

THE
Free Presbyterian Magazine
And MONTHLY RECORD

VOL. XXXI.

September 1926.

No. 5

**The Teaching of the Declaratory Act on
the Gospel Call and God's Decree.**

THE second Clause of the Declaratory Act teaches "That this Church holds that all who hear the Gospel are warranted and required to believe to the saving of their souls; and that in the case of such as do not believe, but perish in their sins, the issue is due to their own rejection of the Gospel call. That this Church does not teach, and does not regard the Confession as teaching, the foreordination of men to death irrespective of their own sin." The first section of this Clause deals with the General Call of the Gospel. In a land which produced such preachers as Rutherford, the Erskines, Boston, MacCheyne, and William C. Burns, and in a Church which had such men as Dr Macdonald, Ferintosh, and Dr Kennedy, Dingwall, to name no others, it does seem strange to all acquainted with the preaching of the Scottish pulpit that it should be considered necessary in the nineteenth century to put such a statement as the above in a Declaratory Act, as if the Reformed Church of Scotland or the Free Church in her Creed did not hold the doctrine of the general call of the Gospel. The most orthodox of our teachers never failed to give prominence to this aspect of the Gospel in their preaching, for while they shunned the Arminian extreme of a universal atonement and an ability of man in his own strength to obey the Gospel call, they declared that the Gospel was to be preached to every creature, and that the hearer was accountable to God for the rejection of the message. The Westminster standards, in common with the Dort Canons, teach that—"It is not the fault of the Gospel nor of Christ offered therein, nor of God who calls men by the Gospel and confers upon them various gifts that

those who are called by the ministry of the Word refuse to come and be converted. The fault lies in themselves." If our Standards taught this doctrine so clearly, why was it necessary that there should be a declaratory statement on the matter? The late Rev. James S. Sinclair, in his criticism of this section, seems to have pointed to the real cause when he says:—"We are fully agreed that all who hear the Gospel are under obligation to believe in Jesus Christ for salvation. But this obligation, we hold, rests upon the direct command of God, and the suitableness of the Gospel provision to men as sinners, and not upon supposed universal love, or universal atonement, as seems to be the case here, from the close connection between this and the preceding Clause, which we have already dealt with. The Arminian Gospel is, God loves all, Christ died for all, and the Holy Spirit strives with all, and this is almost verbally the Gospel we find in the Declaratory Act. The command to believe, referred to in this Clause, is evidently grounded upon such universal propositions as these, which afford a false and unscriptural basis for faith. We also observe that no reference is made here to the person of Christ as the object of faith. The command of the Gospel is, Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. Many may believe the Gospel as they believe a piece of history, and remain spiritually ignorant of Christ. On the other hand, saving faith in Christ springs from a revelation to the soul of His divine glory, sufficiency, and suitableness as a Saviour. No one, therefore, savingly believes the Gospel, except he is enlightened by the Holy Ghost as to the person and work of Christ. To believe unto salvation is not something which men can do, upon invitation, as easily as a common task, but can only be performed after the reception of spiritual life and enlightenment by the Spirit of God. This all-important aspect of the Gospel appears here to be lost sight of in the haste to emphasise the universality of the Gospel call" ("Free Presbyterian Magazine," vol. I., pp. 161, 162). Our Larger Catechism, in answer to the question, "Are the elect only effectually called?" gives the answer—"All the elect, and they only, are effectually called; although others may be, and often are, outwardly called by the ministry of the Word, and have some common operations of the Spirit; who, for their wilful neglect and contempt of the grace offered to them, being justly left in their unbelief, do never truly come to Jesus Christ." And in their answer to the question, "What is effectual calling?" the Westminster Divines speak of "Jesus Christ freely

offered in the Gospel." He would be a daring man, however, who would charge these Divines with such Arminian tendencies, as we have in the Declaratory Act, in view of their own explicit statement that the sinner "is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it" (Confession of Faith, chap. x, sec. 2).

