

THE

Free Presbyterian Magazine

And MONTHLY RECORD

VOL. XXX.

April 1926.

No. 12.

Luther's Early Spiritual Struggles.*

LUTHER'S is one of the great names on the Church's roll. By grace given to him from heaven he delivered one of the most tremendous blows ever inflicted on error; under the impact of that blow the Church of Rome reeled and staggered and was finally broken. Naturally, he was a man of extraordinary energy, an electrified human being, and the Spirit of God made use of this energy in turning it into channels where its efforts would not be dissipated in merely beating the air. As a man he touched humanity at more points than the great Reformed theologian, Calvin. There was a warmth of feeling in Luther that brought him into closer touch with men, and less of the aloofness of the French Reformer which, while it won respect from men, did not call forth their affections to the same degree. Luther, on the other hand, had not the strength of Calvin's clear judgment, and was too ready on occasions to be swayed by his strong, impulsive, overmastering feelings which drove everything before them, sometimes to his own sorrow and to the confusion of the cause he was advocating. As a thinker and theologian, Calvin far excelled him. There was a precision in Calvin's logic that was the despair of his opponents. His evenly-balanced judgment was not only marvellously correct in its decisions, but remarkably comprehensive. And in his case also the Spirit of God made use of these noble powers of mind

* Luther and the Reformation, by James Mackinnon, Ph.D., D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, University of Edinburgh. Vol. I., Early Life and Religious Development to 1517. Longmans, Green, and Co., 39 Paternoster Row, London, E.C. 4. Price 16s net.

and employed them for the purpose of building up a system of theology which was accepted by the Reformed Churches throughout the world. To each of these great men a work was allotted by God. Calvin could not have done what Luther did—he lacked the fire and energy that awakened the dull, slow-moving German mind from its long slumbers. Luther on the other hand could not have done Calvin's work. Had he thundered among the lively French as he did in Germany he might have awakened forces which neither he nor others could have held in check.

While recognising the greatness of Luther's work as a Reformer we are not blind to very serious defects in that work both from the standpoint of doctrine and church polity, but it is not our intention to dwell on these defects but to make some reference to the extraordinary and fiery struggles through which he passed ere he came into the clear light of the Gospel and found peace of conscience through the blood of Christ. In a recently published book—"Luther and the Reformation," by Dr James Mackinnon, Edinburgh—we have decidedly one of the ablest, if not the ablest, and most thorough accounts of Luther's early struggles that has yet appeared in English. Dr Mackinnon, of whose work only the first volume has yet appeared, traces up the history of Luther from his earliest years to the momentous year 1517. He has also been at special pains in presenting the theological opinions of the Fathers and Schoolmen who may be said to have most influenced Luther's theological views. Dr Mackinnon must have given considerable study to this part of his subject, and his studies will be of special use to future historians of the Reformation and biographers of Luther. At the same time we feel it necessary to say that Dr Mackinnon is very far from satisfactory when he deals with the great Pauline doctrines of predestination and total depravity. As a professor in the faculty of divinity he must have subscribed the Westminster Confession of Faith, and he would be well advised to compare its statements on these matters with those of his own in dealing with the Pauline and Augustinian doctrines which had such a prominent place in the teaching of the early Reformers—Luther included. The introduction of a biographer's own views in the life of a great man are not always advisable, and Dr Mackinnon's treatment of these doctrines would have been more satisfactory if he had not made it so clear what his own theological position is.

With this brief criticism we now proceed to deal with Luther's early spiritual struggles, taking Dr Mackinnon's book as our guide. Luther sprang from peasant stock. His parents, both father and mother, were good disciples of Solomon and made use of the rod, at times too drastically. But though he had a Spartan training, Luther admitted afterwards that his parents were seeking his welfare, and he cherished a deep affection for his father and mother. It has been commonly said that Luther was the son of a poor miner, but as Dr Mackinnon points out, while it was true that his father was poor at Luther's birth, yet in 1491, when Luther was only 8 years old, his father had so succeeded by his industry that he was the lessee of several pits and furnaces.

Luther, having passed through his school and university courses with distinction, and having received his Master's degree, was destined, according to his father's wish, for the Law. As, in the case of Calvin, Luther yielded to his father's wish rather than to any inclination he himself had for the study of law. He had no sooner, however, begun the study of law than a remarkable change took place in his views, and in July 1505, he entered the monastery of the Augustinian Eremites at Erfurt. Luther himself gives the explanation of this sudden change in his career. On the 2nd of July, while returning from Mansfeld to Erfurt, he was overtaken by a tremendous thunderstorm, and a flash of lightning prostrated him to the ground. In terror of death, he called on St Anna for help, and vowed to be a monk. In his work on "Monastic Vows," in the dedication to his father, he says:—"I was called to this vocation by the terrors of heaven, for neither willingly, nor by my own desire, did I become a monk, but, surrounded by the terror and agony of sudden death, I vowed a forced and unavoidable vow." His father was strongly opposed to the monks, and when his own son entered a monastery he set it down to an illusion, but Luther, though he afterwards repented of his vow, kept it in spite of the entreaties of his father and friends. This, then, was the first step leading up to that long, sore struggle on which he entered in the hope that he would work out salvation for his own soul. In 1507 he was ordained as a priest, and up to this date there is not much indication of the struggle except that he performed the duties of the monastery with more than ordinary diligence. "I kept vigil night by night," he says, "fasted, prayed, chastised and mortified my body, kept obedience and lived chastely." All this was done, he

tells us, "with the idea of attaining to righteousness by my works." It was no exaggeration for him to say, "I venture to say that if ever a monk could have gained heaven through monkery, I should certainly have got there. This all my fellow-monks who have known me will attest." Again he writes—"I was so deeply plunged in monkery even to delirium and insanity. If righteousness was to be got by the law, I should certainly have attained it." God's righteousness was a terrible stumbling block to him. "Just" and "justice" he says were like a thunderbolt in his conscience. As yet he knew not Eternal Wisdom's way for the guilty sinner—"Jehovah Tsidkenu was nothing to him." Not only so, but he himself declares—"We fled from Christ as from the devil, and ran to the Virgin Mary and St Barbara, for we were taught that every one must appear before the judgment seat of Christ with his works and his order." "Often," he further adds, "was I horrified at the name of Jesus, and when I regarded Him on the Cross, it was as if I had been struck by lightning, and when I heard His name mentioned, I would rather have heard the name of the devil, for I laboured under the belief that I must seek by my good works to make Christ my gracious friend and thereby reconcile an angry God." The text that troubled him most of all was the one that was afterwards to be of the greatest comfort, viz., Roms. i. 17. "This passage," he says, "always stuck in my mind. For I was unable to understand otherwise the word righteousness, wherever it might occur in Scripture, than in the sense that God was righteous and would judge righteously." The account of how deliverance came to his troubled conscience and storm-tossed heart will be told in another issue.

Women Speaking in Church.

BY THE LATE PROFESSOR B. B. WARFIELD, D.D.,
PRINCETON.

"Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church."—I. Cor. xiv. 34,35.

I HAVE recently received a letter from a valued friend asking me to send him a "discussion of the Greek words 'laleo' and 'lego' in such passages as I. Cor.

xiv. 33-39, with special reference to the question: "Does the thirty-fourth verse forbid all women everywhere to speak or preach publicly in Christian churches?" The matter is of universal interest, and I take the liberty of communicating my reply to the readers of "The Presbyterian."

It requires to be said at once that there is no problem with reference to the relations of "laleo" and "lego." Apart from niceties of merely philological interest, these words stand related to one another just as the English words speak and say do; that is to say, "laleo" expresses the act of talking, while "lego" refers to what is said. Wherever then the fact of speaking, without reference to the content of what is said, is to be indicated, "laleo" is used, and must be used. There is nothing disparaging in the intimation of the word, any more than there is in our word talk; although, of course, it can on occasion be used disparagingly as our word talk can also—as when some of the newspapers intimate that the Senate is given over to mere talk. This disparaging application of "laleo," however, never occurs in the New Testament, although the word is used very frequently.

The word is in its right place in I Cor. xiv. 33ff, therefore, and necessarily bears there its simple and natural meaning. If we needed anything to fix its meaning, however, it would be supplied by its frequent use in the preceding part of the chapter, where it refers not only to speaking with tongues (which was a divine manifestation and unintelligible only because of the limitations of the hearers), but also the prophetic speech which is directly declared to be to edification and exhortation and comforting (verses 3-6). It would be supplied more pungently, however, by its contrasting term here—"Let them be silent" (verse 34). Here we have "laleo" directly defined for us: "Let the women keep silent, for it is not permitted to them to speak." Keep silent—speak: these are the two opposites; and the one defines the other.

It is important to observe, now, that the pivot on which the injunction of these verses turns, is not the prohibition of speaking so much as the command of silence. That is the main injunction. The prohibition of speech is introduced only to explain the meaning more fully. What Paul says is in brief: "Let the women keep silent in the churches." That surely is direct and specific enough for all needs. He then adds explanatorily: "For it is not permitted to them to speak."

"It is not permitted" is an appeal to a general law, valid apart from Paul's personal command, and looks back to the opening phrase—"As in all the churches of the saints." He is only requiring the Corinthian women to conform to the general law of the churches. And that is the meaning of the almost bitter words which he adds in verse 36, in which, reproaching them for the innovation of permitting women to speak in the churches, he reminds them that they are not the authors of the Gospel, nor are they its sole possessors—let them keep to the law that binds the whole body of churches and not be seeking some new-fangled way of their own.

The intermediate verses only make it plainer that precisely what the apostle is doing is forbidding women to speak at all in the church. His injunction of silence he pushes so far that he forbids them even to ask questions; and adds with special reference to that, but through that to the general matter, the crisp declaration that "it is indecent"—for that is the meaning of the word—"for a woman to speak in church."

It would be impossible for the apostle to speak more directly or more emphatically than he has done here. He requires women to be silent at the church meetings. For that is what "in the churches" means; there were no church buildings then. And he has not left us in doubt as to the nature of these church meetings. He had just described them in verses 36ff. They were of the general character of our prayer meetings. Note the words, "Let him be silent in the church," in verse 30, and compare them with "Let them be silent in the churches," in verse 34. The prohibition of women speaking covers thus all public church meetings—it is the publicity, not the formality of it, which is the point. And he tells us repeatedly that this is the universal law of the church. He does more than that. He tells us that it is the commandment of the Lord, and emphasises the word "Lord" (verse 37).

