

THE  
Free Presbyterian Magazine  
And MONTHLY RECORD

---

VOL. XXX.

September 1925.

No. 5.

---

Evolution in Court.

---

ONE of the most determined attacks made against the citadel of truth in modern times is by the advocates of Evolution. There is scarcely a department of human knowledge which it has not ruthlessly invaded and used what attainments have been made in these different fields for its own purposes. One can scarcely take up a book on biology, zoology, geology, palaeontology, anthropology, sociology but one is met with its dominating influence. It has entered the field of history, and was a dominating factor in the mind of Wellhausen in shaping the God-dishonouring theories he set forth. It has been responsible to a large degree for the mythological views that have been adopted by modern scholars in connection with the opening chapters of Genesis and the patriarchs. It has likewise captured philosophy in almost all its branches. It entered into practical politics, and through the teaching of Nietzsche influenced the minds of the War Lords of Germany who deluged the world in blood. It is taught in our universities and colleges. And literature for the young which is circulated broadcast throughout the country, such as the "Children's Encyclopædia," "My Magazine," and the "Children's Newspaper," accept it as one of the most assured facts of science. This being the case, it is no wonder that the un instructed public press should so accept it. Articles from the pen of Prof. Arthur Thomson, one of the most popular evolutionary writers of the day, appear in the press advocating this theory. And when we remember that the Senatus of the Aberdeen United Free College asked Prof. Thomson to deliver a series of lectures to the divinity students of that College, which were afterwards published under the title of "What is Man?"—in which the evolutionary theory is unashamedly taught—it need not be wondered at that editors of the

secular press should fall a prey to Prof. Thomson's captivating literary style, even though some of his writing in the name of science is purely imaginary. Recently, however, the newspaper world was stirred to its depths through the trial of a young professor, Mr Scopes, in Dayton, Tennessee. As for the American press, one can expect almost anything from it, and that it should try to turn the trial at Dayton into a farce was quite in keeping with a certain type of American journalism if it so minded, but one expected better things from British journalism; in this particular case, however, it followed generally the lead of the excited journalists of the United States. The issue to be decided in the Dayton trial was this—The State of Tennessee had made a law forbidding the teaching in State-aided colleges and schools of any theory that called in question the doctrine of creation as set forth in the Bible. It was not denied that Mr Scopes taught evolution, but it was the policy of the prosecution to show that the scientists could say a great deal for evolution, a contention which the presiding judge wisely ruled out of order, as the court might otherwise have a session for a year or two, and at the end of it all never get beyond the evident fact that Evolution is only a theory and nothing more. Mr Scopes was condemned and fined 100 dollars, but the case is appealed to the Supreme State Court, and will probably go to the the Supreme Court at Washington before all is done. The gauge of battle has been thrown down, and the defenders of God's Word have taken it up, and we wish them well. The trial of Mr Scopes is only the firing of the first shot from forces that are entering into a death grapple with the advance legions of the Prince of Darkness marching against them as an angel of light. We cannot predict the issue, but we are intensely interested in it, and it ought to be our prayer that the Lord will arise and defend the cause that is His own, however imperfect and frail the instruments may be that are engaged in the conflict. In view of the interest awakened by this trial, we give in this issue an article written, we believe, by the Editor of "The Protestant" (Washington), Judge Nations, in which the case is stated from the sane American point of view. It is of special interest to know that there has been published at this moment one of the most crushing criticisms that has ever been levelled against Evolution by Prof. Trenchard More, in his "Dogma of Evolution." The work is composed of a series of lectures delivered at Princeton University—not the Seminary, which is

quite distinct—by a scientist of repute. We are completely out of sympathy with his religious views, and especially his views in regard to the early chapters of Genesis, as one may gather from stray references in his lectures, but no one can read these lectures without being profoundly convinced that Evolution is a mere will o' the wisp—a creation of the scientific imagination, and nothing more. It has utterly failed to do what it promised. Prof. More looks at the subject from a severely scientific standpoint, and has no hesitation in saying that Darwinian Evolution is rapidly waning, notwithstanding the infatuated reception that was given to it when it was announced. Though Darwin was a biologist, and that it was in this field Evolution made its first bow to the public, yet the biologist has never been able to explain the mystery of life. But our real antagonism to Evolution is not so much that it ignores the very facts of true science, but that it sweeps away at one blow the very foundations of our faith. In this process of development from lifeless matter through a brute ancestry to man there is no place for the Bible doctrines of creation, the fall, regeneration, the incarnation, the resurrection, etc. It gets rid of such Christian graces as meekness, humility, etc. In fact, the whole work of salvation wrought out by the Lord at such tremendous cost is useless if Evolution be true—man by a process of development would reach a state of perfection, not by the redeeming work of the Lord Jesus and the miraculous intervention of God, but by a mere natural process. It is for this reason we are continually directing our readers' attention to this menace to the Christian faith, and warning, especially those who have the instruction of the young in their hands, and the young themselves, that they shun as the pestilence a theory so dishonouring to God and so destructive to our common faith. As Prof. More truly says:—"I can find no symbol and no law to satisfy our spiritual nature in the quasi-Christianity of the humanitarian applications of Evolution. The real tendency of Evolution is to be found in the philosophy of Nietzsche and not in the life of Christ."

The Scopes trial is only an incident in the great battle waging between Fundamentalists and Modernists, and while we do not commit ourselves to all the methods or doctrines of those who are known as Fundamentalists in America, yet we thoroughly agree with a paragraph in the Statement issued by the Annual Convention of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, which had its meeting at

Memphis, Tennessee, U.S.A. "The time has come," says the paragraph in the Statement, "when Fundamentalists and Modernists should no longer remain in the same fold, for how can two walk together except they be agreed? Therefore, we call upon all Fundamentalists of all denominations to possess their souls with holy boldness, and challenge every false teacher, whether he be professor in a denominational or State school, whether he be editor of a religious publication, or the secretary of a denominational board; and whether he be a pastor in a pulpit in the homeland, or a missionary in the foreign field." Among the signatories of this Statement is Mr William Jennings Bryan, whose sudden death has been so deeply lamented by many of his countrymen in general and Fundamentalists in particular.

### Canadian Church Affairs.

AS so many of our readers are interested in Canada and what is happening there, we are giving in this short article a brief account of church affairs in the Dominion as far as the Union of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches are concerned. Whoever first devised the scheme of bringing Churches so far apart in doctrine and church polity together was either blind to the differences existing between these bodies, or was a reckless dreamer. From the "New Outlook," the organ of the United Church of Canada, one would scarcely know how embittered the controversy has been between the Unionists and the Anti-Unionists, nor that there has been such a considerable break-off of Presbyterians. In the first number of the above there is an article—"The Streams that are flowing together," in which an attempt is made by Prof. Falconer to show how the Calvinism of John Calvin, the Arminianism of John Wesley, the Congregationalism of the New England Puritans, and the Presbyterianism of the Scottish settlers are successfully blended in that strange medley of doctrine and church polity—the United Church of Canada. The article is accompanied by portraits of the three Johns—Calvin, Knox, and Wesley. And with a little imagination one can almost detect the kindling of the fire in Knox's fiery eye as he is brought into such close proximity to that pronounced hater of everything that savoured of Calvinism—John Wesley. Prof. Falconer, however, gives the case away when he says:—"The Congregationalists and Presbyterians have thus been approaching the doc-



trinal positions of Methodism. The Congregationalists and Methodists have been advancing towards the Presbyterian form of government."

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, preparatory to the Union, met at Toronto on 3rd June. Dr Pidgeon, of Toronto, Convener of the Union Committee, was appointed Moderator. The Union report came up on the 9th. The Anti-Unionists tabled a protest, in which they stated that over 700 congregations declared against the Union, while two Provinces had yet to declare. Near the end of the Assembly, the Anti-Unionists constituted themselves as an Assembly, notwithstanding the determined opposition of the Unionists. After all the planning, scheming, plausible speechifying, and bad exegesis of Scripture, the Unionists have not been able to gather into their strange fold all the Presbyterians of Canada, and some of these Unionists are so ill-mannered as to say nasty things about men who have a clearer vision and a stiffer moral back-bone than their own. We are gratified that Canada has witnessed this battle, and that there are men who still value principle above popularity. At the same time, we do not wish our readers, either at home or in Canada, to conclude that we are in full sympathy with the Canadian Presbyterian Church as now constituted. Between us and them there are very serious differences, as our people in Canada know full well, and nothing we have written on this subject is to be taken to indicate that we are blind to the seriousness of these differences. As for the United Church of Canada, its constitution is sufficiently elastic to suit the Churches of Sardis and Laodicea combined. The Presbyterian office-bearers who joined it were disloyal to the Church of their fathers, and their departure will not militate against the Church they left. We have in the United Church an illustration of the modern ecclesiastical fad for Union at any price. Outward union is more than truth, and the devious ways of the politician are resorted to by the ecclesiastic in order, forsooth, that the unity for which, we are told, Christ prayed might become an accomplished fact. If the "New Outlook" prophets prophesy truly, a great day of spiritual blessing has dawned for Canada, but as we have been so often disappointed by the modern school of prophets, we prefer to restrain our rejoicings. The Anti-Unionists, or Non-Concurrents as they are called out there, may have their own difficulties before them, but they should be profoundly thankful they have got rid of the Unionists.

## Christianity and Liberalism.

**DR** J. Gresham Machen, Assistant Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary, in his valuable book, "Christianity and Liberalism," shows what is the difference between modern "liberal" religion and historic Christianity. He believes that these are two distinct religions proceeding from altogether separate roots.

He says:—"In the sphere of religion, in particular, the present time is a time of conflict, the great redemptive religion which has always been known as Christianity is battling against a totally diverse type of religious belief, which is only the more destructive of the Christian faith because it makes use of traditional Christian terminology. This modern, non-redemptive religion is called "Modernism" or "Liberalism." Both names are unsatisfactory; the latter, in particular, is question-begging. The movement designated as "Liberalism" is regarded as "liberal" only by its friends; to its opponents it seems to involve a narrow ignoring of many relevant facts."

He contends that modern Liberalism is not only un-Christian, but that it is also unscientific. The following are a few quotations from his book:—

"Material betterment has gone hand-in-hand with spiritual decline," and a new Reformation is required. Speaking of the modern objection to doctrine, he says—"The things objected to in the theology of the Church are also at the very heart of the New Testament. Ultimately the attack is . . . against the Bible and against Jesus Himself."

"Indifferentism about doctrine makes no heroes of the faith."

"The doctrine of God and the doctrine of man are the two great presuppositions of the gospel. With regard to these presuppositions, as with regard to the gospel itself, modern Liberalism is diametrically opposed to Christianity."

"At the very root of the modern Liberal movement is the loss of the consciousness of sin."

"Miracles are rejected by the modern Liberal Church, and with the miracles the entirety of the supernatural Person of our Lord."

