigh.
 B' fhearr mionaid a' d' chomunn-s', ag itheadh de d' bhòrd,
 Na ònoir, is glòir, is comunn an t-saoghail.
 Nam faighinnse tuille de d' chomunn 's an fheòil,
 Is tuille de d' cheòl, air feadh nan deich teud,
 Biodh m'anam ag imeachd gu Sion na glòir',
 A' seinn na laoidh' mhòir a' dìreadh an t-sléibh.
 An là mo dhunaidh do iarr mi thu,
 Is m' anam gu dlù a' leantuinn a' d' dhéigh,
 'S ged theireadh tu ruim "na tig-sa dhomh dlù,"
 Cha tionndainn-s' mo chùl gus am faighinn mo ghaol.
 Bha m' anam ro theann 's ro dhian air do thòir,
 Is plogail ro mhòr a stigh ann am chléibh,
 A' bùireadh mar fhiadh airson na doch bheò,
 'S cha ghabhadh E òr, 's cha ghabhadh e leug.
 Bha gaol aig mo chridh 'air t' aon Mhac beò,
 'S air làn mo bheòil 'a tobar na treud;
 'S mur faighinnse sbruileach cha bhithinnse beò,
 An laithibh mo bhròin is m' osnaich ro ghéir.

* The Author of this poem was first cousin to Rev. Archibald Cook, late of Daviot, Inverness-shire. There was a very striking resemblance between the two men as regards the deep spirituality and intense earnestness of their minds. This poem reveals a fertile mind; a wide knowledge of the Scriptures; and a rare power to apply the same to the cases of the Lord's people.

'Nuair thairrginn am fagus a lùbadh mo ghluin,
'Se solus do ghnùis' bhiodh m' anam 'n a dhéigh ;
'S nuair gheibhinn fo d' bhrataich a thagradh mo chuis,
Cha 'n fhàginnse cuil, 's cha 'n fhàginnse creuchd.

'N sin sgaoilinn mo lotan fa chomhair do shùl,
'S cha 'n fhàginnse lùb nach innsinn duit féin ;
Gach troitear is gaduich' 'bhiodh bagradh mo chrùn,
Rachadh air cùl le anail do bhéil.

Bhiodh Iosa le ola ag ungadh mo shùl,
'S a sgeadach' mo ghùis le trusgan nan deur ;
'S bu mhillis bhi blasad do aran na tùis',
Air fhuineadh gu dlù le fuil na fion chraoibh.

Cha chumadh gach aran 'n sin m' anamsa beò,
'S cha b' urrain mi sòlas a tharruing o phlaosg ;
Ged dh-fhoghnadh le coigrich faileasan mòr,
Is ainm a bhi beò gun eòlas Mhic Dhé.

O 'n chaidh an anail a shéideadh cho beò
Le Spiorad Iehobhah stigh ann mo chléibh,
Bha acras is pathadh is fadal gu leòir
A' tarruing co-chomhla m' anam a' d' dheigh.

'Nuair gheibhinnse sealladh de aghaidh 'n a glòir,
'Sa sgapadh na neòil o aghaidh nan speur,
'N sin chluichinn is sheinninn', 's bu shuim do mo cheòl,
Bhi moladh do mhòrachd a thug mi o'n Eiph't.

'S e d' fhàbhor, 's do dheadhghean, 's do chaoimhneas bha mòr,

'S e 'n t-loghnadh as mò iad sin a bhi saor—
Gu 'n cuireadh tu dh' onoir air cnuimh anns an fheoil,
Gu 'm faigheadh e beò ded phògaibh ro chaomh'.

Tha fion agus bainne gun ghainn' air a bhòrd,
'S an drùchd sin tha beò air an fhaiche do 'n treud,
'S tha 'n Spiorad, 's an Eaglais, 's gach deisciobul òg,
'S am buachaille mòr toirt cuiridh dhoibh fein.