The second section of Clause ii. of the Declaratory Act, which asserts—"That this Church does not teach, and does not regard the Confession as teaching, the foreordination of men to death irrespective of their own sin," has in view sections iii. and vii. of chapter iii. of the Confession, and is a bad piece of theological bungling arising from misunderstanding the teaching of these two sections. The chapter in which these sections appears deals with God's Eternal Decree—the "high mystery of predestination, and is, in the words of Dr Warfield, "A most admirable chapter—the most admirably clear, orderly, careful, and moderate statement of the great mysteries of God's Decree to be found in the whole body of the Reformed Confessions." In dealing with this great doctrine it is well to keep before us the words of the Westminster Divines that the doctrine should be "handled with special prudence and care, that men attending the will of God revealed in His Word, and yielding obedience thereunto, may, from the certainty of their effectual vocation be assured of their eternal election" (Confession of Faith, chap. iii., sec. viii.). For the benefit of our readers we will quote at length the two sections which made such confusion in the minds of the framers of the Declaratory Act as caused them to make the statement in the Clause under review. Section iii. of chap. iii. of the Confession reads as follows:—"By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death." While section vii. reads—"The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice." Now, we hope to show that these sections reveal that there were master minds engaged in their formation—trained theologians of the first rank, and men profoundly taught by the Holy Ghost in the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven.

1. The chapter on God's Eternal Decree (chap. iii.) opens with what Dr Warfield, in his "On the Revision of the Confession of Faith," terms "the finest and most guarded and most beautiful statement of God's decree in general that has ever been compressed into so small a space (sects. i. and ii.)." The third and fourth sections assert the fact that this sovereign, particular, and unchangeable decree extends over the sphere of the destiny of the creature, while sections v. to vii. deal with God's consequent dealing with the diverse classes, and section viii. closes with a caution against careless handling of this high mystery. Section iii. is simply a clear statement of one of the facts falling under section i., here restated in order to supply a starting point for a full discussion of God's special decree given in sections iv. to viii. Dr Shedd admirably sums up the whole matter when he says:—"The Westminster standards, in common with the Calvinistic creeds generally, begin with affirming the universal sovereignty of God over His entire universe: over heaven, earth, and hell; and comprehend all beings and all events under His dominion. Nothing comes to pass contrary to His decree. Nothing happens by chance. Even moral evil, which He abhors and forbids, occurs by 'the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.' And yet occurs through the agency of the unforced and self-determining will of man as the efficient" (Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, p. 38). If "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass" (sec. i.) then it follows that "by the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life and others foreordained to everlasting death" (sec. iii.) But would it not improve the Confession if we added to this section that sinners were foreordained to everlasting death "because of their sin" as the Declaratory Act does? To this question an emphatic No! must be given, for the addition of these words would mar, as Dr Warfield puts it, "the logical order and exactitude of statement of this now beautifully ordered and carefully phrased chapter. It would prematurely introduce the statement of the ground of God's actual dealings with one class into the statement of the fact that two classes are discriminated. It would confound the treatment of preterition, which is sovereign, with that of condemnation, which is based on sin" (On the Revision of the Confession, p. 49). It was this failure to distin-

guish between "preterition" and "condemnation"* that caused the confusion in the minds of the framers of the Declaratory Act, and set them to tinker with the scriptural and logical statements of the Confession in sections iii. and vii. of chapter iii.

2. In dealing with the doctrine of Reprobation there are two aspects in which this solemn subject is to be viewed—(1) A negative—God passing by sinners; (2) a positive—God condemning them for their sins. "In respect to this negative element," says Dr A. A. Hodge, "reprobation is simply sovereign, since those passed over were no worse than those elected, and the simple reason both for the choosing and for the passing over was the sovereign good pleasure of God. In respect to its positive element, reprobation is not sovereign, but simply judicial, because God inflicts misery in any case only as the righteous punishment of sin" (*Outlines of Theology*, p. 222). The difference between the negative and positive aspects are thus summed up by Dr Shedd :—(1) Preterition is a sovereign act; condemnation is a judicial act. God passes by an individual because of His sovereign good pleasure, but he condemns this individual to punishment, not because of His sovereign good pleasure, but because this individual is a sinner. (2) The reason of condemnation is known : sin is the reason. The reason of preterition is unknown. It is not sin, because the elect are as sinful as the non-elect. (3) In preterition God's action is permissive : inaction rather than action. In condemnation, God's action is efficient and positive" (*Dogmatic Theology*, I. 433). The following quotation from Dr John Arrowsmith, one of the Westminster Divines, will shed further light on this deep and mysterious subject :—"Preterition, or negative reprobation," he says, "is an eternal decree of God, purposing within Himself to deny