"The acceptance of the supernatural is the very heart and soul of the religion that we profess."

"Liberalism finds salvation (so far as it is willing to speak of 'salvation') in man; Christianity finds it in an act of God."

"The modern rejection of the doctrine of God's wrath proceeds from a light view of sin, which is totally at variance with the teaching of the whole New Testament and of Jesus Himself."

"The older evangelism, says the modern Liberal preacher, sought to rescue individuals, while the newer evangelism seeks to transform the whole organism of society: the older evangelism was individual; the newer evangelism is social."

After pointing out that, in a most important sense Christianity is individualistic and not social, the author adds—"But though Christianity is individualistic, it is not only individualistic. It provides fully for the social needs of man."

After pointing out how hopeless must be the work of the missionary of Liberalism in the foreign field, the author says—"The Christian missionary and the Christian worker at home as well as abroad, unlike the apostle of Liberalism, says to all men everywhere—'Human goodness will avail nothing for lost souls; ye must be born again.'"

"What is the trouble with the visible church," asks Dr Machen. "What is the reason for its obvious weakness. There are perhaps many causes of weakness. But one cause is perfectly plain—the Church of to-day has been unfaithful to her Lord by admitting great companies of non-Christian persons, not only into her membership, but into her teaching agencies."

"It is highly undesirable that Liberalism and Christianity should continue to be propagated within the bounds of the same organisation. A separation between the two parties in the Church is the crying need of the hour."

J. FORBES MONCRIEFF, C.A.

"Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of His servant, that walketh in darkness, and hath no light? let him trust in the name of the Lord, and stay upon his God" (Isaiah i. 10). His God still. That relation is always the same; and so are the blessings which are included in it, and which He cannot fail to bestow upon those who honour His word in such trials of their faith, that against hope they believe in hope: for blessed are all they that put their trust in Him.—*Romaine.*

## The National Petition to the Scottish Privy Council (1637).\*

---

**F**OR the glory of Jesus Christ and preservation of true religion, for the honour of King Charles and the good of this his native and ancient kingdom,

This underwritten is the just copy of the supplication and complaint presented in our names to the Lords of the Secret Council, October 18, 1637, and because no particular persons complained are named, and all who have "enters" in the grievances contained therein may not attend, but must appoint some few of their number to wait for answer. Therefore, lest the Lords reject the supplication and complaint for the want of the supplicants' and complainers' names, we have subscribed this present double to be shown to the Lords if they shall happen to call for the same.

My Lords or Secret Council, Unto your Lordships, humbly means and shows we undersubscribers, Noblemen, Barons, Burgesses, Ministers, and Commons, that whereas we were in all humility and quiet manner attending a gracious answer of our former supplications against the Service Book imposed upon us, and ready to show the great inconvenience which upon the introduction thereof must ensue, we are without any known desert, for by our expectation surprised, and charged by public proclamation to depart of the town within twenty-four hours thereafter, under pain of rebellion by which peremptory and unusual charge our fears of a more summary and strict course of proceeding in their matters is augmented, and the course of our supplications interrupted, wherefore we are constrained out of the deep grief of our hearts humbly to remonstrate that where the Archbishops and Bishops of this realm being entrusted by His Majesty with the government of the affairs of the Kirk of Scotland, have drawn up and set forth or caused to be drawn up and set forth and enjoined upon the subjects two books, in the one whereof called the Book of Common Prayer, not only are sown the seeds of divers superstitions, idolatry, and false doctrine, contrary to the true religion established in this realm by divers Acts of Parliament, but also the Service Book of England is so absurd (especially in the matter of the communion) by

---

\* See note under Notes and Comments.—Editor.

additions, subtractions, interchanging of words and sentences, falsifying of titles, and misplacing of collectis to the disadvantage of reformation, as the Romish Mass is in the main and substantial points made up therein, as we offer to instruct in time and place convenient, close contrary unto, and for reversing of the gracious intention of the blessed Reformers of religion in England. In the other book called "Canons and Constitutions for the Government of the Kirk of Scotland," they have ordained that whosoever shall affirm that the form of worship contained in the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments whereof heretofore and now we must justly complain, doth contain anything repugnant to the Scriptures, or are corrupt or superstitious or unlawful in the service and worship of God, shall be excommunicated and not be restored but by the Bishop of the place or the Archbishop of the province after his repentance and public revocation of this his wicked error. Beside an hundred canons more, many of them tending to the reviving and fostering of abolished superstitions and error and to the overthrow of our church discipline established by Acts of Parliament, opening a door for what farther innovation of religion they please to make, and stopping the way which law before did allow unto us for suppressing of error and superstitions, and ordaining that wherein any of the canons there is no penalty expressly set down, the punishment shall be arbitrary as the Bishop shall think fittest. All which canons we have never seen nor allowed in any General Assembly, but are imposed contrary to order of law appointed in this realm for establishing of matters ecclesiastic unto which two books the aforesaid Prelates have under trust procured His Majesty's royal hand and letters patent for pressing the same upon us his loyal subjects and yet are they the contrivers and devisers of the same as doth clearly appear by the frontispiece of the Book of Common Prayer, and are begun to urge the acceptance of the same—not only by injunctions given in Provincial Assemblies, but also by open proclamation and charges of horning, whereby we are driven in such straits as we must, either by process of excommunication and horning suffer the ruin of our states and fortunes or else by breach of our covenant with God, and forsaking the way of true religion, fall under the wrath of God, which unto us is more grievous than death. Wherefore, we, being persuaded that these their proceedings are contrary to our gracious sovereign's pious intention, who, out of his zeal and princely care of the preservation of

true religion established in this his ancient kingdom, has ratified the same in his Highness' Parliament, 1633, and so His Majesty to be highly wronged by the said Prelates who have so far abused their credit with so good a King as thus to ensnare his subjects, rend our kirk, undermine religion, in doctrine, sacraments, and discipline, move discontent betwixt the King and his subjects, and discord betwixt subject and subject, contrary to several Acts of Parliament, do, out of bounden duty to God our King and native country, complain of the aforesaid Prelates, humbly craving that this matter may be put to trial, and these our parties taking order with, according to the laws of the realm, and that they be not suffered to sit any more as our judges until this cause be tried and decided according to justice. And if this shall seem to your Lordships a matter of higher importance, then ye will condescend unto before His Majesty be acquainted therewith. Then we humbly supplicate that this our grievance and complaint may be fully represented to His Majesty that from the influence of his gracious government and justice their wrongs may be redressed, and we have the happiness to enjoy the religion as it has been reformed in this land.—“*Scottish Historical Review* (July).”

### **Tennessee Evolution Case.**

AS the trial of Prof. Scopes at Dayton for teaching of Evolution contrary to the law of the State of Tennessee has awakened wide-world interest and called forth a great deal of hostile criticism against the law passed by the State of Tennessee, we give for the benefit of our readers a copyright article which appeared in “*The Protestant*” (Washington, D.C.) before the trial, in which some of the points are dealt with from an American point of view:—

“The controlled newspaper press has devoted thousands of columns within the last few weeks to the concerted effort to ridicule out of court the case of the State of Tennessee against John T. Scopes on the charge of having violated a penal statute of that State by teaching the hypotheses of Darwinism in a public high school. Newspaper editors with little or no expert knowledge of either legal or scientific issues that may develop in the case, lecture the Christian scholarship of the United States as though the crude and immature views of those editors were a finality and should forever dispose of the issues involved.

"If the Darwinists are as sure of their footing as they and their editorial propagandists assume, it is not clear why they are so excited over the Tennessee case. That a State has the right to prohibit the teaching of pernicious doctrines in school or elsewhere is apparently conceded by reason and precedent. It has long been a penal offence in most jurisdictions to teach the doctrines of anarchy. Nobody but anarchists seems to question the righteousness and constitutionality of such statutory prohibitions. The Mormons have finally been compelled to obey statutes that prohibit the teaching or practice of polygamy.

"But the question of Tennessee's constitutional right to enact a statute prohibiting the teaching of the Darwinian theories is a question of constitutional law. It should be decided in the same manner as other constitutional questions. Its decision by judicial authority in the light of arguments and briefs prepared by able and careful lawyers will be safer than any prejudiced opinions which the controlled and agnostic press can bring about. Let the courts decide the case. It has long been the custom of the controlled and agnostic press and of the Darwinists to answer all critics by calling them ignoramuses. No custom could be more unscientific or intolerant. But the tons of deceptive propaganda now being directed against the prosecution in the Tennessee Evolution case indicates that apologists of Darwinism fear that Mr Bryan is not so ignorant as they have been pretending.

"The fact that two lawyers as talented and renowned as Clarence Darrow and Bainbridge Colby have been retained to defend the case indicates the grave misgivings with which the Darwinists face their adversaries in a judicial forum. It will require more than vituperation to sustain their hypotheses there. The case will be considered on the basis of law and fact. Charges of ignorance hurled at opposing advocates may avail in the controlled press and in the class-room. But it will not suffice in court. The methods that have been used to propagate Darwinism cannot endure the light of searching investigation. They consist largely of sophistry and unverified assumption. It is not strange that they face judicial investigation with grave misgivings.

"But if Clarence Darrow and Bainbridge Colby cannot establish the Darwinian guesses in court, those guesses are too questionable to be imposed on immature minds in the class-room as established principles of organic science. The scoffing newspaper press has

suggested that Tennessee might be consistent by enacting a statute to prohibit teaching that the earth is round. But the rotundity of the earth is better established than the theories of Darwinism. It can be established by millions of witnesses who have gone around the earth, while Darwinism cannot produce one witness that man is the offspring of dumb brutes.

"No issue of freedom of thought or speech is involved in the Tennessee case. If the question concerned mature minds of substantially equal attainments it might be considered in relation to freedom of thought. But the Tennessee statute is designed to protect children and youth from baseless and pernicious theories imposed on them by teachers whose maturity and authority and presumed scholarship give them an irresistible advantage over their pupils. Let the pending case be tried according to law and facts. Let the decision be made in court, where lawsuits are usually decided. If the final judgment is not satisfactory, let other cases be filed and presented till the truth is judicially ascertained. The issues are too vital and profound for editorial charlatans. Let them be determined in the full light of truth.

"There is more at issue in the Tennessee case than the Darwinists are willing to admit. With constantly increasing boldness they have been instilling their unverified theories into text-books and propagating them in the class-room as if those theories were as firmly established as the axioms of mathematics. Of necessity and of right children and youth in our schools regard their teachers and especially the text-books approved by school authorities as accurate and final in their statements purporting to be scientific. The pupils are hardly permitted to challenge such statements even if equipped by maturity and expert knowledge to do so.