"Ithibh, mo chairdean, de m' fhuil is de m' fheòil ;
'S mise bhur n-Ioseph 'reic sibhse do 'n Eiph't,
'S ged thig sibh a cheannach is airgiod 'n ur dorn',
'S thann a tha an stòr a th' agam-sa saor.

"Fagaidh e 'n t-anam nis beartaich ra bheò
Na Alastair Mòr a cheannsaich an saogh'l ;
O faicibh, is blaisibh, is thigibh am chòir,
Is mise bhur n-Ioseph 'reic sibh do 'n Eiph't.

"An uair a bhios cunnart, 's an uair a bhios bròn,
'S an uair a bhios lòn 'n 'ur n-uireasbhuidh fein—
'Bhios ciont air a choguis, 's an t-anam fo leòin,
'S e Dia 'chuir Ioseph roimhibh do 'n Eiph't.

“Ged bhitheas ifrinn a’ bualadh le ’dorn,
 ’S air sreaing ann an ordugh a sàighdibh gu léir,
 Thig comhnadh á Sion, gabh misneach, ’s bi beò,
 ’S e Dia ’chuir Ioseph romhad do ’n Eiph’t.

“Ged a thig gort anns an dùthaich ’bhios mòr,
 ’S nach faigh thu bhi beò, thu féin na do spréidh,
 Dean amharc le creidimh a dh’ ionnsuidh ’n tigh-stòir,
 ’S e Dia ’chuir Ioseph romhad do ’n Eiph’t.

“Ged reic thu le d’ pheacaibh am Buachaille Mòr,
 Chum aislingean Ioseph a thabhairt gu bréig,
 Ann an la na gainne ’s ann a dh-fhosgail an stòr—
 Cha tus’ ach Iehobhah a chuir E do ’n Eiph’t.

“A theàrnadh do bheatha le fuasgladh mòr,
 ’Nuair nach robh lòn aig tigh Israeil,
 ’Thoirt anam mur aran chum t-anam s’ thoirt beò :
 Cha tus ach Iehobhah a chuir E do ’n Eiph’t.

“Tha ionmhas nam flaitheas gu beachd ann a stòr :
 Thig falamh gu leòir ’s cha diùlt E an déirc,
 ’S cha ’n aicheadh E idir, tha ’chridhe co mòr,
 Cha tus ach Iehobhah a chuir E do ’n Eiph’t.

“Feuch nach fear brath thu, le aidmheil gun deò,
 Ag iarraidh gu Ioseph a mhain le do bhéul :
 Bheir Dia dhiot an fhalluing, a chealgair’ mhòir !
 Tha fiosachd gu leòir aig Ioseph E féin.

“Mu thàinig ort gainne agus anshocair mhòr,
 Is thusa le deòir ag iarraidh na déirc,
 Tiomaichidh ’chridhe ri gearan do bheòil,
 Is mise t-Ioseph ’reic thu do ’n Eiph’t.

“Thig thusa am fagus is tabhair dhomh pòg,
 Is faic, mur rinn Tòmas, gur mis’ E gun bhréig,
 Is sàsuich do chreidimh le beantainn do mheòir :
 Tha cnàmhan is fèil aig Ioseph E fein.”

’S E am Bràthair a ’s sine, ’s E Tighearn na glòir’,
 ’S E ’m Fear-nuadh-posda d’ a Eaglais E féin :
 ’S E dh’ fhosgail a chridhe do ’n pheanas bha mòr,
 ’S e cupan an dòlais a thug E do ’n eug ;

Ach dh’ eirich an Gaisgeach, is chaidh E gu glòir,
 Is thiormich E Iordan uile d’ a threud,
 Is bheir E iad dhachaidh’ chur pailmean ’n an dòrn,
 ’S a sheinn air a ghlòir, fad saoghal nan saogh’l.

O ! gabhaibse misneach, tha ’g imeachd le bròn,
 Siabaidh E deòir gu slorruidh o threud,
 Is crùnaidh E ’n t-anam le naomhachd co mòr
 ’S nach foluich na neòil gu slorruidh a’ ghréin.