The passages in I. Tim. ii. 11ff is just as strong, although it is more particularly directed to the specific case of public teaching or ruling in the church. The apostle had already in this context (verse 8, "the men," in contrast with "women" of verse 9) pointedly confined public praying to men, and now continues: "Let a woman learn in silence in all subjection; but I do not permit the woman to teach, neither to rule over the man, but to be in silence." Neither the teaching nor the ruling function is permitted to woman. The apostle says here, "I do not permit," instead of as in I. Cor.

xiv. 33ff, "it is not permitted," because he is here giving his personal instructions to Timothy, his subordinate, while there he was announcing to the Corinthians the general law of the church. What he instructs Timothy, however, is the general law of the church. And so he goes on and grounds his prohibition in a universal reason which affects the entire race equally.

In the face of these two absolutely plain and emphatic passages, what is said in I. Cor. xi. 5 cannot be appealed to in mitigation or modification. Precisely what is meant in I. Cor. xi. 5, nobody knows. What is said there is that every woman praying or prophesying unveiled dishonours her head. It seems fair to infer that if she prays or prophesies veiled she does not dishonour her head. And it seems fair further to infer that she may properly pray or prophesy if only she does it veiled. We are piling up a chain of inferences. And they have not carried us very far. We cannot infer that it would be proper for her to pray or prophesy in church if only she were veiled. There is nothing said about church in the passage or in the context. The word "church" does not occur until the 16th verse, and then not as ruling the reference of the passage, but only as supplying support for the injunction of the passage. There is no reason whatever for believing that "praying and prophesying" in church is meant. Neither was an exercise confined to the church. If, as in I. Cor. xiv. 14, the "praying" spoken of was an ecstatic exercise — as its place by "prophesying" may suggest—then, there would be the divine inspiration superseding all ordinary laws, to be reckoned with. And there has already been occasion to observe that prayer in public is forbidden to women in I. Tim. ii. 8-9. Unless mere attendance at prayer is meant, in which case this passage is a close parallel of I. Tim. ii. 9.

What then must be noted, in conclusion is:—

(1) That the prohibition of speaking in the church to women is precise, absolute, and all-inclusive. They are to keep silent in the churches—and that means in all the public meetings for worship; they are not even to ask questions; (2) that this prohibition is given especial point precisely for the two matters of teaching and ruling—covering specifically the functions of preaching and ruling elders; (3) that the grounds on which the prohibition is put are universal, and turn on the difference in sex, and particularly on the relative

places given to the sexes in creation, and in the fundamental history of the race (the fall).

Perhaps it ought to be added in elucidation of the last point just made, that the difference in conclusions between Paul and the feminist movement of to-day is rooted in a fundamental difference in their points of view relatively to the constitution of the human race. To Paul, the human race is made up of families, and every several organism, the church included, is composed of families, united together by this or that bond. The relation of the sexes in the family follows it therefore into the church. To the feminist movement the human race is made up of individuals; a woman is just another individual by the side of the man; and it can see no reason for any differences in dealing with the two. And, indeed, if we can ignore the great fundamental natural difference of sex, and destroy the great fundamental social unit of the family, in the interest of individualism, there does not seem any reason why we should not wipe out the differences established by Paul between the sexes in the church. Except, of course, the authority of Paul. It all, in the end, comes back to the authority of the apostles, as founders of the church. We may like what Paul says, or we may not like it. We may be willing to do what he commands, or we may not be willing to do it. But there is no room for doubt of what he says. And he certainly would say to us, what he said to the Corinthians:—"What? Was it from you that the word of God went forth? or came it to you alone?" Is this Christianity ours—to do with as we like? Or is it God's religion, receiving its laws from Him through the apostles?—"The Presbyterian" (Philadelphia).

Some Famous Answers in the Shorter Catechism.

(Continued from p. 418).

ANOTHER excellent answer is that to the question, What are the decrees of God? The answer being—"The decrees of God are His eternal purpose, according to the counsel of His will, whereby for His own glory, He hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass." This is a judicious and scriptural statement of the high mystery of God's foreordination of all

things. In their Confession the Westminster Divines say :—"The doctrine of this high mystery is to be handled with special prudence and care." Dr Cunningham has said—"The consideration of this great doctrine runs up into the most profound and inaccessible subjects that can occupy the minds of men—the nature and attributes, the purposes and actings, of the infinite and incomprehensible Jehovah—viewed especially in their bearings upon the everlasting destinies of His intelligent creatures." While the doctrine is to be handled with prudence and care, it is not to be neglected or set aside because it is difficult to understand and not popular. It is clearly set before us in Scripture, and has its place in the great temple of Truth.

The doctrine of the Fall is very clearly stated in the answers to Questions 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19. The universality of the Fall is excellently stated in the Answer to Question 16—"All mankind descending from him [Adam] by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression." In the Answers to Questions 17, 18, and 19, the terrible fruits of the Fall are mentioned and clearly stated. In language noted for its scripturalness and theological exactness the Divines state the doctrines of the guilt and corruption of Adam and through him of all mankind. The teaching of the Shorter Catechism memorised from earliest years was long a barrier against the loose, unscriptural, Pelagian and semi-Pelagian views that are now so rampant in Scotland.

In the Answer to Question 18 it has been discussed what did the Westminster Divines mean by Original Sin when they say—"The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called original sin." Did they mean that Original Sin is "the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature," or did they mean that Original Sin is simply "the corruption of his whole nature?" The fact that divines have used the phrase "Original Sin" in a twofold sense renders it necessary to make some reference to this point. In answer to the question raised here, Dr Cunningham says :—"The words Original Sin, indeed, are not directly used in the Confession of Faith, but they occur both in the Larger and Shorter Catechisms; and though, in the Shorter Catechism, it might be doubted, as a mere question of grammatical construction,

whether the words, 'which is commonly called original sin,' applied only to the 'corruption of his whole nature,' which is the immediate antecedent, or included also the other ingredient or constituent elements of the sinfulness of the state into which man fell, which had been also previously mentioned, viz., the guilt of Adam's first sin, and the want of original righteousness—yet any ambiguity in this respect is removed in the fuller exposition given under the corresponding question in the Larger Catechism, where it is plain that the statement made as to the common meaning of the words 'original sin,' applies it only to the corruption of our nature—the inherent depravity which is the immediate source of actual transgressions" (Historical Theology, I., 496). Dr Cunningham, however, points out that the term "Original Sin" is used in a two-fold sense by divines—"Sometimes the phrase is employed as a general comprehensive description of all the different elements or ingredients that constitute the sinfulness of the state into which man, through Adam's transgression, fell; and sometimes as denoting only the moral corruption or depravity of his nature, the inherent and universal bias or tendency of man, as he comes into the world, to violate God's laws, which, being the immediate or proximate cause of all actual transgressions, constitutes practically the most important and fundamental feature of his natural condition of sinfulness. It is in the latter and more restricted sense that the phrase is most commonly employed." This is also Dr A. A. Hodge's and Thomas Boston's view. "Original Sin," says Boston, "in its full extent, consists of three parts—The guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of our whole nature. The last is commonly called 'original sin,' as being the worst part of it."

Sin in its origin and its fruits, affecting the whole human race, opening the floodgates of all misery in time and all the misery in eternity, is clearly set before us in the Shorter Catechism. But desperate though man's case was by the Fall, yet it pleased God to save some, and so in answer to the question, "Did God leave all mankind to perish in the estate of sin and misery?" we have the fine answer—"God having, out of His mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer." We now enter on what has been happily termed the

"Immanuel's land of theology," and at this stage, if under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we may, like Christian under the guidance of Piety, Prudence, and Charity, see the Delectable Mountains of Immanuel's Land. "Then I saw in my dream," says Bunyan, "that on the morrow that he got up to go forwards, but they desired him to stay till the next day also, and then, said they, we will if the day be clear show you the Delectable Mountains, which they said would yet further add to his comfort, because they were nearer the desired haven than the place where at present he was; so he consented and stayed. When the morning was up, they had him to the top of the house and bid him look south: so he did, and behold, at a great distance, he saw a most pleasant mountainous country beautified with woods, vineyards, fruits of all sorts, flowers also, with springs and fountains very delectable to behold. Then he asked the name of the country. They said it was Immanuel's Land, and it is as common, said they, as this hill is, to and for all pilgrims; and when thou comest there, from thence thou mayest see to the gate of the Celestial City, as the shepherds that live there will make appear." "God having, out of His mere good pleasure, elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer." In this answer the free sovereign grace of God in His people's salvation is stated with unmistakable clearness. Man has no part or lot in providing that salvation in which the glory of the Redeemer is made great. The doctrine of election is so clearly set forth in Scripture that one wonders how any one reading the Word of God could ever call it in question. The whole work in the planning and execution of God's salvation is all of grace. The distinction made by some of the great Puritans, such as Dr Owen, between the covenant of redemption and the covenant of grace is not recognised in the Westminster standards, nor by our leading Scottish evangelical divines. "The covenant of redemption," says Boston, "and the covenant of grace are not two distinct covenants; but two names of one covenant under different considerations. By a covenant of redemption is meant a bargain of buying and selling; and the second covenant was such to Christ only (I. Pet. i: 18, 19). By a covenant of grace is meant a bargain whereby all is to be had freely; and it is such a covenant to poor sinners only" (Is. lv. 1).

A Revival of Calvinism.

IN a recent number of "De Heraut" (Amsterdam), Prof. Dr H. H. Kuyper discusses the revival of Calvinism, and also makes mention of a remarkable event in France. In the theological faculty of the Protestant Church in Paris, a man appeared who subscribes to Calvinism with all his heart, Professor Lecerf, in charge of the course in New Testament. Originally a free thinker, the reading of the Scriptures brought him to faith in Christ, and it was Paul's Epistle to the Romans which, under God's blessing, became the means to the dawning of the light in his soul. After this he began to read the writings of Calvin, and the striking agreement between Paul's Epistle to the Romans and the theology of Calvin won his heart for the great Reformer, who indeed has best comprehended the thought of the Apostle. At first Professor Lecerf imagined that he was the only Calvinist, as he himself told us, but how great was his astonishment and pleasure when he learned from Dutch students in Paris that in Holland theologians were to be found who likewise held Calvinism in high honour. He ordered the works of Drs A. Kuyper and H. Bavinck to be sent to him, and he studied the Dutch language, in order to be able to read them. And when, last summer, the professor of Dogmatics was obliged to give up lecturing in the Theological School of Paris, this work was for the time put in charge of Professor Lecerf, who then made his students acquainted with Calvinistic Dogmatics. These lectures made such an impression that the students themselves requested that after the return of the regular professor of Dogmatics, Professor Lecerf might be allowed to continue his lectures on Calvinism, to which the faculty agreed. Last Fall, Professor Lecerf visited the professors of the Free University of Amsterdam (founded by Dr A. Kuyper), and made a most favourable impression upon them, and not the least cause for joy was this, to learn that the students in Paris were so fully taken up with these Calvinistic lectures.—"The Presbyterian and Herald and Presbyter" (Philadelphia).