"Millions of high school pupils are being mentally saturated every year with pure guesses and sophistries fitted and apparently designed to subvert their faith in God and in the biblical account of creation, which, by the way, is the only account we have. In spite of boundless arrogance and presumption, high school teachers, college and university professors and biologists and anthropologists of the most eminent attainments are utterly powerless to account for the origin of man and of the earth. They differ with one another by billions of years in their guesses as to the age of the earth.



" Their theories and hypotheses present insuperable difficulties at every turn. Assuming that blind, insensate rocks by some unexplainable spontaneous generation have brought the infinitude of organic forms that inhabit and beautify the earth, the most eminent scientists are as powerless as the rude swain to produce from those rocks even the most elementary forms of organic life. They as the finished product of Evolution are totally unable to produce what they assert that the rocks produced millions of years ago—organic life. It is time to challenge the right to teach such sophistries to our boys and girls as science. The civil courts are a very good place to meet the issue. Let the Darwinists produce the evidence in support of their hypotheses. Let it be weighed by the standards applied to all evidence in the courts. Let the truth be ascertained."

---

### **Thomas Cartwright.\***

---

**A**MONG the names of the great Puritan leaders of the 16th century that of Thomas Cartwright occupies a very high place. He is of special interest to us as a pioneer of Presbyterianism, and though at his time Presbyterianism was the driving force of Puritanism, yet it never made headway in England, largely, we believe, through a mistaken policy of the great Puritan Presbyterian leader, who believed in remaining in the Church of England while advocating the principles of a thorough-going Presbyterianism. At first sight it appears incredible that a man of Cartwright's thorough grasp of the points involved should have compromised his own position by remaining in a prelatical Church while doing all in his power to overturn it. And as we read the biography by Dr Scott Pearson, in which he surveys the ecclesiastical situation of the time, we feel strongly convinced that Thomas Cartwright was ill-advised in fighting the battle from within. The biography which has been recently published by the Cambridge University Press is the product of an exceptionally careful study of the period along the lines of modern historical research, and while it cannot be described as a book that will appeal to the general

---

\* Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism (1535-1603), by the Rev. A. F. Scott Pearson, M.A., B.D., D.Th., F.R. Hist. S., F.S.A. (Scot.) Cambridge ; University Press. 25s net.

reader, the facts gleaned by Dr Pearson from a wide field will be invaluable to the student of the period.

Thomas Cartwright studied at Cambridge, where he graduated in Arts. In 1562 he became Fellow of Trinity College, and as he was regarded as one of the four "eminentest men" in the University, he was chosen to make an oration before Queen Elizabeth on the occasion of her visit in 1564. The story of his long contest with Whitgift is told with great thoroughness, and the long-drawn-out conflict with the leader of Episcopalian ideals must have tried Cartwright's patience and scholarship to the uttermost. In a short notice like this it is impossible to give even a brief resume of his writings, or to even enter into an account of his contentings and sufferings in connection with the cause of Presbyterian Puritanism. It is interesting to note that the Presbyterian leaders in Scotland were keenly interested in the struggle in England; and in 1580 he was invited to St Andrews to fill one of the new Chairs instituted by Andrew Melville in St Mary's College. The invitation set forth that he along with Travers, instead of hiding their lights under a bushel, should be engaged in public teaching and preaching, and now that an opportunity had come, these noted leaders of Presbyterianism were asked to come north. Both, however, refused the invitation.

Cartwright as a controversialist was the author of many books and pamphlets. He was wrongly charged with being concerned with the famous Martin Mar-Prelate tracts. His Treatise or Larger Catechism and Shorter Catechism occupy a prominent place in those catechetical manuals which were so useful and popular among the Puritans, and which were the forerunners of the Westminster Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the 17th century.

---

### Christ in You, the Hope of Glory.

---

We must know this for a ground, whatsoever is done to us, is done to Christ first; and whatsoever we have, Christ hath it first. Therefore, life is first in Christ, and then in us; resurrection first in Christ, and then in us; justification from our sins first in Christ—He is freed from our sins—and then in us; ascension first in Christ, and then in us; glory in heaven first in Christ, and then in us. We have nothing in us, but it is derived from Christ.—*Sibbes.*

## Dr Moffatt's New Translation of the Old Testament.

---

THE new translation is being widely advertised and actively discussed, extravagantly praised, and vigorously condemned. The publishers describe it as a monumental work. Our principle reason for devoting so much attention to it is because we believe that in a sense their estimate of it is correct. We do not mean by this that we regard it as a work of such conspicuous scholarship that it will obtain, or permanently hold, a place among the great translations of holy writ. On the contrary, a translation which aims primarily at novelty, which is full of inconsistencies and doubtful renderings, and which does not deal fairly with the original of which it purports to be a translation, cannot be expected to have more than ephemeral popularity. It will prepare the way for a whole series of new translations, each striving to outdo its predecessors in novelty and originality, or it will arouse Christian people who love the Bible to protest in no uncertain terms against this popular pastime of the critics, the "wresting" of the Scriptures in the interest of "Modern Thought." This book is momentous, because it is, we believe, the boldest and most ambitious attempt that has yet been made to rewrite the Bible in the light of rationalistic criticism, to introduce purely conjectural changes into a translation of the Old Testament not merely without explaining or justifying them, but even without indicating their presence in any way. Except for the general statements in the brief (four-page) preface, in which Dr Moffatt states his acceptance of the views of radical critics as to the unreliability of the text and his attempts to amend it, there is nothing which could give the "ordinary reader," whom Dr Moffatt tells us he has particularly in view, the slightest hint that he has changed the text of a passage.

The use of "dots" to indicate that the text is "corrupt," and of italics and brackets to discriminate "documents" and editorial additions or later interpolations may lead him to feel doubtful of the text of a passage. But there is nothing to indicate that the translation is at all uncertain. No question marks, no foot-notes, nothing. There is not even an index. Yet Dr Moffatt frankly characterises some of his renderings as "guesses," and he tells us, "When the choice lay be-

tween a guess or a gap, I inclined to prefer the former, feeling that the ordinary reader, for whom this version is designed, would have a proper dislike of gaps." This is in a sense true. A gap looks ugly, and we "dislike" it, because it is so conspicuous to the eye, and because it so obviously breaks the connection. But a guess is dangerous, just because it is not obvious to the eye and may make excellent sense, and therefore pass muster as something more than a guess. If Dr Moffatt's translation had more obvious "gaps" and fewer unrecognisable "guesses," it would not be so deceptive a version of the Old Testament. Dr Moffatt excuses himself from what would seem the obvious duty of calling attention to these "guesses" on the ground that there are so many of them. "Since nearly every page," he tells us, "contains some emendation of the traditional text in the interests of accuracy and point, it has been impossible to annotate them." As an indication of the difference between Dr Moffatt's attitude towards the Old Testament and his treatment of the New, it is noteworthy that, while, as we have stated, there is not a single foot-note in his Old Testament (1031 pages).

His New Testament (327 pages) has about two hundred marginal notes. Yet the difference is not really as great as this would seem to indicate, for the same inconsistency which we have found to figure so prominently in Dr Moffatt's Old Testament is no new feature in it, but one which is also observable in his New Testament.

The star example of this is Matt. i. 16, which Dr Moffatt renders "Jacob" (was) the Father of Joseph, and Joseph (to whom the Virgin Mary was betrothed) was the Father of Jesus who is called Christ."

This is a rendering of Von Soden's text regarding which Professor Armstrong tells us in Matt. i. 16, Von Soden inserts in his text the reading supposedly underlying the rendering in the Sinaitic Syriac—a reading which is not found in any primary authority.

This extremely questionable reading which makes Jesus to be the Son of Joseph in a literal physical sense, Dr Moffatt adopted without mentioning the vitally important fact that he was following Von Soden in the use of a reading "not found in any primary authority." He did not add any foot-note at all. But in the case of I. Thess. v. 4, for example, he carefully stated that he read "thieves" instead of "thief" on the authority of "A, B, and the Bohairic Version."

It is hard to avoid the impression that such inconsistency is more than mere inconsistency. This is unfortunate, to say the least. For we believe that if all the "guesses" were annotated the "ordinary reader" would be able to see what havoc "criticism" has played with the Scriptures, and would revolt against it. As it is, he must either follow Dr Moffatt blindly, accepting without question his statement that no emendations of the traditional text have been made "except upon what the translator regards as sufficient evidence," or else he must compare every passage with a reliable translation, or have recourse to a scholarly commentary to find out whether the surprisingly "fresh" rendering which Dr Moffatt gives of a passage has substantial evidence back of it, or is simply a "guess" of the critic.

In stating that Dr Moffatt has deliberately falsified the text in such passages as those just cited, we have no intention of bringing a railing accusation against a distinguished scholar. Dr Moffatt has no intention of being dishonest. He speaks of himself as an "honest translator," who must recognise that "the books of the Old Testament are, for the most part, books which have been either made out of books or edited more or less drastically by later hands." He has become so imbued with the spirit of conjectural criticism that he perhaps thinks his new translation a decidedly conservative piece of work. He doubtless aims to be candid when he assures the reader that no emendation of the traditional text "has been admitted, except on what the translator regards as sufficient evidence." He can cite the names of eminent scholars in favour of his rendering of Ps. xiv. 6, and of his interpretation of Isai. liii. But that does not alter the fact that his rendering of these and of other verses is a literal forgery, i.e., the substitution of a purely conjectural reading for one the correctness of which cannot be questioned on objective grounds. Dr Moffatt, like many others, does not recognise that the fact that he feels that he can improve on a passage of the Bible is in itself no sufficient proof that the passage in question is corrupt, or that his emendation would be an improvement upon it. But our quarrel is not with Dr Moffatt personally, but with his method; and Dr Moffatt learned his method in a celebrated school of theology in Scotland, sitting at the feet of one of the most widely known Bible scholars of to-day. It is the method of rationalism. Yet it is being taught in theological seminaries, and finding expression in new translations of the Bible. This shows the seriousness of the issue with which Protestantism is confronted.

Mohammed, in the Koran, classes the Jews and the Christians with his own followers as people of a book. Radically as Islam differs from Judaism and Christianity, Mohammed recognised that the Jew and the Christian shared that belief in and reverence for a Divinely authoritative revelation which is characteristic of the followers of the Crescent. The most noticeable thing about the "higher critic" of to-day and his pupil the "liberal" Christian, is his slight regard, or, to put it more strongly, his entire disregard for the authority of Scripture, for all external authority. He is a law unto himself. A hundred years ago, even fifty years, such a translation as Dr Moffatt's would have aroused a storm of protest. How it will be received to-day is not yet clear. One thing is certain. If the generations that are gone had permitted themselves the same liberties with the Scriptures which Dr Moffatt and other critics are taking to-day, there would now be no Old Testament, no Bible to which to appeal. The mass of conjectural changes would be so great that it would be impossible to get back to the original. We are heirs of those who even in the face of persecution cherished the Bible as the Word of God.