Notes and Comments.

A Great Work Imperilled!—No doubt our readers will be as much amazed as we were when they learn that the anticipated loss of a brass band was likely to imperil the work of God in Deptford. The *Life of Faith* has the following extraordinary appeal signed by the Rev. Charles G. Craggs:—"We are faced with a great difficulty. Most of the instruments now in use were bought second-hand nine years ago. Since then they have been used so well that they are literally worn out. Repairing them any longer is to throw good money away. We must obtain new instruments. The Bandsmen and their friends have been working hard, and have raised a sum of £60. The instruments we desire to purchase will cost £400, with a guarantee of fourteen years. This Band goes out twice every Sunday for marches and open-air services. It is an untold blessing to our work. We reach in this way those we could never touch in any other. It is a matter of great urgency. For this work to be imperilled would be a serious disaster. For the sake of God's work we dare not risk the possibility of losing the Band." If Mr. Craggs would take our advice, he would not give another moment's thought to the indispensable band. God's work does not stand in need of such helps, and the £400 he purposes to raise is good money thrown away.

Anti-Roman Bills in Kentucky.—*The Menace* of 7th March reports that a Bill which covers inspection of convents is presently before the Kentucky legislature. It is called House Bill No. 496, and provides that each public or private hospital, reformatory, home, house of detention, private asylum, and correctional institution shall be open at any time and at all times to the inspection of the local Fiscal Court or Board of Commissioners. It appears that "Roman Catholic nuns are actually teaching in the public schools of Kentucky in the garb of their religious orders." This has led to the presentation of another Bill (House Bill No. 66), which provides that "no teacher shall wear during school hours, while teaching in the common schools in this commonwealth, any distinctive or unusual dress, garb, or costume, or any mark, emblem, or insignia, which is worn exclusively by the members of any religious sect, order, or denomination for the purpose of indicating membership in such religious sect or denomination." *The Menace* strongly urges the Kentucky citizens to impress upon their representatives the importance of passing these Bills into law. Such measures would certainly be valuable steps in the right direction. Rome seems to be very strong in some American States, for three or four of them "had Bills before their legislatures last year, only to be killed through the influence of Rome." May God arise and then His enemies shall be scattered!

The Home Rule Crisis.—During the past month the Prime Minister announced the Government's proposals with reference to Ulster and the Irish Parliament. They propose to give the counties of Ulster an opportunity by vote of expressing their wish for or against inclusion under the Home Rule Parliament. Those counties who, by a bare majority, vote for exclusion, are to be left under the Imperial Parliament, as at present, for a period of six years, at the end of which time they must immediately come under the Irish Parliament, whether willing or not. It is explained that two General Elections will take place before the end of this period, and that there is a possibility that new conditions may be arranged whereby those who desire to remain excluded may do so. Sir Edward Carson and the Protestant representatives of Ulster all reject these proposals with indignation, and consider that the matter of exclusion cannot be left in an element of uncertainty for six years. They hold that the people should have the same opportunity at the end of that time to express their mind for inclusion or exclusion, and that their personal choice should determine the matter permanently. At the present moment the prospects of peace in Ulster are very dark, and it would become all praying people to be presenting the case with earnestness at a throne of grace. May the Lord, in infinite mercy, interpose for the deliverance of our nation from the terrible dangers that appear to be looming ahead!

A Woman's Church.—One of the latest fruits of the Suffragette movement is a new Woman's Church, started on Sabbath the 22nd March, at Wallasey in Cheshire. The preacher is "the Rev. Hatty Baker." At the morning service, there were none but women, but at the evening service men were admitted. The times are out of joint!

"The Bible and the Monuments" by Rev. John Urquhart.—The party who had a copy of the above book on loan from Mr. John MacLaine, Bookseller, Portree, Skye, will oblige by returning same as soon as possible.

Church Notes.