Correction.—On page 414 of the "Free Presbyterian Magazine" for last month, the writer did not mean to convey the idea that the person referred to used the words, "Making flesh of one and fish of another," to the Session, but to himself and another gentleman. The writer does not know what that person said on that point to the Session.—NEIL CAMERON.

Church Unity and Christian Unity.

IN dealing with our Lord's prayer for unity it is evident from the statements made by leading ecclesiastical leaders that they regard His petitions for unity in His great intercessory prayer as petitions for the unity of the professing Church as it exists in the world in larger or smaller units as denominations. That this is the view held by the leading advocates of Union in Scotland is manifest from their speeches, in which they unhesitatingly declare that in their efforts to bring the Established and United Free Churches together they are doing so with Christ's prayer before their minds. This misapplication and misinterpretation of the Saviour's words arise from confusion of thought in not distinguishing (1) between Church or denominational unity and Christian unity, or unity of believers; (2) and secondly, in overlooking the guidance we have in the Saviour's own words to their correct interpretation.

1. That there is a distinction between church or denominational unity and Christian unity or unity of believers is manifest from the fact that we may have church unity without Christian unity and Christian unity without church unity. In the Church of Rome there is outward unity—at least of a kind—but we have no hesitation in saying that it is not the unity Christ prayed for. Protestants, on the other hand, are divided into various denominations, such as Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists. And while there is a common outward unity among them as opposed to Roman Catholicism, yet because of their separate existences as denominations it has been argued that they are thus going in the direct teeth of the petitions for unity in Christ's intercessory prayer. It is not so, for the Lord's people among Episcopalians (such as Bishops Ridley and Latimer, to name only a few), Congregationalists (such as Owen and Edwards), Baptists (such as Bunyan and Spurgeon), Presbyterians (such as John Knox and Andrew Melville), are one in the sense that Christ prayed they should be one, viz., as believers, but they are far from being one denominationally. Denominational unity is based on the agreement of certain articles of belief and acceptance of certain principles, and the more scriptural these are the more strenuously ought the denominational status to be maintained. The fact that some of the articles or principles maintained by a denomination are not regarded as of much importance by another denomination seeking union with it is no valid reason

either on Scriptural or rational grounds that they should be given up. And while a denomination holds by doctrines or principles which it regarded as scriptural and which brought it into existence, it cannot without the betrayal of its trust enter into any denominational union that requires the renunciation or even the neglect of these. But supposing there was a case in which the above conditions were fulfilled, he would be a bold man, in view of what Christ said, who would assert that in this denominational union Christ's prayer was fulfilled, for then all in the uniting denominations, as we shall see, would require to be believers. But as our main purpose is not so much the subject of church or denominational unity as Christian unity, we proceed to notice that the application of Christ's words to church unity arises from a misinterpretation of His words.

2. The Redeemer's words are as follows:—"Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are" (John xvii. 11), and again—"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one—even as we are one: I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me" (John xvii. 20-23). He first prays for His disciples that they may be one (verse 11). Then He prays for those who through their word would believe on Him. The prayer then is on behalf of those who believed, but lest it should be said this would include professed believers as well as real believers, we call attention to the following points:—

(1) He tells us plainly that He is praying for those who were given to Him by the Father—"I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me: for they are thine" (verse 9); and they are again described as "those whom thou hast given me" (verse 11), and again as those in whom Christ is—"I in them" (verse 23). This surely settles the point that they are real believers, not simply in name. And he who would take upon himself to say that all in the Established Church and the United Free Church are true believers is audacious enough for anything.

(2) The Redeemer makes it plain what kind of unity He is praying for—"That they may be one, as we

are." That is, it is a unity analogous to the unity subsisting between the Father and the Son. He does not pray that they might be one in the sense that the human race is one, nor in the sense that nations are one, nor even in the sense that His divine and human natures are one in the Eternal Person of the Son. The mystery of the incarnation is that we have two distinct but not separate natures in the one person. The mystery of the Trinity is that we have three separate Persons of one essence. As we approach this great theme we do so with the consciousness that it becomes us to put our shoes from off our feet, for we are on holy ground, but in stating the following points we believe we have Scriptural authority for what we say. In the unity subsisting between Father and Son we have (a) the same divine nature; (b) the same divine life — there is but one fountain of never-ending life in the Trinity; (c) the divine love is common to Father and Son; (d) a common aim characterises all the operations of the Father and Son, viz., the glory of God; (e) the unity subsisting between Father and Son shall have no end. Now, unless these points at least are realised in any unity, whatever kind of unity it may be called, it is not the unity that Christ prayed for in His intercessory prayer. In believers we find that (a) they are partakers of a divine nature; (b) their new life is a divine life; (c) the love they have to Christ is common to them all, for it was out of the fullness of His love that they received; (d) a common aim characterises them when under the influence of God's Spirit, viz., seeking the glory of God in all they do and say; (e) the unity of God's people is not to come to an end at death; it is to go on for ever. If it were a mere outward union it would come to an end at death. And if Christ prayed for the union of denominations in which, at their purest, there may be believers and unbelievers, it would mean that when death came Christ would break that unity, for unbelievers shall not be one with His people in Eternity nor on earth for that matter of it in the sense in which He prayed that His people might be one. Whatever arguments may, therefore, be brought forward by the Union leaders of the Scottish Churches for the union of the Established and United Free Churches, we feel fully convinced that our Lord's prayer for unity is not one of them, and the sooner they give it up the better it will be for all concerned, for a position built on bad exegesis and glaring misinterpretation is bound to do injury to any cause.

The Jews and Jesus.

FOR 1800 years the Jews have ignored Jesus. They have given Him no place in their religious or national life. His name has never been allowed to be mentioned. If it was found necessary to speak about Him, He was referred to as "the Nazarene." For 1800 years no orthodox Jew has written a single line about Him. Mohammed and Buddha have often been mentioned and discussed by the most pious Jews, but Jesus has been ignored. The Jews have tried very hard to forget Jesus, but the more they have tried to forget the harder it has become not to remember. And now, with the evolution of time and national character, they are beginning to realise that they cannot forget, that they must face and settle the problem which He presents. These men, zealous in their religion, pious and monotheistic, leaders of their race, are feeling their way cautiously round the Gospels, anxious to prove innocent their nation from the crime of the Crucifixion, ready to acclaim Jesus as a national prophet and a great teacher of ethics. It is one of the outstanding phenomena of our time that the Jews are seeking to find the right place which Jesus should occupy in their religion and nation.

Dr Klausner, Professor of Hebrew in Jerusalem University, has published in Jerusalem itself a "Life of Christ" written in Hebrew. It is the first time an orthodox Jew has attempted such a work with neither satiric nor apologetic bias. It is an honest attempt by a very great scholar to find a place for Jesus in Judaism. Dr Klausner is broad-minded, and refuses to write under any dogmatic bias. Speaking of Jesus, he says:—"In His ethical code there is a sublimity, distinctiveness and originality in form unparalleled in any Hebrew ethical code, neither is there any parallel to the remarkable art of His parables. Fifteen years ago a great Hebrew scholar and editor of a philosophical Hebrew quarterly, the late S. J. Hurwitz, was nearly lynched for having published an essay in which a positive attitude was taken towards Jesus. Now another great Hebrew scholar is able to publish in the Holy City itself, not an essay, but a "Life" of Christ.

This alone should be a fact startling enough, but even more remarkable was the news contained in a short paragraph in the "Daily Express" of December 31st, 1925. It was headed, "Rabbi's Advice to Jews," and told of a sermon which had been preached in New York by a Rabbi on Dr Klausner's "Life of Christ." The preacher was Dr Stephen Wise, Secretary of the

American Zionists, and one of the most popular and scholarly Rabbis in America. During the course of his sermon he said :—"The Jews must accept Jesus as a Jewish teacher and accept His ethical code. The Jew can carry on the teaching of Jesus better than the Christians."

This remarkable statement makes us turn to the prophecies of over 2000 years ago. "In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer" (Is. liv. 8). "Neither will I hide my face any more from them, for I have poured out my Spirit upon the house of Israel, saith the Lord God" (Ezek. xxxix. 29). "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and of supplication; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for Him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born" (Zech. xii. 10).

Missions to Jews will have the unique opportunity of speaking to eager, unbiassed listeners, Jews who will, by the Spirit of God, see the vision of a Messiah pierced by themselves, and will mourn and call upon His Name. It is in these coming days that God speaks to all Christians, "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem." Now, when Jews are seeking Christ as the greatest of the prophets and a national hero, pray that they may find also their Messiah and a Saviour of the world. "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness" (Zech. xiii. 1). "They shall call on my name, and I will hear them: I will say, it is my people: and they shall say, the Lord is my God" (Zech. xiii. 9).—P. S. S., in "Immanuel's Witness."

Luther and Melancthon.

MEANWHILE Luther, at Coburg, was putting on the whole armour of God; he was constantly singing the praises of the Lord and reading His Word, full of courage, hope, and joy. Not a day passed by in which he did not spend at least three hours in prayer. He addressed God as his Father; so we are informed by his servant. One day he was heard praying in his closet in these words: "I know that Thou art our merciful God and Father; wherefore I am certain that Thou will destroy the persecutors of thy children. If thou dost not, the danger concerns thee as well as us. The whole matter is in thy hands; we have done our

duty; wherefore, O holy Father, thou wilt protect us."

The wise, gentle, and timid Melancthon, at Augsburg, did not feel the same confidence that Luther felt; he was full of fear and anguish. His friend Camerarius frequently saw him shed bitter tears. Luther full of assurance, endeavoured to inspire his friends at Augsburg with the same courage. He wrote to Jonas from his desert (for thus he dated his letters written from Coburg): "It is philosophy, and nothing else, that troubles Philip; for our cause is in the hands of One who can say with truth, 'No man shall pluck them out of my hand.' I do not wish that it were in our hands. I have had many affairs in my own hands, and none of them have been successful; but all those which I entrusted to Him have succeeded perfectly; for it is true that the Lord is our Refuge and our Strength. Whom has He ever forsaken that trusted in Him? as it is written, 'Thou, Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek Thee.' Let us, then, bid defiance to our adversaries, and let us be bold in the Lord Jesus; for, 'because He liveth, we shall live also,' even in death; and He will preserve the wife and the children of the man who shall have confessed His name at the cost of his life. Since He reigns, 'we shall also reign with Him'; even now already we reign with Him! Oh! if my presence was required at Augsburg, how soon, by the grace of Christ, would I be there! God be with you."