It is because of the care with which they treasured it that we can say to-day, as we read its precious pages, "Thus saith the Lord God!" The question for us is this, shall we allow this Bible after nineteen Christian centuries of blessed witness to the things of God to be at the mercy of any and every critic who has a new theory as to what it ought to say and mean? Or shall we expect, as our fathers did three centuries ago, that a version which is to gain acceptance with Christian people will be one of which it can honestly be said that it is "translated out of the original Tongues; and with the former translations diligently compared and revised" by the command, not of king or prince, however "Christian," but of Christian people who love the Bible and will tolerate no substitute for it however "modern" or "scholarly" it may claim to be. Our answer to this question will determine whether our faith is to rest upon the wisdom of men or upon the Word of the Living God.—PROF. O. T. ALLIS, in the "Princeton Theological Review" (April).

---

"Albeit that grace is perfectly free to men, in pardoning and saving of them; yet justice must be satisfied, and Christ was abated nothing."—*Elisha Coles.*

## Sermon

PREACHED BY THE REV. D. MACFARLANE, DINGWALL.

“When the poor and the needy seek water, and there is none, and their tongue faileth for thirst, I the Lord will hear them, I the God of Israel will not forsake them. I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys; I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water. I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah tree, and the myrtle, and the oil tree; I will set in the desert the fir tree, and the pine, and the box tree together, that the hand of the Lord hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it” (Is. xli. 17-20).

In this chapter the Lord begins to appeal to the islands whose inhabitants were idolaters, and Britain was one of these islands, and He challenges the false gods they worshipped to do good or evil, to save their worshippers or to punish them. They could not do either, and then He shows what He Himself as the only living and true God can do to those that look to Him for salvation. He can save them but their idols could do nothing to give the good all sinners need. There was a missionary sent to a heathen land, and a large number of idolaters gathered to hear him and brought an idol in the shape of a man with them, and placed it in a prominent place in the congregation. In the course of his address the missionary in order to show the vanity of idols walked up near to the false god they worshipped and spoke thus: “Your god has a mouth but cannot speak, has ears but cannot hear, and eyes that cannot see, feet and cannot walk, and hands but cannot work, therefore, it cannot save you, for it is a dead god.” His hearers were convinced of this, and with the consent of the whole congregation a number of them went up to the idol, removed it and cast it away, and they became worshippers of the God the missionary preached to them. Since the Gospel began to be preached the Lord had a people in the world. In the time of Isaiah the prophet speaks of these as a small remnant (Is. i. 9). It is of these that the Lord speaks in our text. In addressing you from these words we shall call your attention to the following particulars:—

I. Those described as poor and needy.

II. Their endeavours to get their needs supplied:—they seek water.

III. The promise that is made to them:—I the Lord will hear them, I the God of Israel will not forsake them.

IV. The Lord's purpose in this connection in doing what He promised:—that they may see and know and consider and understand together that the hand of the Lord hath done this and the Holy One of Israel hath created it.

I. Those described as poor and needy. The Lord's people are often spoken of in Scripture as poor. By nature all our fallen race are poor, having lost God and all the good we had in our first creation. We are all poor spiritually but the Lord's people are poor in spirit. By spirit here we mean the new nature born again of the Spirit: "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John iii. 6). The old nature considered itself rich and having need of nothing but it is not so with the new nature, it is conscious of its need of everything which God provided in Christ for salvation.

In what sense are the Lord's people poor? Negatively, they are not poor. (1) As to their state they are justified and there is no condemnation to them. In this sense they are complete in Christ. (2) They are not poor as to their rights. Christ is theirs; for all the benefits of His redemption are theirs. Christ in His Sermon on the Mount says of them "blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." (3) They are not poor as if they had not received anything of the blessings of salvation, for they have received the earnest of the inheritance. They have a covenant right to all the good things of this world which they need to support their bodies during their time on earth. Christ promised them this. "Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth."

Positively, they are poor (1) In their own experience; the Psalmist was rich, for he could say that God was his portion and yet he said:—"I am poor and needy" (Ps. lxx. 5). (2) They are comparatively poor. They have not yet received all the blessing that they shall receive. And this is true of them during their time in the state of imperfection, but when they are brought to heaven they shall be filled with the blessings of glory in the full enjoyment of God to all eternity.

They are described not only as poor but needy. They are not like some beggars who have hoarded up much money and yet pretend to be poor and beg alms from door to door. We have heard about some such



beggars that after their death it was discovered that they left behind them hundreds of pounds. These were not needy but the Lord's people are needy as well as poor. Many professing Christians are poor in mouth but not conscious of their need. Through the power of unbelief the Lord's people are often poorer in their own experience than they really are: that is when they come to doubt their interest in Christ and in the blessings of His purchase.

II. Their endeavours to get their needs supplied. A sense of need leads to this: they seek water. All living creatures labour to get their needs supplied; even the fowls of the air do so. You see them working diligently in the fields to get food to support them. Water in Scripture has several significations. Sometimes it signifies the Holy Spirit, as Christ spoke of it to the Woman of Samaria: "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee: Give me to drink; thou wouldst have asked of Him and He would have given thee living water" (John iv. 10). See also John vii. 38. It signifies also the blessings of salvation. As these blessings are spoken of in Isaiah lv. 1: "Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the waters." This, we think, is the meaning of water in our text. Where do they seek this water? They seek it in the means of grace, private and public. They seek it in the closet and family worship, and in the public means of grace. These are wells of salvation as they are spoken of in Isaiah xii. 3: "Therefore, with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." They attend these means not only in obedience to God's command but from a sense of need, and a desire to receive good to their souls. When Christ manifests Himself to His people in the means of grace they find it good to be there as Peter said on the Mount of Transfiguration: "Lord, it is good for us to be here." You have been many years coming to the means of grace: Have you ever found good in these means? Alas! many have to say that they have not. That is not a good sign, at least, if you are satisfied with your condition. It is sad to think that the great majority that attend the means of grace perhaps for scores of years cannot say from their own experience that they got good for their souls. And yet are not troubled on that account, but it is not yet too late. Cry to God to awaken you out of the sleep of death; convince you of your sins, and of your need of salvation, and change of nature and state. God is the hearer of prayer. He hears the prayer of the poor and needy.

These are discouragements which the poor and needy meet with in seeking water. They seek water and for a time they find none. This was a great discouragement and trial of faith. Perhaps they were seeking water under the ministry of graceless men where living souls can find no good. A certain man said that it would be as unlikely that you should go to the top of the highest hill expecting to get shell-fish there as to go to hear a graceless minister expecting to receive spiritual good under his preaching. And that is quite true, and even where the Gospel is preached by Christ's ambassadors the Lord's people may for a time be seeking water and finding none. This is a greater trial, and when they are long in that state our text says that their tongue faileth for thirst or, as we have it in the Gaelic translation, their tongue is dried with thirst. A great and long continued thirst affects the tongue so that they cannot speak or express in words their desires to God. They cannot pray, and they are on the verge of despair thinking that God will not hear their prayers at all. Although this is hard to bear, it is a better sign than to be indifferent resting on their heels without any real concern as to whether He will hear you or not. I would have more hope of your salvation on the verge of despair than to be indifferent concerning the things which pertain to your everlasting peace. Man's extremity is God's opportunity.

III. The promise: (1) "I the Lord will hear them." This is a word in season, a word of comfort and encouragement. He has His own time to hear prayer. There is nothing so comforting to the poor and needy as a word from the Lord. His people would rather hear a word of threatening from Him than to be silent to them altogether. There was a godly man who enjoyed much of the comfort of the Gospel and who, after that fell into a disconsolate state of mind because the Lord was not speaking to him as on former occasions, and he was for a number of days in a very gloomy frame of mind. Still he was praying, and on a certain day he was praying in some corner outside his house, and when he came home his wife observed that his face was shining as with delight. She said to him you must have received some token for good since you left home. "Yes," he answered, "the Lord has spoken an awful threatening to me to-day, and this is a token that He has not forsaken me utterly." Some have found comfort from the words: "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life but the wrath

of God abideth on him" (John iii. 36). If God speaks to you by the threatenings of His Word it is a sign that He is still striving with you, but be not content till He begins to speak to you by the still small voice of the Gospel.

(2) "I the God of Israel will not forsake them." Having been long seeking water and finding none they were ready to conclude that God had forsaken them, but in this part of the promise He assures them that He has not forsaken them and that He shall never do so. "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." This also, is, a word in season to the poor and needy. Oh! what a comfort it is to hear this promise from the mouth of the Lord. What a lift it gives to a poor soul seeking comfort and finding none! No tongue of man can express the joy which it brings to a sorrowful soul. It is a joy unspeakable and full of glory. It moistens the tongue that was parched with thirst, so that now it is like the pen of a ready writer. Praising the Lord and calling upon others to join in praising Him like the Psalmist: "Oh! that men would praise the Lord for His goodness and for His wonderful works to the sons of men" (Ps. cvii. 21). He tells them that He is their covenant God—"the God of Israel." In another part of Scripture He says: "The mountains shall depart and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord who hath mercy on thee" (Is. liv. 10).

(3) "I will open rivers in high places and fountains in the midst of the valleys." The high places here mean heathen lands. High places, such as high hills, are places where one would not expect to see rivers of waters. Such were the Gentiles before the Gospel came to them. In connection with this we may quote the words of the Psalmist: "There shall be an handful of corn in the earth on the top of the mountains, the fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon" (Ps. lxxii. 16). The rivers that were to be opened are the means of grace opened for the Gentiles who were by these means brought to be fellow heirs and of the same body, and partakers of His grace in Christ by the gospel (Eph. iii. 6). This was a mystery which was not made known to (or at least understood by) the sons of men in other ages as is now revealed unto His holy Apostles by the Spirit (Eph. ii. 5). These rivers of living water were not like stagnant water but water that flowed far and wide till it reached our country. It flowed to the High-

lands of Scotland. It came to Ross-shire, where there was no parish without the means of grace, and poor and needy souls found plenty of water at last. There was scarcely a parish without a godly minister who preached the gospel. Is it so now in Ross-shire? No! You may go from sea to sea and not hear a sermon that will do good to a needy soul. Where are the poor and needy in Dingwall? They are very few indeed. The most do not know where the gospel is because they are dead. They have no spiritual understanding and therefore go anywhere to hear and are satisfied with anything delivered to them from the pulpit under the name of Gospel which is no gospel at all but in name.

(4) The fountains opened in the valleys may mean the means of grace set up; for the Jews to whom the Apostles, and especially Peter preached the Gospel to many, were blessed. Three thousand were converted on the day of Pentecost under the preaching of Peter, and many others were added to the number afterwards.