Communions.—Ness (Lewis) and Stoer (Sutherlandshire), first Sabbath of April; Lochgilphead, second; Greenock, third; St. Jude's, Glasgow (Jane Street, Blythswood Square), and Wick, (Caithness), fourth. Kames (Kyles of Bute) and Oban, first Sabbath of May; Edinburgh (Hall, Riego Street, near Tollcross), second; Dumbarton, and Glendale (Skye), third.

Communion at London Mission.—The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper will (God willing) be dispensed at our London Mission on the second Sabbath of April. The address is as usual: Conference Hall, Eccleston Street, Buckingham Palace Road, Victoria, S.W. The days and hours of service are as

follows: Thursday (9th April), 3.30 p.m. (Gaelic) and 7.30 p.m.; Friday (10th), 3.30 p.m. and 7.30 p.m.; Saturday (11th), 3.30 p.m.; Sabbath (12th), 11 a.m., 3.30 p.m. (Gaelic), and 7 p.m.; Monday (13th), 3.30 p.m. (Gaelic) and 7.30 p.m. It will be observed that there are Gaelic Services on Thursday, Sabbath, and Monday at 3.30 p.m., the rest being English. The Revs. Neil Cameron, St. Jude's, Glasgow, and Alex. Macrae, Portree, are expected to officiate. We hope that friends throughout the Church who have friends in London will call their attention to these services.

Canadian Mission Committee.—We are requested to intimate that the Canadian Committee will (God willing) meet at Wick on Friday before the last Sabbath of April, and that at this meeting the Convener (Rev. J. R. Mackay) will move that Mr. Donald M. Macdonald, in the capacity of an ordained missionary, be sent as the Church's Deputy to Canada for the next twelve-month, and that the Convener be authorised in consultation with friends of the cause in Canada, to make the necessary arrangements in this connection. It is further requested that members of this Committee, who may find it impossible to be present at this meeting, might communicate any suggestion that they desire to make to the Convener.

Financial Statements: Northern Presbytery.—Congregational Treasurers within the bounds of the Northern Presbytery are respectfully asked to send in to the Clerk of Presbytery (Rev. John R. Mackay), a copy of their Financial Statement for the year ending 31st March, 1914, as soon as may be after the date now specified.

Acknowledgments.—Mr. Angus Clunas, General Treasurer, 35 Ardconnel Terrace (East), Inverness, begs to acknowledge, with thanks, the following donations:—*For Sustentation Fund*—£3 3/ from "Adherent, Scourie District," per Mr. H. Morrison; 30/6 from Mr. D. Cameron and family, Island of Soay; 20/ from "A Lady Friend," Daviot, per Mr. Alex. Mackenzie; 12/ from Mrs. M. Macleod, Achintraid, Kishorn; 10/ from "Anon" (Edinburgh P.O.); 5/ from Mr. Roderick Mackenzie, Laide, Aultbea; 3/ from Mr. T. Finlayson, Forsinard, per Rev. J. S. Sinclair; 15/ from Mr. Macpherson, Braefoot, Strontian, and 5/ from same for Jewish Missions. *For Matabele Building Fund*—10/ from "Anon" (Lochinver P.O.); 2/ from "A Friend," Daviot; 5/ from Mr. A. Campbell, Diabaig, Torridon, and 5/ from same for Kaffir Psalms; 5/ from "C. M. L.," per Rev. N. Cameron, for Kaffir Psalms; £4 5/10 from Mrs. Gibb, Westonsuper-Mare, per Rev. J. S. Sinclair. *For Foreign Missions*—20/ from Mrs. Macaskill, Polochar, S. Uist; 20/ from Miss Macaskill, Lochboisdale School; 2/6 from Miss C. Macleod, Liverpool, per Rev. J. S. Sinclair.

The Rev. N. Cameron desires to acknowledge, with many thanks, the following donations to the Bembesi Building Fund:—"A Lady Friend," Loch Carron, £1; "A Lady Friend," Glasgow, 7s. 6d.; "A Friend," Skye, £1; "Free Presbyterian," 5s.; "M. M'S., 10s.; "C. M. L., 15s.; "M. M., £1; "Anonymous," per Mr. Wm. Sinclair, Winnipeg, Canada, £2 os. 10d. (10 dol.).