He afterwards wrote to Melancthon: "Grace be unto you, and peace in Christ. In Christ, I say, and not in the world. Amen. Why art thou constantly troubled? If our cause be not just, let us abandon it; but if it be just, why should we make God a liar when He tells us to be of good cheer!" "Cast thy burden upon the Lord," he says. And again: "The Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart." You are concerned about the issue of this matter, because you cannot conceive what it will be. But I tell you that if I could guess that issue, I would not meddle with it, and still less would I be willing to have undertaken the affair. God has put our cause in a place which you will not find by means of your rhetoric or your philosophy. That place is called Faith; and there are all those things which we can neither see nor understand. The man who endeavours, as you are doing, to see and understand these things, is rewarded by tears and anguish of heart.

If Christ be not with us, where in the universe shall we find Him? If we are not the church, where is the church? Is it the Duke of Bavaria, or Rome, or

the Turk and his fellows, if we have not the Word of God, who has it? And if God be for us, who can be against us? If we fall, Christ falls with us, and Christ is the Lord of the earth. Christ has said, 'Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world;' and I know that this is true. And why then should we fear the world when it is overcome as though it were the conqueror? O precious Word! many would go on their knees to Rome and Jerusalem to get it; and we, because we have it, and can at all times make use of it, esteem it lightly. This is wrong. I know that it proceeds from the weakness of our faith. Let us then pray with the apostles, 'Lord increase our faith.' Though a host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear.' No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper, said the Lord."—J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D.D.

A Short Meditation.

BY THE LATE REV. JOHN ROSS, BRUCEFIELD, ONTARIO.

"FOR He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak" (John xvi. 13). (1) The Spirit is God and fills heaven and earth. He is omnipresent and omniscient. He is in Christ and He is in His people. He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit with Him and the Spirit of His Son is sent forth into their hearts crying, Abba, Father, He is in all the sons of God as the Spirit of His Son. He is not the less present with Christ in heaven that He is in the hearts of His people on earth. (2) He hears the voice of Christ—all His intercession in heaven—what He asks for His people, what He obtains for them, what He grants to them, and whatsoever He hears that He speaks to them and can speak in the very instant of time that He hears it of Christ speaking in heaven. At the very moment that Christ is speaking in heaven He speaks the same on earth in the ear of the believer's soul. He does not speak of Himself, He speaks what He hears. He is Christ's mouth and tongue and mind and heart to the Church. Through the Spirit there is instantaneous communication between the Head in heaven and the members on earth. And all that He in heaven wills to communicate to them is actually communicated the instant He wills it—the very thing in the very measure and to the very persons and to none other. He is just Christ's Spirit to them—the seven horns and seven eyes of the slain Lamb.

Seumas Renuic.

(Air a leantuinn o t.-d. 428.)

Goirid an deigh so, bha'n obair a' meudachadh gach la air a lamhan, le cobhair a thainig air o dithis mhisnistearan dilis, Daibhidh Houston o Erinn, agus diadhair ainmeil eile, Alastair Shielis, a bha ro fheumail da, a thaobh an droch-thuaraisgeil a bha naimhdean a cur as a leth; b'e sin nach robh e airson comunn teachdair air bith eile. B'ann mu'n am so chuir Mr Peden, is e air a leabaidh bhais, fios air, agus air dhoibh a bhi tamull ann an comhradh, dh'aidich Mr Peden, gu'n deachaidh moran bhreug innse dhasan mu thiomchioll; 'san am cheudna ga mhisneachadh gu dhol air aghaidh san obair mhaith, 's gu'm biodh e air a ghiulan gu h-eireichdail troimhe; mar an ceudna ag iarraidh mhaithneas air, a chionn gu'n tug e uirread do chreideas da luchd miruin 'sa 'g iarraidh air urnuigh a dheanamh maille ris; ni a rinn Mr Renuic le mor shuilibhireas.

Annas a bhlidhna 1687 thaining ordugh a mach o'n ard chomhairle toirt saorsa do na Cleireanaich *moderate** meagh bhlathaich dol a dh'eisdeachd na ministearan, a gabh sochair an t-saorsa pheacach a chaidh thairgse dhoibh, na'n geilleadh iad d'an riaghladh; ach teann ordugh an aghaidh nan teachdairean, a shearmonaicheadh anns na glinn, iad a bhi air an leantuinn le teine is claidheamh. Le so thug Mr Renuic fianuis dhlis an aghaidh na comhairle a thug an t-saorsa, agus na muinntir a ghabh i; toirt rabhadh da'n t-shluagh gu'n ghnais air bith a thoirt di. Nuair a chuala na ministearan meagh-bhlathach so; bha iad air leithid do bhuaireadh na aghaidh, 's nuair a fhuair iad, iad fein air an socrachadh nan gnothuichean, 's nan goireas; leig iad a mach a' miruin le bhi gairm, fear-reubainn, papanach, diabhul geal deth, gun robh e falbh na dhiabhul geal feadh na tire, le bratach gheal an diabhul, ag radh gu'n d'rinn e moran ni bu mho do chron da Eaglais na h-Alba na rinn e do mhath dhi. Chum tuille maslaidh thilgeadh air, chuir iad paipearan a mach feadh na tire mar gu'm b'e fein a rinn iad. Ach ged a bha e mar so air a mhaslachadh le luchd aideachaidh, aig an robh anis saimh is socair, bhuaich esan 'na obair, oir bha a dhuine san taobh a stigh a meudachadh ni bu mho, 's ni bu mho; ach bha'n duine an taobh a muigh gu mor air

*Bha droch mhanadh air an ainm o thoisich. Se so a cheud iomradh ata orra ann an eachdaraidh.

a lughdachadh. Dh' fhas e co lag 's nach b'urrainn e suidhe air each, 's ann a bha e air a ghiulan gu's an aite shearmon-achaidh.

Chinn a gheur leanmhuinn aig an am so co dian na aghaidh, oir ann an uine chuig miosan an deigh da'n t-shaorsa pheacach ud, a bhi air a gabhail leis na meagh-bhlathaich, chaidh cuig ionnsuidhean deug ro chruaidh a thoirt chum a ghlacaidh. Gu so a mhisneachadh, bha tairgse cheud punnd Sasunnach air a thoirt leis an riaghladh do neach sam bith a ghlacadh beo na marbh e.

Air thus na bliadhna 1688, air dha a bhi teachd fagus do chrìoch a thuruais, ruithe e luath, agus dh'oibrich e cruaidh, mar chrìosduidh, 's mar mhinisteir. Bha na ruin roimh so ni-eigin a chuir a mach da'n t-saoghal, mar fhianuis a sheasadh air chuimhne an aghaidh a mhuinntir a thug 'sa ghabh an t-shaorsa pheacach ud, a dh' ainmich-eadh a cheana; chaidh e air an aobhar sin dò Dhuneidin, ach air an rathad bha dol as chaol aig o bhi air a ghlacadh; ann an Duneidin bha e an-fhoisneach gus an d' fhuair e sin a liubhairt, ach do bhrìgh 's nach robh cleir de na meaghbhlathaich cruinn, chaidh e dh' ionnsuidh Huistean Ceannadaidh a bha na phrìomh fhear suidhe sa chleir, agus chuir e 'n fhianais na laimh-san.

O Dhuneidin chaidh e gu siorramachd Fife, far an do shearmonaich e caochladh Sabaidean; b'ann air an 29 de mios mu dheireadh a gheamhraidh a liubhair e shearmoin dheirreanach ann am Borustanis. Phill e o sin do Dhuneidin, 's ghabh e comhnuidh ann an tigh caraid air Cnochd-a-Chaisteil, a bhiodh a reic bathar gun chis a phaigheadh; air dha bhi ni b'u mhi-fhurachail na b'abhaist da—air dha am a bhi air teachd,—air dha fear da'm b'aim Iain Iustis, a bha na fhear-frithealadh ann an tigh osda, esan a chluinntinn ag urnuigh san teaghlach, chuir e fairidh co a bh'ann, thainig e air an ath-mhaduinn, agus thug e ionnsuidh air an tigh, a gabhail air a bhi rannsachadh airson bathar mhi-laghail, fhuair iad a steach, 'san uair a thainig Mr Renuic chum an dorus, thuirt Iustis ris—" Mo bheath air a shon mar e so Mr Renuic." Chaidh e 'n sin amach chum na sraide, ag eubhachd cobhair a bheireadh a' madadh Renuic an tigh-fhreiceadan.

Dh'fheuch Mr Renuic is dithis chairdean eile ri teich-eadh amach air dorus eile, ach bhacadh iad le cach. Le so loisg e urachar o dhag, thug orra dhol as an rathad, ach air dha bhi gabhail seachad bhuail aon diu e le maide trom air a bhroilleach, ni a mhill air ruith e. Dol sìos caol shraid a Chaisteil gu ceann sraid a Chruidh 'chaill e ad,

's mar sin thugadh toigh dha, 's chaidh a ghhlacadh le beadagan air an t-shraid, ach chaidh an dithis eile as sabhailt.

Thugadh a dh' ionnsuidh an fhreiceadan e, 's chumadh an sin car uine bhig e. Nuair a chunnaig an Greumach ceannard an fhreiceadan, e bhi co iosal na phearsa, sa leithid do ghnuis mhaiseach, oigeil, ghlaodh e "Ciod! an e so an giulan Renuic, mu'n robh an rioghachd co mor air a trioblaideachadh?" Aig an am cheudna thainig aon de 'n luchd riaghlaidh a stigh, agus le fior dhroch oilean, chuir e cleachdanan fuasgailt as a leth, da'n d'thug e freagairt leis an taire a thoill e. Chaidh a thoirt an sin an lathair aireamh de na chomhairle; nuair a thug an Greumach thairis dhoibh e, thuirt e,—“Thug mi Renuic thairis dhoibh anis, deanadh iad ris mar as aill leo.” Ciod a thachair air bheulaobh na chomhairle, cha d'fhuaradh amach.

Chaidh chuir am prison duinte 'sa cheangal ann an iar-ruinibh; co luath so dh' fhagadh na aonar e, chaidh e a dh' urnuigh ri a Dhia, a' deanamh tairgse shaor de a bheatha dha, a tagar gras chum a ghiulan troimh, agus gu'm biodh a' naimhdean air am bacadh o bhi pianadh a chuirp—be sin leis a *Bhoot*, mar rinneadh air Mac Cathail. Chaidh na h-iarrtusan so uile a dheonachadh air doigh iongantach; 's bha sin air aideachadh leis fein le mor bhuidheachas, mu'n deachaidh a chrochadh.