* A word of explanation may be here offered for the benefit of our readers as to the terms used. "Reprobation" is that aspect of God's eternal decree having reference to sinners finally lost. It is positive and negative. Positive inasmuch as sinners are condemned to eternal misery; negative as sinners are passed by. This is what is meant by the terms "condemnation" and "preterition" respectively used above. It may be here pointed out that the Westminster Divines, instead of using the term "Reprobation," use the word "Foreordination," but their teaching on this solemn doctrine is one with that of the great Reformed symbols and divines.

*

unto the non-elect that peculiar love of His wherewith election is accompanied, as, also, that special grace which infallibly bringeth to glory. . . . This description carries in the face of it a clear reason why the thing described goeth under the name of negative reprobation, because it standeth mainly on the denial of these free favours which it pleaseth God to bestow upon His elect. . . . Condemnation for sin : this last is that which, by divines, is usually styled positive reprobation, and is clearly distinguishable from the negative in that the one is an act of punitive justice respecting sin committed and continued in. But the other is an absolute decree of God's most free and sovereign will, without respect to any disposition in the creature. I call them consequents, not effects, because, though negative reprobation be antecedent to them all, it is not the proper cause of them" (Chain of Principles). The distinctions drawn above may appear to some to be the mere invention of subtle theological minds, but they are distinctions resting on facts—mysterious we admit—nevertheless facts capable of being grasped by the mind. The Westminster Divines were, therefore, not only sound theologians, but good logicians when they did not introduce the question of sin into section iii., which deals with God's sovereign act in passing by sinners, and reserved it for section vii., which deals with God's judicial act. The Declaratory Act statement is bad theology arising from confused thinking and erratic logic. In regard to its statement we may apply the words used by Dr Warfield in regard to the attempts made by the revisers of the Confession in the American Presbyterian Church. "The fact," he says, "that men are sinners does not affect the sovereignty of preterition; it only affects the treatment they are left to by preterition. If, for instance, out of the holy angels God chose sovereignly a certain number for some high service involving special gifts of grace to them to fit them for it, the 'leaving' of the rest would be just as truly 'preterition' as in the case of fallen men; but the consequent treatment being but the 'consequent,' and not the 'effect,' of preterition, would be infinitely different in the two cases, seeing that it is the effect of the deserts, whatever they may be, in which those who are 'passed by' are found to be left. Consequently, sin is not the cause of preterition; election is the cause of preterition, i.e., the choosing of some is the cause that 'the rest' are left. Sin is the cause, however, of how the preterited ones are treated. And to guard this, the Westminster men were accustomed to use a phrase they borrowed from Wollevius, which affirmed that sin is not the

'causa reprobationis,' but the 'causa reprobabilitatis,' that is, sin is not the cause of reprobation (otherwise the elect, who also are sinners, would be reprobates), but it is the cause of men being in a reprobable state. These are not theological subtleties; they are broad, outstanding facts of God's dealings with men; and it is failure to note them that is causing much (not always intelligent) criticism of the Confession in these last days" (On Revision of the Confession, pp. 47, 48).