The Treasurer of the Dingwall Congregation acknowledges with thanks five shillings, received per the Rev. D. Macfarlane, from "Well-Wisher," Tain, for the Manse Building Fund.

The Magazine.

Errata.—We regret that there were several small errata in last number. Two of these were on p. 412: line 2 from top, "Him" should have been "His"; and line 11, a second "that" should have been after "to be."

Notice to Subscribers.—We respectfully remind subscribers that April is the last month of the Magazine year, and that payments due for past and future will now much oblige. All who order directly from the Editor and Treasurer are requested to send their subscriptions to address, 248 Kenmure Street, Pollokshields, Glasgow. Readers are also reminded that it is not our practice to stop a Magazine immediately the payment is run out, unless expressly told to do so, and we therefore earnestly request readers who desire the Magazine to be stopped at a certain time, to give us distinct notice of the same. Timely notice should also be given of all changes of address on the part of subscribers.

Subscriptions Received for Magazine.—J. Adamson, Helmsdale, 3/; J. Parker, Bridge-of-Allan, 2/; Miss Taylor, Church Street, Halkirk, 2/6; J. Campbell, Achilles Road, London, N.W., 2/6; M. Mackenzie, Drumbeg, Lochinver, 3/; A. Fraser, for St. Jude's Collectors, 36/4; M. Stewart, Kyle, 2/6; Mrs. Urquhart, Cullicudden, 2/6; A. Clunas, Inverness, 2/6; Mrs. Bannatyne, Blackwaterfoot, Arran, 2/6; Mrs. M'Bean, Tordarroch Cottage, Daviot, 2/6; D. Ross, missionary, Malaclait, North Uist, 2/6; Rev. J. A. M'Caskill, Onich, 10/6; Mrs. MacKenzie, 12 Aultgrishan, Gairloch, 2/6; Miss Sutherland, Tarmachy, Rogart, 2/6; N. Shaw, E. Anabich, Harris, 2/6; P. Stewart, Beaulay, 5/; C. Urquhart, Luibmore, Achnasheen, 5/; A. M'Kenzie, Drumchark, Aultbea, 3/; Mrs. M'Leod, Box 656, Prince Rupert, B.C., 3/1; Mrs. Malcolm, Wallasey, Cheshire, 2/6; H. M'Kenzie, Badachro, Gairloch, 5/; A. Matheson, Badidarroch, Lochinver, 5/; D. M'Leod, Shegra, Kinlochervie, 2/6; Miss G. Mackay, Edinburgh, 2/6; Miss Mackay, Hospital, Prince Rupert, B.C., 3/4; D. Clark, Egmondville, Ontario, 2/6, and Free Circulation, 1/6; W. Ross, Sen., Park Hill, Ontario, 2/6; J. Sutherland, Burnside, Loth, 2/6; J. M. M'Kechnie, Leopold, Geelong, 5/; Miss Ina Matheson, Tanera, 2/6; R. Wright, Matheson Street, Glasgow, 2/6; A. Graham, Ulva, N. Knapdale, 2/6; Mrs. Matheson, Badnaban, Lochinver, 2/6; W. Mackay, Slamannan, 5/; Miss K. M'Kenzie, Torbeg, Drumbeg, Lochinver, 2/6; T. Finlayson, Forsinard, 2/6; Mrs. Gibb, Weston-super-Mare, 2/6, and donation, 10/; Miss Mackenzie, Weston-super-Mare, 6/8; Miss Cameron, Pollokshields, 2/6, and donation, 2/6; Miss Macleod, Courtenay House, Liverpool, 2/6; Miss Mackenzie, Valtos, Staffin, Skye, 2/6; A. Fraser, for St. Jude's Collectors, 36/4; H. and Miss M. Mackay, Hamilton Street, Toronto, 12/4; Miss Banks, London, 2/6, and donation, 2/6; M. Beaton, Watnish, 2/3.