Mu'n d'thugadh dha a chuis dhitidh, chaidh a thoirt fa chomhair an ard fhear riaghlaidh, ann an tigh Mhorair Tairbeairt, agus a cheasnachadh mu thiomchioll a bhi striochdadh do ughdarras an t-seachdamh Righ Seumais, paigheadh cis, agus a bhi giulan airm aig na coinneamhan achaidh; ceistean a fhreagair e le leithid do shaoirsinn, agus do sheimheachd sa chuir uamhas air na h-uile a bha lathair. B' e 'n t-aobhar e bhi air a cheasnachadh mu thiomchioll paigheadh cis, gu'n d' fhuaradh leabhar pocaid aige, anns an robh cinn da shearmoin air na puigean so, ris an d'aideich e air ball. Bha mar an ceudna litrichean mora—*capitals*—anns an leabhar cheudna, a bha iad ro dheigheil fhaotainn amach co na daoine a bha air an ciallachadh leo; agus do bhrìgh nach robh e nan comas cron na greim a dheanamh air na daoine sin, dh'innis e dhoibh gu seolta co iad. Nuair a chual' iad cho eugnaidh seolta sa fhreagair e, thraogh sin gu mor am feirg na aghaidh, air chor 's gu'n robh so na mheadhon nach do phian iad a chorp. Dh' fheoraich an t-ard chomhairliche ris, ciod an t-aideachadh de'n robh e? Fhreagair e, gu'n robh e de'n aideachadh Protastanach Chleireanach. A ris, dh' fheoraich iad; ciod bu chian-fath gu'n robh a leithid do eadar-dhealach-

adh eadar e fein agus Cleireanaich eile, a bha reign ri ughdarras an Rìgh, agus a gabh an t-saorsa? ciod a shaoil e dhiubhsan? Fhreagair e, gu'm bu Chleireanach e, agus gu'n robh e seasamh ris na seann bheachdan Cleireanach, ceud faithean leis an robh na h-uile ceangailte leis a Chumhnant an cumail suas, agus bha aon uair air an aideachadh, 's air an cumail suas leis an rioghachd o na bhliadhna 1640 gus a bhliadhna 1650, o na chul-shleamhu-aich iad airson saorsa bheag, cha'n eil fhios aca cia fhad, mar rinn sibh fein airson onair bheag. Fhreagair an t-ard-chomhairlich, 's thug cach an aonta, gun robh iad ag creidsinn gu 'm b-iad sin na fìor bheachdan Cleireanach, agus gu 'n deanadh na Cleireanaich eile an aideachadh cho math risan, na 'm biodh uibhir a mhisneachd aca. An deigh na h-uile car, fhuair e chuis dhitidh air an 3 la ceud mhios an earraich 1688; air na trì puigean so, a bhi ag aicheadh ughdarras an rìgh; an dara, nach robh e laghail a bhi ag iocadh cis; san treas puing, gu 'n robh e laghail a bhi giulan airm gu neach fhein a dhion. Fhuair e cuig laithean gu freagradh a thoirt da na puigean sin.

An deigh dha chuis dhitidh fhaotain, fhuair a mhathair comas dol a stigh ga fhaicinn, ris na labhair e moran do bhriathran taitneach. Air a cheud sabaid bha e duilich gu'n robh a threud bhochd gun aodhair, 's gu 'm feumadh e anis am fagail; thuirt e na faigheadh e a roghainn, "Nach b-urrainn dha smaoineachadh air gu 'n ghrath, dol a stigh a rithist anns a chomhraig ri corp peacaidh agus bas; gidheadh na 'm biodh e ris dol a shearmonachadh anns na fasaichean, cha 'n fheudadh e dol leud na roine o'n fhianuis a thug e, agus gu 'm biodh e fo chomain a bhi cleachdadh an aon shaorsa, agus dhilseachd 'sa rinn e riamh." Sgriobh e litir air Diluan, an 6 la, ag asluchadh gu 'n rachadh tos a chuir a dh' ionnsuidh na mhuinntir a bha an ainmean na leabhar pocaid ann an litiribh diomhair, agus a dh' innis e co iad, chum s' nach tigeadh trioblaid sam bith orra air a sgathsan; ann an co-dhunadh na litir, thuirt e "Se m' iarrtas nach teid trioblaid a chuir air neach sam bith air mo shonsa, ach gu 'n dean iad aoibhneas maille risan, a ta le dochas agus aobhneas a feitheamh uair a chrunaidh." Aig am eile, dh' fheoraich a mhathair cia mar bha e; fhreagair e gu 'n robh e gu math, ach o am a cheasnachaidh gur gann a b-urrainn da urnuigh a dheanamh. Bhuail uamhas a mhathair; ach thuirt e gu 'm b'u ghann a b-urrainn e urnuigh a dheanamh, leis mar bha e air a lionadh le moladh, agus air eigneachadh le aoibhneas an Tighearn. Thuirt a mhathair ris gu 'n robh e agail oirre gu 'm fann-aicheadh i; "an uair," ars ise, "a chi mise an ceann 's na

lamhan sin air an cuir suas a measg chaich air port a bhaile, cia mar sheallas mi orra.” Le fiamh ghaire fhreagair e, nach faiceadh i sin, oir thug mise mo bheatha h-aithris do 'n Tighearn, agus ghuidh mi gu'n ceangladh e suas mo bhuill; agus tha mi dearbhta nach ceadaichear dhoibh aon chuid mo chorp a phianadh, na aon roinneag de mo cheann a laimhseachadh, 's fhaide na mo bheatha ghabhail. Nuair a ghlacadh e, bha mor eagal air gu'n rachadh a phianadh a *Bhoot*, ach fhuair e dearbhadh an deigh so nach b-eagal da a thaobh a ni sin, agus treghras chuidicheadh e gu bhi ag radh, “gu 'n robh eagal a ni sin air a thoirt air falbh cho mhor, 'n gu 'm bu roghnaich leis a bhi air a thilgeadh an coire do ola ghoileach, na ni bu lugha a dheanamh chuireadh lethtrom air an fhirinn.” Fhuair cairdean eile a steach ga amharc; dh' earalaich e iad, an sith ri Dia a dheanamh cinnteach, agus seasmhachd na shlighibh-san a chnuasachd; air dhoibh a bhi ag caoidh, a thoirt uatha, thuirt e ri u, “Gu 'm bu mho bu choir dhoibh a bhi moladh an Tighearn gu 'm biodh e anis air a thoirt air falbh o na maslaidhean a chaidh a thilgeadh air, sa bhris a chridhe, nach b-urrainn a bhi air an glanadh air falbh air dhoigh eile, eadhon ged a gheibheadh e a bheatha, air doigh san gabhadh e i, gu 'n chiurradh da 'n fhirinn.

Air Diluan, 8 la de ceud mhios an Earraich thugadh e air bheulaobh na' morairean dearga, 'san uair a chaidh a chuis dhithidh a leughadh, dh' fheoraich cleireach na cuirt deth, an robh e seasamh ris na dh' aidich e roimhe, agus an robh e ag aideachadh ris na bha anns a chuis dhithidh? Fhreagair e “gu'n robh anns na h-uile puing, ach far am bheil e air a' radh, gu'n do thilg e dheth uile eagal De: Tha mi ag aicheadh sin; oir is ann do bhrigh 's gu bheil eagal orm peacachadh an aghaidh Dhe, agus a lagh a bhriseadh, tha mi mo sheasamh an so ullamh gu bhi air mo dhiteadh.” Dh' fheoraich iad deth an sin, “An robh e strìochdachd do ughdarras, agus gu'm be an Seachdamh Rìgh Seumas ard uachdaran laghail? Fhreagair e, “Tha mi ag aideachadh, 'sa seasamh leis na h-uile ughdarras aig am bheil an seasamh 'san crìochan o fhocal De; ach cha'n urrainn dhomh an duine mi cheart sin aideachadh mar rìgh laghail; air dhomh a bhi faicinn, o fhocal De, agus o laghan aosda na rioghachd so, gu bheil a leithid do neach mi-chomasach air riaghladh, agus mar an ceudna nach eil na laghan sin a ceadachadh do neach sam bith crun na h-Alba a chuir air a cheann, ach am mionnaich e an creideimh Protastanach a dhion; ni nach urrainn do dhuine aidmheil sin a dheanamh.” Dh' fheoraich iad a

ris, Am b'urrainn e aicheadh e bhi na righ? Nach b'e brathair an righ nach maireann e? An robh aig an righ nach maireann clann dhilgheach? Nach robh e air chuir an ceill na righ le gnìomh parlamaid? Fhreagair e, "Gu'n robh e gu'n teagamh na righ air a chaithir ann an seilbh, ach nach robh e na righ a reir lagh na rioghachd; gu'm b'e brathair an righ nach maireann e, cha b'fhiosrach esan air a chaochladh; cia uirread a bha chlann aig an righ nach maireann, nach b'aithne dha: ach o fhocal De, bu choir a bhi na riaghailt da na h-uile lagh, agus o laghan aosda na rioghachd, nach robh e na'n comas fheuchainn, gu'n robh coir sam bith aige, agus nach b'urrainn coir a bhi aige air a bhi na righ." B'i 'n ath cheisd; an robh e ag aideachadh, agus a teagasg gu'n robh e mi-laghail a bhi paigheadh cis agus mal da'n righ? Fhreagair e, "Mu thiomchìoll na cis a ta air a togail san am so, airson an neach so a ghabh air a bhi na righ 'an aghaidh coir is ceart, tha mi ga mheas mi-laghail a paigheadh, do bhrìgh gu bheil e maraon foirneartach air an iochdaran a h-iocadh, chum cumail suas ain-iochd is aintighearnas, mar an ceudna, tha chis so air a leagail airson a bhi cuir as do'n t-soisgeul. Am biodh e air a shaoilsinn laghail do na Iudhaich ann an laithibh Nebuchadnessar, gun toireadh gach aon diu leis meall guail, a theasachadh an amhuinn theinnteach a bha gus an triur chloinne a losgadh, ged' iarradh an righ ain iochdmhor sin orra?