(5) "I will make the wilderness a pool of water and the dry land springs of water." This is the effect of the Gospel preached. Those men that were formerly like a dry wilderness were now like a pool of water and springs of water. Men by nature are like a barren wilderness bearing no good fruit but are by means of the Gospel so watered and saturated that they bear the fruits of the spirit whereby God is glorified as Christ says: "Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit" (John xv. 8). And thus they were to prove that they were His disciples. Have you found out that by nature you are like a wilderness, and are you dissatisfied with your condition and praying that God would change you by His Spirit from a state of nature to a state of grace? If so, I would not lose hope of your salvation. It is sad to think that so many are careless about the salvation of their immortal souls, but if they die in that state they are lost for ever. I beseech you to have a real concern about your soul's salvation before it is too late. This may be the last warning which you may have. You are now in the land of the living; to-morrow you may be in eternity. Oh! rest not this night till you find rest in Christ and then although you should not see another day you may be sure, like the thief on the cross, to be with Christ in the glorious paradise of God.

(6) "I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah tree, and the myrtle, and the oil tree; I will set in the desert the fir tree, and the pine, and the box tree together." These trees may symbolize believers of every shade and degree who are public witnesses for Himself in the Church who are like trees that are a shade and a shelter from the heat of the sun and are thus a shelter or protection to others from many evils to which they are liable and instruments for good to those who associate with them. It is said that those who dwell under the shadow of Israel shall return or be converted, and that they shall revive as the corn and grow as the vine (Hos. xiv. 7). This was fulfilled in the past in the family of Abraham. Isaac dwelt under the shadow of his godly father, and he was converted and revived as the corn. Jacob dwelt under the shadow of his godly father Isaac, and he also was converted; and the twelve tribes of Israel sprang from Jacob and many of them were converted too. Although grace does not run in the blood, yet it runs from generation to generation in families and tribes. True godliness was found to run in the line of Seth in Old Testament times. While in the line of Cain, who killed his brother, we see no trace of true godliness but rather the opposite. There is a promise to the children of godly parents unto the third and fourth generation of them that fear Him—that God will bless them with the blessings of salvation.

IV. The purpose in this connection—"That they may see, and know, and consider, and understand together that the hand of the Lord hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it." The Lord's purpose in fulfilling His promise to the poor and needy, in such a gracious and wonderful manner, was to convince them and idolaters that He as the only living and true God could do, and did, what idols could never do. He appeals to them to know this, to consider, and understand together that His hand hath done this "and that the Holy One of Israel hath created it." The idols could not do either good or evil, they could neither punish transgressors nor save them, but He could and does both. When the Lord's people are in doubt as to whether they had undergone a saving change, they will admit that they had undergone a change from what they had formerly been. They ought to examine themselves on the Shorter Catechism answer to "What is effectual calling?" And to ask themselves—"Have we been convinced of our sins and misery? Has our mind been enlightened in the knowledge of Christ? Has our

will be renewed? Have we, in consequence, been persuaded and enabled to embrace Christ freely offered in the Gospel?" We have no hope for eternity but in Christ alone, and if we cannot say that we have faith of assurance we cannot deny that we have faith of adherence, that is to say, if we cannot say with some believers: "My beloved is mine and I am His;" we can say with others who have a weaker faith: "To whom shall we go, thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ the Son of the living God" (John vi. 68-69). Neither their own power or any finite power could effect this change, therefore, it must be the power of God through the agency of His spirit and the medium of His word even law and gospel that did it, and that it was the Holy One of Israel that created it. On the other hand, if many professing Christians examine themselves on effectual calling they might find by that test that they are still in a state of sin and misery notwithstanding their high profession. The Lord add His blessing to our meditation upon His Word. Amen.

---

## The Suffering Saviour.

---

BY REV. JOHN MACDONALD, CALCUTTA.

V.

(Continued from p. 151.)

**O**NCE more, what say you? "I know that He is lovely, but I dare not say that I love Him." Then I would next ask: Do you wish to love Him; from the heart, do you wish it? Does your conscience say, No? Does your conduct say, No? Then I can do no more but leave you in the hands of your God; let Him do with you as seemeth Him good. To know Jesus is to be worthy of love, and yet not wish to love Him! Oh, my dear reader, I conjure you, by all that is awful in Eternity, to strive to awake from this awful condition.

Is your reply, "I would indeed wish to love Him, if I knew but how. I am grieved from the heart that I do not and cannot love Him." If in this answer you be sincere, as in the sight of God, then, indeed, there may be hope; and if I were by you, I would stretch out the hand of affection to you. "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted" (Matt. v.). Behold the gift of the Holy Spirit freely promised to perform all that you desire.

1. It is the office of the Spirit to give "a new heart and a right spirit." Your natural mind is enmity against God and Christ; but the renewed mind loves Him. Oh plead then earnestly for the fulfilment to you of that precious promise in Ezekiel, xxxvi. 26—"A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you;" for to you it is addressed, if you but believe and trust in it.

2. It is the office of the Spirit to reveal Christ, in all His loveliness and excellency, to the heart and spirit thus renewed. Christ says to His sorrowing disciples, "The Spirit shall testify of Me," "He shall glorify Me, for He shall receive of Mine and shall show it unto you." (John xv. 16.) Plead, then, this promise also, that the Spirit may reveal Christ to you in all His glory, as "Immanuel, God with us."

3. It is the office of the Spirit to "shed abroad in the heart the love of Christ" (Rom. v.) thus revealed. He has done so to others. Oh, plead that He may do so to you also; for, hear the promise, "Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find" (Luke xi.)

If, then, you are sincere in wishing to love Jesus, and yet know not how, oh be earnest night and day in pleading for His Holy Spirit to renew you in the spirit of your mind; to reveal Christ to your soul, and to shed abroad the love of Him in your heart. This is what is meant by being born again; and remember what Jesus Himself says—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John iii.).

II. Another question I would now put to you, and grant, O Almighty God, for the sake of Him with whom Thou art ever well pleased, that whosoever readeth these lines may not pass it by, without laying it to heart! It is this—"Wilt thou go with this man," even with this Jesus? Yea or Nay; for there can be no silence, no half-way. Consider with whom I ask you to go. It is with Jesus, the "Lord of Glory," the eternal Son of God, "fairer than the sons of men," the "chiefest among ten thousand," and "altogether lovely." He is the "brightness of the Father's Glory," the "express image of His person," and therefore, also, He is "Love." It is in vain to say that this earth never saw His like, for the heaven of heavens, every stone of whose pavement is precious and beautiful, with all its glory and joy, is not even mentioned in the songs of the blessed that dwell there; but it is the Lamb of God, the chosen Lamb that was slain, the glorious Lamb now



upon the Throne, that fills the heart and souls of ten thousand times ten thousand spirits at this very moment in His immediate presence, who were once as guilty and hell-deserving as you or I. Come! up! let us join them, hear that voice which says, "Come up hither." Why should we not? They, too, were asked if they would go with Jesus; and, through His grace given to them, and now offered to you, they said, "We will go!" Oh my dear fellow-mortal, say you too, "I will go," in sincerity, and in dependence on that grace, and ye shall yet be happy with that Lamb and with those blessed ones.

Do you ask me, what is it "to go with Jesus?" I answer, It is to "believe in Him with the heart," to trust in Him, to give yourself wholly up to Him. Will you, then, go with Him? What is it that troubles you, that makes you hesitate? Is it this, "I know not the way?" Do you sincerely wish to know it? If so, then let me tell you that Jesus is a Prophet, and that He who sends for you will teach you. "I am the way, the truth, and the life." He teaches by His word, which you have in your hands; search it diligently; with much prayer to Him who is the author of it, for the effectual teaching of that Spirit who is the great Instructor of all who would come to Jesus, and who alone can make the word to become "spirit and life." Take this promise into your mouth: "I will send the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, and He shall guide you into all truth" (John xv.).

Or, is this your reply, "I am so vile a creature, and have so often rejected Christ, that I am afraid to dare to come to Him? Then let me remind you that Christ is a Priest, a great High Priest; and that by the enduring of those sorrows, and the suffering of that death which we have already been considering, He has so taken away sin that whosoever comes to Him in sincerity, shall find his own individual sins already pardoned. Behold the Man of Sorrows on the cross enduring all those awful agonies for sinners, and can you doubt but He will now receive you?"

The thief on the cross said to Him in the midst of that agony, "Lord, remember me;" and what was the reply, "To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise!" He intercedes for His murderers; and is there less hope for you? "His blood cleanseth from all sin" (John i. 1.) Oh, come then to this open fountain, with all your sins and wickedness! "He ever liveth to make intercession" (Heb. vii.); therefore, "He will save to the utter-



most all that come to Him." Take hold of this invitation and promise of His own, and plead it earnestly with God in Christ's name, "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt. xi).

Or, lastly, do you reply, "Willingly would I go with Jesus; but I feel that I cannot rouse myself from this hardened indifference, nor break myself off from sin to turn to Him." I say, then, Jesus is a King, and to Him is committed all power in heaven and in earth, and this power He employs in saving. Tell me, is not He that made your heart able to renew it? Is not He who has already turned to Himself myriads of sinful hearts, able to turn yours? How cheering to hear the Father say to Him, "Thy people shall be willing in the day of Thy power" (Psal. cx). Strive, therefore, to come to Jesus, looking up to Him, and confidently trusting in Him to make you willing by His power, by the power of His love: for thus saith the holy apostle, once a blasphemer, "The love of Christ constraineth me" (II. Cor. v.). Remember that "Jesus is exalted as a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance," as well as "forgiveness" (Acts v.) and is not repentance, to be grieved for sin, to hate it, to turn from it to God? Is not this what you wish for? and is it not freely given to them who will receive it?

Oh, come then to Jesus with that ignorance, that He may instruct you with that guilt, that He may remove it, with those bonds and chains, with that weakness and helplessness, that once more He may "bind up the broken-hearted, proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound!" (Isaiah lxi).

## Co-Eigneachadh Soisgeulach.

SEARMOIN LEIS AN URRAMACH TOMAS BOSTON.

"Co-eignich iad gu teachd a steach."—Lucas xiv., 23.

Agus nach sona iadsan a ta steach? Am bheil bhur carraig mar an carraig-san, O pheacacha? Thugaibh fein breith, agus c'uime nach tig sibhse steach mar an ceudna. Cha 'n eil tigh Chriosd fathasd air a lionadh. Thainig moran a stigh, ach "gidheadh tha ait falamh ann fathast" airson tuille, rann 22. Agus tha sinne air ar cuir amach gu "'ur co-eigneachadh gu teachd a steach." Tha sin air a sparradh oirinn 'nar bonn-teagaisg.