The result of our discussion, then, is that the Confessional statements in sections iii. and vii. of chapter iii. are scriptural and logical, while the Declaratory Act statement in its efforts to mix up sections iii. and vii.—God's sovereign act with God's judicial act—is unscriptural and illogical—in fact, poor theology and bad logic. In taking leave of the solemn and high mysteries with which we have been dealing we are not unmindful of the rebellion in the natural heart against God's sovereignty in passing by sinners, and we leave the subject with the following words from Bunyan:—"Eternal reprobation makes no man a sinner. The foreknowledge of God that the reprobate will perish, makes no man a sinner. God's infallible determining upon the damnation of him that perisheth, makes no man a sinner. God's patience and forbearance until the reprobate fits himself for eternal destruction, makes no man a sinner" (Reprobation Asserted, xi.).

The Stone which the Builders Refused: Notes of a Meditation.

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

"The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner. This is the doing of the Lord and it is marvellous in our eyes" (Ps. cxviii. 22).

I. The treatment which the stone received at the hand of the builders—rejected, condemned, and rejected as not fit for the building, not suited to the place, or to any place in the building. If rejected by any others than the builders, the stone might notwithstanding get its own proper place in the building; but rejected by them with one consent, it would seem that the stone in consequence of their rejection, must be left out of the building. It was their voice, their veto, their decision that the stone should be left out of the building.

II. The honour put upon the stone notwithstanding their rejection—the Head of the corner. The most

honourable, conspicuous and important place in all the building—Head of the corner—not the top stone but the chief stone of the foundation, answering to what we call the first stone. This is the chief stone, the main stone.

III. Consider who it is who gave this place to the rejected stone. This is the doing of the Lord, and it is marvellous in our eyes. This is a marvellous work and it is wrought by the Lord. He is the Author of it. He reversed the decision of the builders regarding it. They refused it. He said: "It is the headstone of the corner." Rejected of men but chosen of God and precious, and the decision of God in its favour prevails against the decision of the builders.

IV. How the Lord makes Christ the rejected stone, the headstone of the corner. (1) He does this by all His acts towards the Lord Jesus Christ personally. 1. His resurrection. 2. By accepting of His works which He wrought on earth, obedience, and sacrifice for all the ends and purposes for which He sent Him into the world. 3. By exalting to His own right hand and constituting Him Head and King over His own church, and over the whole New Testament dispensation, and over all principalities and powers, delivering all things into His hand. All things put under Him and nothing left that is not put under Him.

(2) By His treatment of men because of Him, and for His name's sake. All His treatment of this world, both by grace and providence, and providence in all its aspects of mercy and judgment, God makes the rejected stone the head of the corner. In all His dealings with men as individuals, and also as united to each other in all the relations of this life, He has respect, supreme respect to His own purpose and decisions regarding this stone—and is at work making it the headstone of the corner in everything in the family, in daily life, in the church, in the nation and kingdom. 1. By sending out His word as the sceptre of His great power out of Zion. He makes known to men who Christ is; for what ends He has sent Him; what blessings He communicates by Him, and for His name's sake, and makes known to them also what need they have, and what doom awaits all who live and die in disobedience to Him. 2. By shedding forth His spirit, the Holy Ghost, upon us abundantly; for His sake He makes known His Son effectively as the only name given among men under heaven whereby we must be saved. He makes known His glory and loveliness so as to win to Him the heart of His people. They come to believe in Him, love Him and to serve and obey Him in all things. Ties are

formed between Him and them which neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to break. He dwells in them, they are one Spirit with Him. He fills them with divine power, makes them kings and priests unto God and His Father. What they ask in Christ's name and for Christ's interests are granted to them. Their labours for His name's sake are owned and blessed. They overcome and conquer in His name. The power of sin and Satan and the world goes on breaking before them, wasting and consuming as the fire consumes the stubble.