B'i 'n ath cheisd, An robh e ag aideachadh gu'n do theagaisg e do luchd eisdeachd teachd armaichte, chum na coinneamh, agus nan tigte orra, cogadh an aghaidh an naimhdean? Fhreagair e, "Bhiodh e maraon ann an aghaidh reusan, agus diadhaidheachd, gu'n sin a dheanamh; dheanadh sibh fein a' ni ceudna, na'm biodh sibh anns an aon suidheachadh ruinne. Tha mi ag aideachadh gu'n do theagaisg mi dhoibh airm, gu iad fein a dhion, agus gu bhi cur an aghaidh 'ur foirneart ana-ceart sa. Dh' fheor- aich iad an sin, an robh e a gabhail ris, gu'm bu leis an leabhar pocaid, agus an da shearmoin a bha sgriobhta innte, a fhuaradh aige, agus an do liubhar e'n da shearmoin sin? Fhreagair e, "Gabhaidh mi riu, mar do chuir sibhse ni riu sibh fein, agus tha mi ullamh chum na firinnibh uile a ta ann, a sheuladh le m' fhuil." Air da aideachadh uile a bhi air a leughadh thairis da, dh' iarradh air ainm a chur ris. Thuir e, "Nach cuireadh, do bhrìgh 's gu'n robh e ga mheas mar a bhi toirt seorsa aonta do'n ughdurras aca-san." Air dha dhiultadh caochladh uairean a dheanamh, thuir e, "'S mi togail fianuis, cuiridh mi m'ainm ris a phaipeir, mar a se m' fhianuis e, ach cha 'n ann, ann an umhlachd dhuibhse."

Ri leantuinne.

The Wrong Priest.*

THOUGH I am not at liberty to mention the name of the gentleman to whom reference will here be made, I am able to record a very interesting incident, and to vouch for its strict truth in every detail. The incident occurred in a London restaurant, and on the occasion referred to, the men at one of the tables were conversing upon the subject of religion, and the argument grew so lively that it became impossible for those at the nearest tables not to hear it. As it proceeded the interest of the listeners became intense. The argument was chiefly as to whether salvation was by works or of grace, and whether a person could be assured of his salvation in this life. One of the disputants firmly insisted that salvation is by grace, through faith; not of ourselves, but the gift of God. Another, a Roman Catholic, contended that no man can know he is saved until he dies, and, as a final argument, he exclaimed, "Well, all I can say is this: I have placed myself in the hands of my priest, and he is responsible for my salvation." At this point a gentleman rose from his table, and, lifting his hat, said: "Gentlemen, I believe I am well known in the Law Courts and in this room. I could not help hearing the argument at your table, and I feel bound to say that our Roman Catholic friend is perfectly logical in what he has said. I also have placed myself in the hands of my Priest, and he is responsible for my salvation. The mistake our friend has made is that he has chosen the wrong priest. My Priest is the Lord Jesus Christ. By faith I have committed myself into His hands, and 'I am persuaded He is able to keep that which I have committed to Him.'" The effect of this, from a well-known King's Counsel, was marvellous. Perfect silence reigned as he spoke, and I believe that some men there heard the Gospel for the first time, thus preached in a restaurant by an exponent of the law. Reader, who is your priest? Be not deluded to think that any fellow-mortal who may called himself a "priest" has any right to come between God and your soul. Beware also of placing any trust in any thing you have done, your character or your prayers. Salvation is entirely

* This leaflet may be had from the Protestant Evangelical Mission, Southwood Road, London, S.E. 9. 1s per 100, postage 3d.

by grace, and faith is the hand that receives it as a free gift from God. All the fitness He desires is that you feel your need of Him, and this He graciously bestows. I wish I could make it plain to you that Jesus Christ is the "one only Priest." But if my poor words fail, listen to the words of God: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners."—*W. Wileman.*

The Place of the Weaker Brother.

THE next illustration consists of two candles, and I am going to read, if I can, by the light of them. It may have happened to you at home, when you burned candles, that you required two of them. It needed some sense to arrange them if they were of unequal heights. I will place them here in this fashion, and I will sit down to read by their light. I cannot see, for I have put the tall candle in front and the shorter candle behind; the short one is envious, and causes the tall one to cast an injurious shadow over my book. It seemed natural to put the greatest first, but I see it will not work. I will put the shorter candle in front, and put the longer one behind. Now I get the light of them both. Here is the lesson: Always put the weaker brother in the place of honour if you can, and thus make the best use of his light, and prevent his creating a shadow through envy. Notice the order of marching in the Stockwell Orphanage when the children walk out to worship, or to the Common. The rule is, that the smallest boys and girls shall lead the way. In the old method the taller children blocked up the vision of the little ones, and also went along at a pace too great for the juniors; but on our plan the taller boys can see over the heads of the shorter ones, and the pace is toned down to suit little feet. This is a suggestive rule for the young, and I trust that we who are older will not depart from it. Church members should make this the law of precedence in the house of the Lord, weaker brethren first considered. Let us go our own pace, but consider their weakness, lest we cause any one of them to stumble.—C. H. Spurgeon's "Sermons in Candles."

Undiluted Higher Criticism.

IN a former issue of the Magazine attention was called to a series of articles begun in the United Free Church "Record" by Dr John F. M'Fadyen, Professor of Old Testament Literature, and Theology, Glasgow U.F. College, under the general title, "The Bible and Modern Thought," and a promise made that further reference would be made to the articles. Dr M'Fadyen has now finished his series—six in number—and they are a revelation of the kind of teaching given to theological students in Glasgow U.F. College. What amazes one in reading these articles is their confident tone as to the so-called assured results of the Higher Criticism, the complete ignoring of the scholarly and able defences made by conservative scholars of the Bible, and the repetition of alleged discrepancies which have been answered quite satisfactorily a hundred times. In an article like this it would be wasted time to take up some of Prof. M'Fadyen's statements for the purpose of confuting them, but we think it right our readers should have some idea of the seriousness of the situation when these articles are allowed to appear in the "Record" of the United Free Church by one of her theological teachers. In dealing with the Pentateuch Deuteronomy is placed in the 7th century B.C., mid-way between Isaiah and Jeremiah. Genesis, according to the well-approved higher critical skill in dissecting literary documents, has had a number of authors. It has two Creation and two Flood stories. This learned trifling has been so thoroughly exposed by conservative scholars that we marvel that Dr M'Fadyen goes on his way without giving the slightest hint that the Critics have been answered again and again, and that E, J, P, D, etc., have been shown to be only the vain imaginings of the Critics' brains. The historical books come under the same ruthless criticism. I. Samuel is a favourite book for the exploitation of the Higher Critics' views, and Dr M'Fadyen has no difficulty in finding divergences in I. Samuel which he asserts are due to the fact that the book in its present form rests upon different documentary sources, possibly J and E. Isaiah's great inspired prophetic utterance in chap. liii. we are calmly told is "an anticipation of the experience and work of our Lord," "though the prophecy is not a prediction of Him." The Book of Daniel, we are told, is a late production, and the two Isaiahs are spoken of according to the approved higher critical view. In his concluding article, Dr M'Fadyen

deals with "Inspiration and Miracle." "Claims of inerrancy," he says, "and infallibility, which the Bible nowhere makes for itself, can never reasonably be made for it by any one who understands that, though it came from God, it came through men, imperfect men." He further adds—"It would also be foolish to deny that in other literatures, ancient and modern, there is a real measure of inspiration. Plato and the Greek tragedians, on the one hand, and writers like Browning and Tennyson, Carlyle and Ruskin on the other, to say nothing of devotional books such as the 'Imitation of Christ,' have searched, enlightened, and stimulated many a heart with a power analogous at least to that of the Bible. But the modern writers are derivative and secondary, they owe their power to the moral and religious atmosphere created by the Scripture." This paragraph is most unsatisfactory and brings down the inspiration of the Scripture to too low a level, notwithstanding the qualifying phrase at the end. As for miracles, the narratives of miraculous events in the Old Testament, he says, are not infrequently centuries later than the events themselves, and he instances those in the Book of Daniel, which according to the higher critical chronology must be 400 years after the period wherein they are set. They may be believed, but they cannot be proved, we are told. Then are they worthless? No, he says, they rendered an inestimable service to the men who were faced by the fury of a demon like Antiochus. This is playing with the great moral issues involved, and is throwing dust in the eyes of the simple. The sun standing still (Josh. x. 13) is not a miracle at all, and its miraculous character rests, we are told, on a misunderstanding of a fine poetic apostrophe of Joshua to the sun taken from the Book of Jashar. We are also warned, lest we should believe the fall of the walls of Jericho to be a miracle, that we are reading poetry not prose, which may alter the whole complexion of the miracle. We have only given a few indications of the undermining of the old foundations which characterise these articles. If the Church Courts of the United Free Church allow these articles to go unchallenged and their author be allowed to continue teaching such views, then they proclaim again to the world that the United Free Church is surely and with accelerated momentum rushing down the steep. In the March number of the "Record," the Rev. Dr Macintyre, Glasgow, challenges and combats Dr M'Fadyen's positions, but we would like to read a more militant note in his article declaring war against any scholar and scholarship that makes light of the Word of the Lord.

Short Gleanings from Rev. Lachlan Mackenzie's Sermons and Writings

The Wells of Salvation.

FROM the Rock of salvation proceeded the well of salvation: Nothing can be more grateful and refreshing to the weary traveller than water—nothing so comfortable to the soul as grace. The water refreshed and strengthened the children of Israel in the barren desert. In like manner, the salutary streams that flow from the river of life make glad the city of God. With joy, therefore, we may now draw water out of the wells of salvation. The promises of the gospel are full of consolation to sinners, and the waters of the sanctuary are for health or medicine.

Hiding our Great Sins.

Many of us are like a man who has a deep and dangerous wound in his side, and a small cut on his finger. He shows his finger to the doctor, but conceals the wound that affected his life. When asked the reason of such foolish conduct, he replies, that such a man applied a plaster to it. Besides, he was afraid the doctor would ask a high fee, and oblige him to observe a strict and regular diet; but when the wound begins to pain him, and threatens his life, he must show it to the physician. Such is our case. We ask pardon for what we call small sins—we say nothing to Him about our hearts, and the great sin of our nature.

Many Dishes at the Gospel Feast.

At a feast, as there are persons of different tastes, there are different dishes. The doctrine that may refresh the soul of one may be dry to another. But there are many great and precious promises in the Word. Some have strong corruptions—some have strong unbelief—strong temptations—and strong fears. Some have sickly stomachs, and they cannot taste any dish. These require cordials to give them an appetite. And as there are many dishes at this feast, there is what suits every man's taste.

Persevering Grace.

There is a formidable conspiracy against the least grace in the heart of any saint. And if God had not resolved and promised to carry on the work it must

surely fail—where He has begun it He will surely carry it on. Our Lord will not put you in the power of His enemies to scoff and say: "This man began a spiritual building and could not finish it." If there was not security in the promise for our perseverance, I do not believe a single soul could be saved. And we might ask the greatest Christians upon earth what secured their standing. Is it the grace they possess or the grace that is in Christ Jesus?

No Lasting Happiness in Earthly Blessings.

Happiness is not here. There is no rose without a thorn, except the rose of Sharon. Any little happiness we taste in this life is mixed with misery. When we go to the creature for happiness it disappoints us. The language of our hearts is, "O that I had such a blessing." When the blessing is granted, we find that it is either very unsubstantial or short lived. And the more our hearts are knit with affection to any earthly thing, the stroke is severer when we must part—and part we must, for nothing will last always but God.