Se brìgh a chosamhlachd so (ata ciallachadh an aon nì ris a chuir phosaidh ata ann an soisgeul Mhata xxii.) a bhi nochdadh cuir air chul nan Iudhach airson an diultadh air Crìosd, agus gairm nan Cinneach 'nan aite. Si 'n t-shuiper chum am bheil iad air an cuireadh 'an so, Iosa Crìosd, le uile shochairan tearnaidh: is esan maraon fear deasachaidh, agus brìgh na suiper so. Ann am maduinne ann an linntibh na 'n aithrichibh, bha daoine air an cuireadh chum na feisde so; oir eadhon aig an am sin, cha robh an saoghal a dh' easbhuidh luchd searmonachaidh fireantachd, 2 Pead. ii., 5. Anns a mheadhion-latha, fo'n lagh, bha daoine air an cuireadh chum na feisde so, le faidhean, sagairt, agus Lebhithich. Agus a nis anns an fheasgar, anns na amanaibh deireannach, amana an t-soisgeul, tha iad air an gairm da h-ionnsuidh mar gu suiper; air da frithealadh an t-soisgeul, a bhi frithealadh deireannach grais do 'n t-saoghal. Fhuair na Iudhaich a cheud tairgse, ach cha tigeadh iad; ghabh iad an leith-sgeulan, mar a leughas sibh aig roinn 17, 18, 19, 20, de na chaibdeil so. Tha na Cinnich a faighail an ath thairgse; tha 'n seirbhiseach air a chuir amach gu sraidibh agus gu caol-shraidibh a bhaile: tha ministirean Chrìosd a' searmonachadh an t-soisgeul do na Cinnich bhochd, agus tha iad a gabhail ris. Ach cha 'n eil na h-uile teachd a stigh comhlath: uime sin tha 'n seirbhiseach air a chuir a mach "gus na rathaidibh mora, agus na garachaibh" far am bheil an seorsa is ro thruaighe do shluagh ri 'm faotainn, agus feumaidh eadhon iad so, a bhi air an co-eigneachadh gu teachd a steach. Feudaidh e bhith, gu 'n robh suil aig cuir amach an t-seirbhiseach da uair, ri rathadh an Tighearna ann am frithealadh an t-soisgeul do 'n t-saoghal Gheintileach; air da'n t-soisgeul air tus a bhi air a shearmonachadh do na mheud dhiu sa chuir eul ri iodhol-aoraidh an duthcha, 'sa rinn aoradh do'n fhìor Dhia; agus a chruinnich cuid a dh-uairean maille ris na Iudhaich na 'n sionagogaibh gu eolas De fhoghlum uatha, ged nach do ghabh iad ri pàirt dheas-ghnathach do crabhadh nan Iudhach: dh' fheudadh iad so gu cothromach a bhi air an cumail a mach mar "na daoine ciurramach, na crabhadh nan Iudhach: dh' fheudadh iad so gu cothromach a bhi air an cumail a mach mar "na daoine ciurramach, na bacaich, agus na doill' 'nan suidhe ann an sraidibh agus caol-shraidibh a bhaile. Ach na dheigh sin bha 'n soisgeul air a thoirt chum nan oisnibh bu ro-dhuirche de 'n talamh, far nach robh suim aon chuid air crabhadh Iudhach na Cinnich, ach a bha uile air dol fodha, anns an iodhol-aoraidh agus anns an aineolas bu ro-ghraineil; nì a dh' fheudadh gu cothromach a bhi air a chumail a mach mar 'na rathaidibh mora, agus na garachaibh. Faic Gnìomh x. agus xiii. 42, 46, 49.

Tha againn anns a bhonn teagasg tri nithe. (1) A chrìoch mhor a bhuineadh do mhinistearan a bhi aca fa chomhair an suil, ann an searmonachadh an t-soisgeul; agus is e sin, peacaich a thoirt a steach gu Crìosd. Cha 'n ann a mhaing ga 'n tarruing gu pairtidh, ach ga 'n tarruing gu Crìosd. Cha 'n e mhaing a bhi toirt orra a bhi ag atharrachadh an oibre na'n seirbheis, air dhoibh bhi fathast a fantuinn a muigh le bhi searmonachadh modhalachd a mhaing dhoibh; ach is e a bhi toirt orra am maighstir atharrachadh mar an ceudna, le bhi ga 'm faighail gu Crìosd tre chreidimh. (2) Feumaidh ministearan an deagh aire a thoirt co ris a ta aca ri dheanamh gu 'n toirt a steach; eadhon iadsan a ta na'n suidhe anns na rathaidibh mora agus anns na garachaibh, mar dheircich ann am broineagan agus fo chreuchdan, a chuid is neo-airidh agus is graineil do pheacaich. (3) An doigh a dh'f heumas iad a chleachdadh chum am faotainn a steach; "Co-eignich iad gu teachd a steach." Cha 'n ann le bhi deanamh ainneart air an cuirp. Chuir Crìosd claidheamh an Spioraid ann an laimha mhinistearan, ach cha do chuir e claidheamh tiomail nan laimh. Feumaidh geurleanmhuinn le luchd airm, le pianadh, le croich, agus claidheamh, a bhi na meadhonaibh chum daoine iomain a stigh gus an ana-criosd, ach cha toir sin gu brath a stigh gu Crìosd iad. Is co-eigneachadh modhail a ta againn sa bhonn-teagaisg; a leithid 'sa tha muinntir a cleachdadh ata cuireadh sluaigh gu cuirm, cha 'n ann gan slaodadh a stigh le spairn, ach ga 'n cuireadh le caoimhneas agus dian-iartus gus am faigh iad an aonta. 'S ann mar sin bu choir do mhinistearan peacaich a cho-eigneachadh gu teachd gu Crìosd, a' buintinn riu gu teo-chridheach agus da rreamh, chum is gu faiceadh peacaich gu 'm bheil ministearean ro-dhurachdach air gnothuch am Maighstir. Feumaidh sinn cuiridhean agus tairgsean caoimhneil an t-soisgeul, a thoirt dhoibh air an aon laimh, agus "uamhas an Tighearna," air an laimh eile, air chor 's ma theid daoine chum ifrinn, gu 'n teid iad an sin le fianuis na'm broilleach. Fadheoidh, tha lan eifeachd an Spioraid Naomh air a thoirt fainear an so, a ta cochuideachadh an fhocail, gu dheanamh eifeachdach chum iompachaidh an taghaidh; nach eil a deanamh spairn orra, ach gu caoimhneil ga 'n n-eigneachadh gu teachd a steach.

Teagasg.—Is i obair mhor mhinistearain, peacaich a cho-eigneachadh ann an doigh soisgeulach gu theachd a stigh gu Crìosd.

'S 'n doigh is fearr ann 's an urrainn dhomh am bonn-teagaisg so a laimhseachadh, mo shuil a chumail air a' ni sin a ta air a sparradh ann. Agus chum na crìche sin, bheir mi fainear cìod a ta air fhilleadh ann. Anns

1. Tha peacaich do thaobh naduir a mach. Mar biodh iad mar sin, cha bhiodh feum airson an co-eigheachadh gu teachd a steach. Eisdibh sibhse uile a ta 'n diugh a mach a Criosd, co as a ta sibh a mach, agus c'aite am bheil sibh.

Air tus, A pheacacha, am bheil fhios agaibh co as a ta sibh a mach? (1) Sibhse uile a ta mach a Criosd, tha sibh amach a teaghlach Dhe—Eph. ii. 18, 19. Is e teaghlach Dhe teaghlach a chreidimh; cha bhuin sibhse dhi. Feudaidd a thigh a bhi na thigh falamh air bhur sonsa. Theich Adhamh 'sa shliochd uile maille ris, amach as an tigh; agus tha sibhse an sin fathast far an d-fhag Adhamh sibh. Agus nach dubhach an cor sin, a bhi 'mach a teaghlach Dhe? Ged tha sibh ann an tigh ar mathair, cha chomasach dhuibh athair a ghairm dheth-san, do bhrìgh nach eil sibh ann an Criosd a Mhac! cha'n urradh sibh cuibhrionn na oighreachd na cloinne a thagar—Gal. iv. 30. (2) Tha sibh a mach o co-cheangal sith Dhe, agus mar sin gun dochas slainte, am feadh'sa ta sibh anns a staid sin—Eph. ii. 12. Tha sibh a leughadh mu charabad glormhor, ann an Dan Shol. iii. 9, 10. Is e sin cumhnant grais, cumhnant sith, mar air a chumail a mach anns an t-soisgeul shiorruidh; oir is e sin "focal na firinn, na macantach, agus na fireantach," air am bheil Criosd a marcachd agus a toirt buaidh. Be cumhnant nan gnìomh an carabad anns robh Adhamh agus a shliochd gu bhi air an giulan do neamh: b'ann aig Adhamh a bha stiùireadh a charabad so, ach cha b'fhada mharcaich e, nuair a bhriseadh an carabad na bhloighdean. Nis a ta carabad nuadh air a dheanamh anns a bheil Criosd a' giulan a shluagh uile gu gloir; ach tha sibhse a mach as. B'e Rìgh Solamh, an t-Eadar-Mheadhonair Criosd a rinn e; cha robh neach eile comasach air a dheanamh ach esan. Rinn se e air a shon fein, gu bhi foillseachadh a ghloir fein, agus anabarra saoihbheas a ghrais leis; agus "airson nigheanaibh Ierusalem, chum a cheile ghiulan dachaidh ann gu tigh Athair. Rinn se e do "fhiodh maireannach Lebanon," oir is aill leis an carabad a bhi na chumhnant shiorruidh nach teid a chaidh a bhriseadh. Tha aig a charabad so "puist do airgid"—na geallanna oirdheire sin a ta co sonruichte do chumhnant grais, mar tha geallach maitheanais, buannhair-eannachd sa leithid sin, oir ta e "air a dhaingneachadh air geallanna ni 's fearr." Agus do bhrìgh nach cudthrom beag a ta anns a charabad so nuair ata peacach ann, rinn e "iochdar do or" daingean agus laidir, air chor 's nach tuit neach ata ann gu brath troimh, ged bu truime iad na beannaibh luaidh; "Oir a ta bunait Dhe a' seasmhach daingean, aig am bheil an seula so, Is aithne do 'n Tighearn an dream as leis"—Tim. ii. 19. Tha iad air an deanamh tearuinte le

ordugh siorruidh taghaidh Dhe. Cha tuit òinionn feirg gu brath orra san a ta sa charabad so, air a ta comhdach air do fhuil cro-dhearg Iosa Crìosd. “Tha a mheadhon, an taobh a stigh dheth air a chomhdach le gradh:” tha gradh a linigeadh a charabaid; tha e os an cionn, air gach taobh dhiu; seadh tha e fodhpa, air chor is ged thuitedh iad ann, nach fhaigh iad leithid do thuiteam craiteach, is nach comasach dhoibh eirigh a ris. Is sona iadsan a ta ann, ach, mo thruaigh a pheacacha tha sibhse a mach as. Tha sibh ’nur luidhe far do leig a cheud charabad sibh nuair a bhris e. (3) Tha sibh a mach o fhabhor Dhe, air dhuibh a bhi mach a’ Crìosd: nis tha sin uamhasach, “oir a ta ar Dia-ne na theine dian-loisgeach,” agus cha ’n eil fasgaidh o fheirg Dhe, ach a bhi fo’ chomhdach fuil an Eadar-mheadhonair—Eph. ii. 13. Tha ’n aingeal sgriosaidh a’ teachd seachad, ach cha’n eil fuil craththa air ursanaibh bhur dorsa. Tha Dia ann an Crìosd a reiteachadh an t-saoghail ris fein; mar tig sibhse a stigh, agus a choinneachadh ’an sin, ciod ris am bi duil agaibh ach gu’n coinnich e sibh mar mhath-ghamhuinn o’n do bhuineadh a cuileanan, gu’n reub e sgairt ’ur cridhe, agus gu’n sluig e sibh mar leomhan—Hos. xiii. 8. Ciod am feum a ni ’ur dleasdanas dhuibh, am feadh ata sibh mach a’ Crìosd? an urrainn iad fahbor Dhe a chosnadh dhuibh? Cha teid bhur deoir a chaoidh ’na shearraig ni mo thig ’ur uirnich gu brath gu chluasan—Eoin xiv. 6.