Be Content with such Things as Ye Have.

Your lot is carved out to you with unerring wisdom. Be it so that your present lot is the result of your own folly—what then?—the permission of such folly is calculated to your good if you be not wanting to yourself. As you did not consult God by prayer before you made your choice, what remains for you now is to bear the consequences of your own folly—bear it with patience, and He can and will bring good out of your evil. Do not say that another lot had been better for you. Are you angry at God that He did not work a miracle to prevent you making a bad choice? As He has permitted you to go forward in your own way till your folly has corrected you, take with patience the chastisement of your sins.

Flatterers Great Favourites.

A compliment that can apply to one may apply with little variation to one hundred thousand. However much mankind run down flattery, we always find that the flatterers in every place are the greatest favourites. We almost say that a person without some spice of flattery is unfit for conversation in this world. The best of us fall into it insensibly; even when we are sincere in our praise we convey this latent poison into one another's minds.

All Praise Not Flattery.

Every species of praise is not flattery; for there are some characters who deserve praise; but we are in danger of running into extremes. When we ascribe the good qualities of the person we praise to the Author of every good gift, we convert the poison into medicine. Of this kind was the praise which the Queen of Sheba bestowed upon Solomon—"It was a true report that I heard in mine own land of thy acts and of thy wisdom. Howbeit I believed not the words, until I came. and mine eyes had seen it; and, behold, the half was not told me. Thy wisdom and prosperity exceedeth the fame which I heard. Happy are thy men, happy are these thy servants, which stand continually before thee, and that hear thy wisdom. Blessed be the Lord thy God which delighted in thee, to set thee on the throne of Israel; because the Lord loved Israel forever, therefore made he thee king, to do judgment and justice."

Man's Praise Inaccurate.

If we do well, we shall receive praise whenever a man's character shall be properly ascertained. The truth is, that our praise or dispraise of any man in this dark state of things will be partial and mixed. We may praise a good man too much, and it is certain we may carry our censure of a bad man too far. We may withhold praise from a worthy character when he deserves it. We often blame when we should praise, and praise when we should blame. When we praise or dispraise, we do not know the circumstances in which another may be placed, the secret springs of his conduct, and the motives that induced him to do such and such actions.

The Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

IN the writings of the Higher Critics the expression is met with time and again that the Bible contains the Word of God, while we hold that it is the Word of God. We have been asked how, then, can the expression in the Shorter Catechism, which is given as the

heading of this brief article, be explained. The answer is quite simple. The Westminster Divines, in drawing up their statement of Scripture, had before their minds the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this article. The canon of Scripture, according to the Romish view, is much more extensive than the Protestant, as it includes the Apocryphal Books which Protestants reject. These Apocryphal Books, unfortunately, were for long printed with the Word of God, and it is to guard against the idea that they form part of the Word of God that the Westminster Divines use the expression—"The Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments." "The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of Scripture" is their statement in Section iii., chapter i. of the Confession. After the famous Apocrypha Controversy near the beginning of the 19th century, in which some of our own countrymen took such a prominent part, and which resulted in the separation of the Bible Society in Scotland from the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Apocrypha ceased to be printed with the Scriptures. All that the Westminster Divines mean, therefore, is to guard against the idea that the Word of God is in the Apocrypha. So their view point is entirely different from that of the modernists.

The Many Mansions in the Father's House.

BY DR JOHN DUNCAN.

PAUL'S mansion and the Philippian jailor's mansion are in the same Father's house—they are not the same mansion. The administration of the progress corresponds with the administration of the completion; and then the completion corresponds with the arrangements on both sides—the above and below. There is therefore one mansion for Paul, who was in labours more abundant—and another for the Philippian jailor. Christ has a mansion for Zaccheus. He got ready a mansion for Zaccheus. And He got ready a mansion, and a peculiar mansion, for that man who was His solitary witness, when all had forsaken Him, and Peter had denied Him. What that mansion is I know not—the mansion arranged of the Father, administered by the Son. That man did a peculiar service—

no man did what that thief did but himself—there is a mansion for him corresponding. And every one will see that his mansion is his prepared mansion—while we who deserve another and a worse, may well be contented to be in that house at all. Well, then, when the mansions are all ready, and the people all ready for the mansions, then comes the end, then Jesus comes again—these two things must go together. When the last elect sinner is gathered in and the last saint fitted for his mansion, for his peculiar mansion—not merely to go to the Father's house, but to that mansion which the divine arrangement has made—then He comes, then all is ready for His coming again. We sometimes say, in our short-sightedness, that as soon as a man is converted he is ready for heaven. In a sense, it is true. But he is perhaps not ready; nay, if he does not die when he is converted, we may be sure he is not ready yet for his mansion. There is much to do ere he goes to the Father's house—both in what the Lord has to do in preparing him, and in what He has to do in order to the new state of things in the arranged mansion—and he cannot go yet. He both belongs to the Father's house, and in the distribution of it has a prepared mansion, and is prepared for that mansion. So he lives on earth—either remains till he dies, or remains till he is changed; and when he is ready for the mansion, then is also the mansion ready for him. He was in the family, he was being prepared for the prepared mansion; when Christ presents him before the Father as one of His children, He presents him as one of the chosen for this place in the Father's house. And in virtue of his intervention and intercession it was—they together flowed forth in preparing him for this precise mansion.—(Rich Gleanings from "Rabbi" Duncan, pp. 403, 4).

Literary Notice.

BRYAN'S LAST WORD ON EVOLUTION : HIS POSTHUMOUS SPEECH PREPARED FOR THE FAMOUS SCOPES TRIAL AT DAYTON, TENN. Chicago : The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 826 North La Salle Street. Price 10 cents.

This is the speech Mr Bryan intended delivering at the famous Dayton trial, but which he was prevented from doing through the early termination of the case. It is a speech that was well worthy of the occasion, and highly creditable to the well-known oratorical powers of the great American publicist. There is a fine rever-

ent bowing to Christ's supreme authority and His written Word. In a masterly way he exposes the wild wanderings of the opposing counsel, Mr Darrow, the well-known agnostic criminal lawyer, in the notorious Chicago murder trial, in which the sons of two millionaires were involved. Mr Darrow daringly offered in defence of that hideous crime the plea that the perpetrators were to be excused because one of his clients had imbibed the brutal and demoralising evolutionary teaching of Nietzsche. Mr Scopes was rather unfortunate in having Mr Darrow, with that speech of his on record, as his defender in this trial, and Mr Bryan drives home the point in a disconcerting way for the defending counsel.

Notes and Comments.

What May It Mean?—In this issue we give an article from "Immanuel's Witness" that will be of interest to our readers. Recently in one of these Notes we quoted a paragraph from the same periodical on Dr Klausner's "Life of Jesus," and made reference to the interest awakened in this work in American Jewish circles. The "Dayton Herald" (Tennessee) reports a sermon by Rabbi Meyerberg, from which we quote the following:—"We, Jews all over the world, would long since have bowed to Jesus—the greatest Son our nation produced—with love and respect. We would long since have included the name of the noble Nazarene in the list of our saints and prophets. But, alas! the savage persecutions by the Christians of the Middle Ages—their decrees and inquisitions against us in the name of Christianity widened the breach between us and the Nazarene. But, thank God, the dark Middle Ages with its persecutions is a thing of the past! There no more exists an official decree against Jews, the reason being that we understand each other better. The time is now approaching when the Founder of Christianity will be officially acknowledged by all Israel." While these utterances come very far short of giving God's Son the place which is His right, they are an extraordinary advance on sentiments hitherto expressed by Jews on the Son of the Highest, and countenance what the Editor of "Immanuel's Witness" asserts when he says—"The Name that is above every name is to-day on the lips of every Jew. Never since the day of the Crucifixion of our Lord are Jews so full of that Name."

Trusting in Christ!—Mr Samuel Levermore, in an interesting account of his evangelistic labours in Calais, given in the January issue of the Trinitarian Bible Society "Quarterly Record," tells the answer he received from a French lady in answer to his question, "Are you trusting in Christ?" "Am I trusting in Christ?" she cried in amazement. Then, like Ignorance in Bunyan's heavenly book, she fumbled in her bosom, and produced a bunch of little medals, charms, etc., still crying, "Am I trusting in Christ?" Look at this—Notre Dame de Lorette—and this, Notre Dame de Lourdes—trusting in Christ indeed? Look at this medal of the Holy St Antoine. What medals have you got? Where are your indulgences? What do you think of the holy St Antoine? Trusting in Christ indeed! I should just think I am. I would not lose these for anything." And she rattled her charms, and displayed her medals and indulgences with a smile of perfect complacency. Then we turned her mind from dead charms, medals, and indulgences, to the living Saviour; from the lying legends of semi-paganism to the infallible and incorruptible Word of God. She listened like a quickened soul, as we sought—in dependence upon the Holy Spirit—to preach the gospel to her, knowing that the revelation of Christ in her heart would be the grave of Rome's wretched, soul-deceiving materialism.

A Queensland Reader's Comment.—A Queensland reader of the Magazine throws some light on the religious condition of things existing in his district in a letter sent to our printers. "I have tried," he writes, "to get some new subscribers, but it is so difficult. They think the teaching too old for the times. I tell them it is old, as old as the Bible, the very Word of God, which they will have to face at the Great White Throne. This country is steeped in Romanism, Arminianism, Theosophy, and Paganism; every Sabbath Day is used for tennis, golf, football, seaside excursions, shooting, fishing, etc. I am forty years in the colonies, but I have never changed my Calvinistic views, for they are God's mind manifested to men through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour." It is encouraging to find scattered throughout the world a few who are not ashamed of the old truths of God's Word, and who, when need arises, can put in a word in their defence. We feel gratified in knowing that the teaching of the Magazine is reckoned as belonging to this type, and in antagonism to modern teaching. Spurgeon, when twitted for being behind the times, used to say that he liked to be behind the times to see

where the times were going. But anyone who wishes to keep an eye on the times in our day will have his task cut out for him—the movements are so swift. We highly appreciate the efforts of our Queensland reader and those of others in endeavouring to get new subscribers to the Magazine. A young Canadian friend in one of the Prairie Provinces wrote us saying as he could not preach, he intended to get the people in his district to subscribe to the Magazine, so that they might have some scriptural truth brought to their notice at least once a month. Help of this kind is appreciated by us, and we trust that under God's blessing it may bear fruit to His glory.