San dara aite—Am bheil fhios agaibh, a pheacacha, c’aite am bheil sibh? Innisidh mi dhuibh c’aite. (1) Tha sibh air cluanaibh an diabhuil, air beanntaibh an diomhainis, mu fhail nan leomhainn, agus air beanntaibh nan leopaird, far am bheil Satan a’g iomain a threud. Tha sibh a mach a’ tigh Dhe, air seacharan faondrach a’ gleidheadh arain, a’g iarraidh deire aig dorus an t-saoghail, ag radh, C’aite am bheil e? Cha’n aithne dhuidh Crìosd aran na beatha; agus uime sin tha aolach taitneasan, agus buanachdan saoghalta co luachmhor ann ’ur suilibh. Ach innis dhomh, a pheacaich am bheil thu uair sam bith sasuichte? “Bu mhiann leat do bhru a lionadh le plaosgaibh” an t saoghail, ach am bheil iad da rìreamh ga d’ shasuchadh? Nach eil a bhrìgh air fhasgadh as na nithe sin, air chor is gu ’m bheil thu ga ’m faotainn na’m plaosgan falamh? Ann a d’ uile shiubhal air beanntaibh an diomhainis, an tainig thu riamh chum an aite sin mu ’m b’urrainn thu radh—agus a dhearbadh—se so mo shuaimhneas, agus an so gabhaidh mi tamh. Cha tainig ’s cha tig gu brath, ach an tig thu gu Crìosd—Isa. iv. 2. (2) Tha sibh ann an ifrinn air thalamh. Is e bhi ann an ifrinn, a bhi an taobh a muigh—Taisb. xxii. 15; agus cha tainig sibhse a stigh, tha sibh air ’ur diteadh a cheana—Eoin. iii. 18,—ceangailte anns a phrìosan—Isa. lxi 1. Ciod

an t-eadar-dhealachadh a ta eadar sibhse, agus iadsan a ta ann an ifrinn. Tha sibh araon 'nur prìosanaich; amhain gu bheil sibhse sa phrìosan a muigh, ach iadsan 'sa phrìosan a's faide stigh. Tha sibh maraon air falbh o Chrìosd; amhain so, tha sibhse falbh uaith le'r deoin, ach is eigin dhoibhsan imeachd uaith. Tha teine feirg Dhe, air a chuir 'nur co-guisean araon, amhain cha'n eil e air a sheideadh suas na lasair, le anail an Tighearna mar shruth pronnusg ga lasadh annaibh-sa mar a ta e anna-san; ach cha 'n eil fhios agaibh ciod cho luath 'sa dh' fheudas e bhi mar sin. Ach fathast tha eadar-dhealachadh eil ann; tha iadsan nam prìosanaich gun dochas; tha sibhse 'nur prìosanaich an dochais. Uime sin theid mi air aghaidh gu puing eile.

II—Is e gnothuch mhor cairdean an Fhir-nuadh-phosda iadsan a ta muigh, a thoirt a stigh. Fheara, sibhse a ta muigh, tha sibh far nach bu choir dhuibh a bhi; tha sibh air talamh toirmeasgta. B'aill leinn sibh a bhi stigh, b'aill leinn bhuir toirt gu Chrìosd, gu sibh aonadh ris, le creidsinn ann, is gabhail ris na uile ofigean. -

Sa cheud aite—Tha sinn ag' innseadh dhuibh, gur e ar Tighearna amhain a ta air a sgeadachadh le ard ughdarras agus barrantas, gu bhi am Faidh, an Searmonaich, agus am Fear-teagaisg mor, a sheoladh na slighe gu tìr Immanuel—Gnìomh iii. 22, 23. Chuir e suas a thigh-foghlum 'nar measg-ne, ach cha 'n eil aig ach beagan fhoghlumaich; agus thainig sinne chum 'ur co-eigneachadh gu teachd a stigh, gus am bi a thigh air a lionadh. Tha moran dheisciobul aig Satan; tha moran fhoghlumaich aig gliocas feolmhor; mo thruaigh gu 'm bheil! O fagaibh iad. Is e ar Tighearna a mhain, an Treoraiche mor, air a thoirt leis an Athair, gus' a Chanain neamhaidh—Isa. iv. 4. Cha tainig, 's cha tig, neach riamh an sin, ach a luchd leanmhuinn-sa; thigibh a stigh uime sin, thugaibh sibh fein suas dha, gu bhi air 'ur treorachadh leis. B'aill leibh uile a bhi sona; b'aill leibh uile a dhol do neamh fa-dheireadh; ach tha sibh uile air seacharan ann am fasach gu 'n slighe; agus gu cinnteach caillidh sibh, sibh fein, mar gabh sibh esan mar 'ur Treoraiche. Tha 'n t-shlige gu gloir na shlighe dheacair, agus cha 'n eil sibhse eolach uimpe, seadh, is luchd turuis dall sibh, ata an cunnart na h-uile tiota tuiteam thar craig-eigin. O! an gabh sibh fear iuil? Tha sibh a nis, mar gu 'm b-ann 'nur seasamh, far am bheil da shligh a' coinneachadh, gu 'n fhios agaibh co-aca a ghabhas sibh. Tha 'ur gliocas fein, ata na h-aimideas, a' comharrachadh amach slighe fharsuing reigh, ag radh "Ge be neach a ta baoghalta thigeadh e stigh an so—Gnath. ix. 16. Ach na rachaibh a stigh an sin, oir "tha na mairbh an sin, agus ata a h-aoidhean ann an doimhneachdaibh ifrinn," rann 18. Tha gliocas an athair, ar

*Ri leantuinn.*

Tighearn Criosd, ag comharrachadh amach slighe chumhann dhuibh, ach tha i treorachadh chum beatha; agus tha e'n diugh ag-radh ribh, "Ge b'e neach a ta baoghalta thigeadh e an stigh an so," rann 4. Thigibh a stigh uime sin, a' cuir eul ri 'r gliocas fein, thugaibh sibh fein dhasan, gu bhi air ur treorachadh, agus air stiuireadh leis, "Eisdibh agus mairidh ur n-anam beo."

## **Illegal Roman Catholic Processions.\***

**I**N view of the many Roman Catholic Parades (such as Corpus Christi processions) now taking place, every citizen should not the following statute law, says the "Churchman's Magazine":—

### **I. Roman Catholic Emancipation Act.**

"And be it further enacted That if any Roman Catholic Ecclesiastic or any member of any of the Orders Communities or Societies hereinafter mentioned shall after the commencement of this Act exercise any of the Rites or Ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Religion or wear the Habits of his Orders save within the usual places of Worship of the Roman Catholic Religion or in Private Houses such Ecclesiastic or other Person shall being thereof convicted by due course of Law forfeit for every such offence the sum of 50 pounds."—(Sec. 26, 10 George 4, c. 7, 1829).

### **II. Queen Victoria's Proclamation.**

"Whereas by the Act of Parliament passed in the tenth year of the reign of His Majesty King George IV., for the relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, it is enacted that no Roman Catholic Ecclesiastic, nor any member of any of the religious orders, communities, or societies of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows, should exercise any of the rights or ceremonies of the Roman Catholic religion, or wear the habits of his order, save within the usual places of worship of the Roman Catholic Religion, or in private houses. And whereas it has been represented to us that Roman Catholic Ecclesiastics, wearing the orders, have exercised the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic religion in highways and places of public re-

\* The above may be had as a leaflet from the Protestant Truth Society, 3 and 4 St Paul's Church-yard, London, E.C., price 1s 2d per 100, post free.

sort, with many persons in ceremonial dresses, bearing banners and objects or symbols of worship, and procession, to the great scandal and annoyance of large numbers of our people, and to the manifest danger of the public peace. And whereas it has been represented to us that such violation of the law has been committed near places of worship during the time of Divine Service, and in such a manner as to disturb the congregations assembled therein, We have therefore thought it our bounden duty, by and with the advice of our Privy Council, to issue this, our Royal Proclamation, solemnly warning all those whom it may concern that, whilst we are resolved to protect our Roman Catholic subjects in the undisturbed enjoyment of their legal rights and religious freedom, we are determined to repress the commission of all such offences as aforesaid, whereby the offenders may draw upon themselves the punishments attending the violation of the laws and the peace and security of our dominions may be endangered. Given at our Court, at Buckingham Palace, this Fifteenth day of June, in the year of our Lord, in the Fifteenth year of our reign."

---

### Literary Notice.

---

THE DECIDING VOICE OF THE MONUMENTS IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY, by Melvin Grove Kyle, D.D., LL.D., President of the Xenia Theological Seminary. Revised Edition. London: Robert Scott, Paternoster Row. Price 8s net.

This is one of the most interesting and informative books we have ever read on Biblical Archæology. Though an expert in his own department, Dr Grove Kyle differs from many of his fellows in that he presents his subject in a fascinating way to his readers. The testimony of archæology to the trustworthiness of the Bible is presented by a master in a style so lucid and captivating that one reads from page to page without any conscious effort or feeling of weariness. Dr Kyle has done excellent work in this revised edition in bringing before the public the striking testimony of archæological discovery to the trustworthiness of the Bible. While we say this, we do not commit ourselves to all his statements nor subscribe to some of his theories, which may be changed with further discovery.



## Notes and Comments.

**A Notable Scottish Historical Document.** — The "Scottish Historical Review" for July publishes what it terms a "document of unique historical value." The document in question is the "National Petition to the Scottish Privy Council, October 18th, 1637." The "National Petition" was, to use Baillie's words, "Scotland's Magna Charta." It bore the signatures of five hundred noblemen, country gentlemen, burgesses and ministers. The opposition to the "Service Book" was growing and the men who signed the Petition were determined that the Laudian policy should be brought to a speedy end. This was the forerunner of the great national movement that culminated in the signing of the Covenant in 1638 in Greyfriars. The first signatory is "J. Southerland." This is the probable explanation of the oft repeated erroneous statement that the Earl of Sutherland was the first to sign the Covenant in 1638. There is no historical evidence for this and the mistake handed down as a fact of history may be due to confusing the signing of the National Petition with the signing of the Covenant. The names of some of the ministers who became famous in the Second Reformation are found here and alas! also some who went back and joined the persecutors, among them being the notorious Archbishop Sharp. Among the laymen appear the names of Montrose and Thomas Dalryell (Dalziel), father of the persecutor. We give the document in modernised spelling on another page.

**Man's Descent: A New View.**—As we read the views propounded by scientific men as to man's origin we cannot help coming to the conclusion that instead of vainly seeking for the "missing link" among primeval deposits, that it should be sought for in the brains of these learned men themselves. "There is something wrong somewhere," as Principal Rainy said when confronted with the sad effects of his own ecclesiastical leadership, when intelligent men give vent to such puerilities and wild conjectures that pass in the name of science. Recently, Prof. Wood Jones, Melbourne University, who had refused the Chair of Anatomy in London University in order to continue his scientific researches in Australia, declared that the methods applied hitherto in the determination of man's pedigree were such as would not be applied to any other animal. Man, according to Prof. Jones, with the ape sprang from the primitive tarscoïd, and it was absurd to be searching for the "missing link" since man's evolution occurred so early and by far antedated the remains dis-

covered in comparatively modern earth layers. Such is the kind of views presented in the sober name of science. There must be something decidedly wrong with the thinking apparatus of these learned men.

**Return to the "Book of Sports."**—The Dean of Exeter, in a special article in the "Morning Post" (25th July), advocates recreation on the Lord's Day. It seems that the Christian Church, in observing this day as sacred to God, has been under the guidance of what the Dean terms a "false conscience." To put matters right he advocates a return to the ideal set forth in the infamous "Book of Sports," which gave permission "at the end of divine service for lawful recreation, such as dancing, either for men or women, archery for men, leaping, vaulting, the setting up of Maypoles, and other sports hitherto used, so as the same be had in due and convenient time, without impediment or neglect of divine service." "Men may worship and play on the same day without any inconsistency" is the Dean's cure for present-day neglect of Sabbath observance. For our own part, we detest this disloyalty. If men are the enemies of God's law, better that they should cross over to the camp of the enemy than remain in the Church and do the devil's work.

**Dr Moffatt's Translation of the Old Testament.**—The "Princeton Theological Review" for April has an article by Prof. Allis, of Princeton Theological Seminary, in which he gives a most thorough examination of the greatly belauded translation of the Old Testament by Dr Moffatt. Dr Moffatt has not only given a new translation which, with the ostensible purpose of popularising its diction in many places, has only succeeded all too well in vulgarising it, but what is more serious, he has taken great liberties with the text, and displaced sentences in keeping with the teaching of present day higher critical views. This is the most thorough criticism we have yet seen of this work, and a very damaging one it is. The concluding part of Prof. Allis' article is given on another page.

**Corpus Christi Procession in Badenoch: A Correction.**—A correspondent has written us pointing out that we have fallen into a mistake in confusing the Crathie in Badenoch with the better known Crathie in Aberdeenshire. The former is a small crofting township in Inverness-shire. Our sentence implying that the Church of Rome was openly breaking the law of the land and showing aggressiveness in the vicinity of the Royal Palace of Balmoral does not therefore hold true as far as this particular incident was concerned, and we ex-

press regret for the mistake. Having made this acknowledgment, we wish to say that, while we are indebted to anyone who points out any mistakes we make in these pages, it would give us much more satisfaction if when they write a criticism such as we received from the above correspondent, they would have the courage to give their names and addresses, so that we might have the opportunity of giving information where necessary and correcting manifest misunderstanding of what we wrote as in this particular case. We take this opportunity of directing the attention of correspondents to the "Notice to Correspondents" on page ii. of Cover of the Magazine. The Irish method of shooting a man from behind a hedge never appealed to us as manly or heroic, and still less when done with loud professions of loyalty to the King. If our anonymous correspondent will oblige us with his name and address, he may, as the legal notices have it, hear something to his advantage.

---

### Church Notes.

**Communion.**—September—First Sabbath, Ullapool and Vatten; second, Strathy; third, Tarbert (Harris), Applecross, and Stoer; fourth, Laide. October—Second Sabbath, Gairloch; third, Scourie; fourth, Wick. November—First Sabbath, Oban; second, Glasgow; third, Edinburgh and Dornoch. Note.—Notice of any additions to or alterations of the above dates of Communion should be sent to the Editor.

**Short Obituaries.**—It is with sincere regret we have heard of the death of Mr Alexander Mackenzie, elder, Stornoway, and Mr Duncan Campbell, Portree. We also had the sad news of the passing away of Mr R. S. Mackenzie, Detroit, after an operation. Mr Mackenzie was so well known to the deputies who visited the States that his loss comes to them as that of a personal friend. The removal of these men, so useful in their respective spheres, is a great loss to our cause both at home and abroad. We extend to the sorrowing families and relatives our heartfelt sympathy, with the prayer that the Lord would raise up others to fill the vacant places.

---

### Acknowledgment of Donations.

John Grant, Palmerston Villa, 4 Millburn Rd., Inverness, General Treasurer, acknowledges, with thanks, the following donations received up to 16th July 1925:—

**SUSTENTATION FUND.**—Mr and Mrs K. Cameron, Soay, per Mr Kenneth Cameron, £1; Mrs Mackenzie, Brooklyn, U.S.A., per Rev. N. Cameron, £1

Os 5d; Mr A. Maclean, Tomich, Strathglass, 2s 6d; Mrs H. Mackenzie, Foremast, Alberta, 12s; Mr John Mackenzie, Saltburn, £1.

**JEWISH AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.**—For Kaffir Bibles, in loving memory of a beloved brother and two sisters, £100, per Rev N. Cameron; a Friend, Harris, per Rev. N. Cameron, £5; a Friend, Daviot, do., 10s; Donald Clark, Valencia, U.S.A., quarterly subscription, £6.

**ORGANISATION FUND.**—Mr D. A. Stewart, Spean-Bridge, 16s.

The following lists have been sent in for publication:—

**GREENOCK CHURCH DEBT FUND.**—Rev. N. Cameron thankfully acknowledges from—Friend, 7s; Friend, Borne, £1; D. M., Plockton, 10s; Friend, Harris, £5; Friend, Daviot, 10s; J. McK., £1; Friend, Strathpeffer, £3; A. F., Stratherrick, £4; A. MacVicar, Lochmaddy, £1; "A Wisher," 10s; a Friend, £2; Mrs Stewart, Tobermory, 10s; Mr John Urquhart, 12 Lyndoch Street, Greenock, acknowledges, with sincere thanks:—Mr J. Mackenzie, Kelly Street, £1 10s; Friend, per Miss I. Maclean, Greenock, 7s; Mr W. K. Campbell, Glasgow, per Mrs Macintyre, £1; Friend, per Miss Cameron, £2 10s; Mr Duncan Young, Glasgow, £1; Miss M. Young, Kames, 10s.

**CLYDEBANK CHURCH DEBT FUND.**—Mr James Nicolson, 58 Second Avenue, Clydebank, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, from Mr Farquhar MacLennan, Toronto, 3 dollars.

**EDINBURGH CHURCH PURCHASE FUND.**—Per Rev. N. Macintyre:—Lady Friend, Halkirk, £2; Friend, Strathy, £1; Friend, Halkirk, £1; Mr R. Macfarlane, Benbecula, £1. Per Capt. K. K. Macleod:—A Friend, Inverness, 20s. Per Mr Peter Anderson:—Friend, N. Zealand, 20s. Per Mr James Mackay:—Friend, Strathpeffer, 20s.

## The Magazine.

**4s SUBSCRIPTIONS.**—Mrs Andrews, 35 Westbourne Terrace, London; Miss B. Angus, Ullapool; Sam. Cameron, Spean-Bridge; Mrs Crawford, 146 Buccleuch Street, Glasgow; John Finlayson, Applecross; Mrs B. Gillies, Raasay; Donald Gillies, Callikillie; Mrs R. Gollan, Lochcarron; Mrs J. D. Kidd, Richmond River, N.S.W.; Rev. M. Murray, F.C. Manse, Kilchoan; John MacCuish, 17 Northton; John Macdonald, St Boswells; Mal. Macfarlane, 1a Skigersta; John Mackenzie, Saltburn; Hugh Macleod, Fearn; John Macleod, 14 MacLennan Street, Glasgow; Don. MacLennan, Strathvaich; Arch. McMaster, Skiskine, Arran; Mrs H. J. Purdie, Ballina, N.S.W.; John Macrae, 1 Stanmore Ave., Leeds; Mrs Wm. Macrae, Achduart; Don. A. Stewart, Spean-Bridge; Peter Stewart, Craigscorrie; D. McSwan, Boerve, Portree.

**OTHER SUBSCRIPTIONS.**—Misses Fraser, St Giles', Kingussie, 8s; Mrs C. A. Luce, Alberta, Canada, 4s; Rod. Matheson, Lonbain, 8s; Mrs A. Munro, 5 Lower Breakish, 5s; Mrs B. Macdougall, Embo, 10s; Geo. Mackay, Scotscaidier, 10s; Murdo Mackay, 21 Skigersta, 4s 6d; Mrs H. Mackenzie, Foremost, Alberta, 4s 5d; Mrs M. Mackenzie, Brookline, Mass., U.S.A., 4s 1d; John Mackenzie, 4 Openin, Laide, 12s; Duncan Mackenzie, Auckland, N.Z., 5s; Mrs Mackintosh, Tordarroch Mains, 15s; Mrs Macleod, Alness, 3s; Murdo Macleod, Ardionich, 5s; Malcolm Macleod, Maisonneuve, Montreal, 4s 6d; Miss M. Macleod, Clashnessie, 5s; Mrs C. Macneill, Bowmore, Islay, 3s; J. P. Macqueen, Conon-Bridge, 1s; Angus Nicolson, 67 Morley Ave., Manchester, 12s; D. McSween, 12 Borrodale, 4s 6d; Daniel Sinclair, Wick, 8s; Mrs Spottiswoode, Belfast, 2s.

**FREE DISTRIBUTION.**—Misses Fraser, St Giles', Kingussie, 12s; Rod. Matheson, Lonbain, Shieldaig, 2s; John Macdonald, St Boswells, 8s.

**CORRECTION.**—Entry opposite Lairg in Tabular view (July issue) of collections:—Organisation Fund, £3 16s, should have been Dingwall, £3; Lairg, £3 16s.