Strange Self-Denial.—The so-called Salvation Army has an annual Self-Denial Week. Self-denial is a beautiful Christian grace, and we have no quarrel with the Boothites in practising it not only for a week but throughout their whole life-time, but their Self-Denial Week is a somewhat peculiar institution. This organisation is almost as expert in begging as the nuns and monks of Rome. They not only believe in self-denial for themselves, but they send crowds of expert and inexperienced beggars through our towns to help them in their self-denial efforts. Self-denial, if it is to have any meaning, is to be done by the individual, and not by asking others to do it for us. This is the strangest kind of self-denial we have ever known, and is in keeping with many of the other ways of this organisation which are peculiar to itself.

Ordination of Women.—It looks like that the United Free Church is gathering momentum on the downward course, if one is to judge by the resolutions of some of its courts. Recently the question of the ordination of women has been before some of the Presbyteries. Edinburgh Presbytery, one of the largest and most important in the Church, agreed unanimously to transmit an overture asking the General Assembly to initiate legislation declaring the eligibility of women for admission to the colleges of the Church as regular theological students, who on completion of their full course of study might be licensed to preach and ordained to the ministry on the same terms as men. A somewhat similar motion came before the Greenock Presbytery, but while receiving considerable support, it was rejected. The motion by the ecclesiastical feminists in Glasgow Presbytery, while receiving large support was rejected. Hamilton Presbytery decided to send up an overture similar to that of Edinburgh. The matter will now, through these overtures, come up before the General Assembly in May, and it re-

mains] to be seen what the Assembly will do in the matter. The Scripture seems to be explicit enough on the subject—"Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church" (I. Cor. xiv. 34, 35.) We call our readers' attention to Dr Warfield's article on another page of this issue.

Church Notes.

Communion.—April—First Sabbath, Stoer; third, Greenock; fourth, Glasgow and Wick. May—First Sabbath, Kames and Oban; second, Dumbarton; third, Edinburgh. June—First Sabbath, Coigach; second, Shieldaig; third, Dornoch, Glendale, Helmsdale, and Lochcarron; fourth, Gairloch & Inverness. July—First Sabbath, Lairg and Beauly; second, Tain, Staffin, and Tomatin; third, Daviot, Halkirk, Flashadder, and Rogart; fourth, Plockton and Bracadale. South African Mission.—The following are the dates of the Communion:—Last Sabbath of March, June, September, and December. Note.—Notice of any additions to, or alterations of, the above dates of Communion should be sent to the Editor.

London Communion.—The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper will (D.V.) be dispensed on Sabbath (4th April), when the Rev. Neil Cameron, Glasgow, is expected to officiate. The following hours for the services have been arranged:—Thursday (1st April), 7 p.m. (English). Friday, 3.30 p.m. (Gaelic); 7 p.m. (English). Saturday, 3.30 p.m. (English). Sabbath, 11 a.m. (English); 3.45 p.m. (Gaelic); and 7 p.m. (English). Monday, 7 p.m. (English). We take this opportunity of asking those who have friends in London or its vicinity to call their attention to these services.

Home Mission (Missionaries and Catechists) Fund Collection.—The Synod appointed the second annual collection for this Fund to be taken up in April. Our Missionaries are paid out of this Fund, and it is desirable that it should meet with a liberal response.

Winnipeg.—It is gratifying to learn that our people in Winnipeg are now proceeding with the building of their place of worship in MacGee Street, and they hope to have it ready by the end of May.

Acceptance of Call.—The Rev. William Grant, probationer, Glasgow, has accepted the call to the joint congregation of Halkirk and Helmsdale.

South African Mission.—The Rev. John Tallach wrote us that at the Communion held at Ingwena at the beginning of December sixteen persons were added to the Communion roll after a very searching examination, in which those received gave full satisfaction to the Session as regards their knowledge and experience. There were also eight young persons examined, who gave the same satisfaction and were baptized but did not communicate. This shows the high place given by the young there to membership. We have good cause why we should feel thankful to the Lord for His continued countenance to our South African Mission.—N. C.

Acknowledgment of Donations.

John Grant, Palmerston Villa, 4 Millburn Rd., Inverness, General Treasurer, acknowledges, with thanks, the following donations received up to 13th March 1926:—

JEWISH AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.—Anonymous, Lochinver postmark, 2s; Lady Friend, Lewis, per Rev. N. Macintyre, £1. For Rev. J. Tallach's Car Fund—Friends, Halkirk, per Mr A. Black, 10s; Friend, Strathy Point, 5s; Friend, Raasay, per Mrs Tallach, 5s; Robert Sutherland, Scotscaider, 10s.

Rev. N. Cameron gratefully acknowledges the following donations:—Anon., Argyle, £2 10s; Anon., Edinburgh, for Rev. J. Tallach's Car Fund, 4s; A Friend, in Loving Memory of Miss Jessie Mackintosh, Uig., Skye, for do., £1 10s; Anon., Glasgow, for do., 10s; Anonymous, for do., £1; Miss B. Dewar, for Kaffir Bibles, 10s.

SUSTENTATION FUND.—Miss H. Livingstone, Kentra, Acharacle, 5s 6d; Neil Livingstone, do., 5s; Mrs Maclean, New Zealand, per Rev. D. Graham, Shieldaig, £6; Miss M. Cameron, Braefoot, Strontian, 5s.

NOTE.—Would "Friends, Edinburgh," who sent £2, kindly state the fund to which they desire this amount credited?

The following lists have been sent in for publication:—

DUNOON CHURCH DEBT FUND.—Rev. N. Cameron gratefully acknowledges donation of £1 from Matron Macgillivray.

GREENOCK CHURCH PURCHASE FUND.—Rev. N. Cameron gratefully acknowledges the following donations:—Friend, Glasgow, £1; E. M., Oban, £1; Miss F. Macrae, Luib (Collection Card), £4 10s; Friend, Partick, £1; Miss M. M., 2s 6d. Mr J. Urquhart, 12 Lynedoch Street, Greenock, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the following donations:—J. C., Glasgow, £1; Kenneth Matheson, Dingwall, £1; James Maciver, Bonar-Bridge (collecting card), £1 16s; M. Macleod, Scalpa, Harris (collecting card), £7; Malcolm Macleod, Fladda, Raasay (collecting card), £4 3s; Miss Munro, Glasgow, per Mrs Ferguson, 5s; Miss M. Macinnes, Sleat, Skye, £1; Mrs J. Robertson, Elgoll (collecting card), £3 5s 6d.

EDINBURGH CHURCH PURCHASE FUND.—Mr A. Maclean, 16 Marchmont Crescent, Edinburgh, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the following donations:—Per Mr P. Anderson—Miss G. Graham, 10s. Per Mr J. Mackay—Friend, Inverness, 10s.

REV. D. MACFARLANE'S MINISTERIAL JUBILEE PRESENTATION.—

Mr John Grant, 4 Millburn Road, Inverness, Treasurer of the above Presentation Fund, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, contributions up to 13th March amounting to £100 6s 3d, which amount includes the following anonymous donations:—Two F.P.'s, Scalpa, Harris, 12s 6d; M. M., Drummuille, 5s; Two Friends, Glasgow, £2; Anon., Bridge of Weir, 5s; Free Presbyterian, Lochcarron, £1; a Friend, Strathly, 5s; a Reader of Rev. D. Macfarlane's Publications, £3; Strontian, 4s; A. A. McK., Kilmorack, 5s; a Friend, Inverness, 5s; Friends, Halkirk, 10s; Anon., Glasgow postmark, £1; Anon., Cardross postmark, 2s 6d; Well-Wisher, Glasgow, 10s; M. M., Lochcarron, 10s; a Free Presbyterian, Watnish, 3s; Friend, Strathly Point, 5s; Friend, Hougharry, 2s 6d; Friends, Vancouver, per D. Matheson, missionary (60 dollars), £12 5s.

The Magazine.

Notice to Subscribers.—Subscribers are respectfully reminded that their subscriptions for the year 1926-27 are now due, and Mr Grant, Treasurer, Palmerston Villa, 4 Millburn Road, Inverness, will feel greatly obliged by an early remittance. The annual subscription is 4s, paid in advance. The subscription for the United States and Canada is \$1. Subscribers should carefully read the instructions on page ii. of the Cover.

Binding Vol. XXX.—Subscribers who wish Vol. XXX. bound will oblige by sending it to the Editor within a fortnight of this notice. The price of binding is 1s 2d, with 6d for return postage. Please enclose remittance.

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED FOR MAGAZINE.—4s SUBSCRIPTIONS.—

Mrs A. Beaton, Manderson, U.S.A.; Mrs Couty, Aria Te-Kuite, New Zealand; M. S. Fraser, The Mound; Miss H. Livingstone, Acharacle; Miss E. Macdonald, Spean-Bridge; Mrs John Mackay, Balnabruach; Mrs Annie Mackenzie, Achnacarnie; Kenneth Mackenzie, Detroit; D. Mackinnon, 11 Elgoll; Mrs Rod. Maclean, Clashmore, Lochinver; Charles Macleod, Calder Park, Ardrossan; Mrs William Macleod, Droman, Lairg; John Macpherson, 16 Midtown, Inverasdale; Miss J. Sutherland, Upper Doll, Brora.

OTHER SUBSCRIPTIONS.—Miss M. Cameron, Braefoot, Strontian, 5s; Miss N. Cameron, St George's Nursing Home, Glasgow, £1; Alex. Campbell, Lochgilphead, 10s; Andrew Clunas, 692 20th Ave., W., Vancouver, 8s 2d; Mrs Kenneth Graham, Achiltibuie, 5s; Mrs John Macallister, St Thomas', Ontario, 4s 6d; Hugh Mackay, Hilton, Fearn, 4s 6d; John Macdonald, Wairoa, New Zealand, 1s; Miss C. Mackenzie, 14 Port Henderson, 5s; Donald Mackenzie, Windsor, Ontario, 4s 1d; Miss C. Mackenzie, 21 Sand, Aultbea, 10s; Donald Maclean, Camustiel, 5s; Mrs K. Maclean, Olangiwai, N. Zealand, 16s; Mrs Macleod, Alness, 3s 6d; Kenneth Macleod, Gardens, Raasay, 10s; Mrs J. Macrae, The Glen, Torbreak, 12s; Mrs Scott, Grafton, Clarence River, N.S. Wales, £1; Robert Sutherland, Clatequoy, Thurso, 4s 6d.

FREE DISTRIBUTION.—A Friend, Michigan, U.S.A., £3 18s 1d; Two Friends, Glasgow, 10s; M. M., Lochinver, 8s; M. S. Fraser, The Mound, 6s; Mrs John Mackay, Balnabruach, 2s 6d; Miss M. Macbeath, Inverness, 3s 6d; Miss J. Sutherland, Upper Doll, Brora, 2s; Robert Sutherland, Clatequoy, Thurso, 5s 6d.