(3) By His providence God works in behalf of His Son to give Him in effect the place which God has given Him by purpose. He protects His servants who go forth in His name. So that though they are sent forth as lambs they are safe until their work is done. He sets before them doors of usefulness which no man can shut. He weakens and overturns and breaks in pieces everything in human society which stands opposed to the interests of Jesus Christ, making His enemies His footstool; defeating armies, overturning thrones, bringing low the pride and the might of the enemy. His far-reaching wisdom and his almighty power is continually at work to bring to nought the counsels and the power of His adversaries until the last of Christ's foes are made His footstool and every knee of things in heaven and things in earth and of things under the earth bow to Him, and every tongue confesses that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

The new state of matters which is constituted by making the Lord Jesus Christ the head of the corner, universally, in the family; the head of the corner, in human society; the head of the corner, in the nation: the head of the corner, in the Church; the head of the corner—peace, abounding light, abounding holiness, and power, abounding happiness—full authority given to the Word of God, and all things governed by it. When Jesus Christ has actually given to Him all the place and power which God has given to Him in His Word and purpose, all attempts to keep Him out of the place which God has appointed for Him is idle and vain. Those who take part in such action are at work for their own ruin but keep back His cause they cannot for a single moment. God will stand to His purpose regarding Him and before His power all opposition and all opposing forces are but as dry thorns and briars in the way of the devouring fire.

The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner. This is the doing of the Lord, and it is marvellous in our eyes. Why is Christ compared to a stone? What view of Him does this representation give us of Him? He is as fit and suitable for the whole work given Him, and the position assigned to Him in the purpose of God, as a proper stone is for the foundation of a building. Solidity, durability, strength, are ideas suggested by this metaphor. And as it is a stone for a building, it is meant not to be alone, but to stand in intimate relation with others. This stone was rejected by the very men who should be judges of what is fit and unfit to be used in the building—by the very men whose judgment is usually final in such matters. When a number of builders with one voice reject any stone or anything else that is brought for the building and condemn it as unfit for use, no one thinks of placing in the building what they condemned. The stone which the builders reject and throw aside is usually disposed of according to their judgment. It was otherwise with this stone. The adverse judgment of the builders was reversed, and the most honourable, important and useful place in the building was assigned to it. It not only got into the building, but became the head of the corner. It had the chief place in the foundation.

How came the stone, after being rejected of the builders, the head of the corner? It was the Lord's doing and marvellous in our eyes. All the honour conferred upon the Lord Jesus is of God the Father. By Him He was chosen and anointed—His work and position and success in it—the marvellous things wrought by Him—accomplished by Him—the honour and glory conferred on Him are all of the Lord. He never got any real honour or place from man, but as the Lord wrought in His favour. And never gets to this day any real glory but as the Lord works in His behalf. Builders now are no better than builders of old. Builders now as of old would fain build and leave out the stone which the Lord has appointed to be the chief corner stone. This text accordingly calls attention to a twofold action toward the Lord Jesus Christ—opposition and rejection on the part of man, and approbation on the part of God. In man's view there was no need of Him; they can do well enough without Him. In God's view, and by His judgment, all building in which He is not the head of the corner stands condemned and is appointed to destruction. Men oppose Him, reject Him and betake themselves to

other expedients, other physicians, while the Lord declares: "There is no other name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved." All the love of sin there is in the individual; and also in the nations stand opposed to Jesus Christ who is the enemy and destroyer of sin. And the fact that He is the Redeemer and Saviour of sinners does not—cannot modify their enmity. All the pride and selfrighteousness of human society stand opposed—all the blindness and hardness are in direct hostility to Him, putting men in array against Him—all the love of wealth and pomp and power and pleasure on earth combine against Him. And these are as powerful in human nature to-day, as in the day when Christ was crucified by them; there is in reality no change in the unregenerate hearts of men towards the Lord's Christ. Love of sin, self-will, love of the world in its pride, power, pomp, wealth, and pleasure, blindness, and hardness of the heart, and the disrelish and enmity of the carnal heart to vital godliness and to that course of self-renunciation and crucifixion to the world to which the Lord Jesus calls His people, come forth in opposition to Him. Ways in which this opposition manifests itself differ according to time and place and circumstances. But the opposition to the Lord Jesus exists and shews itself as opportunity is allowed to it.

Yet this stone rejected of the builders is become the head of the corner; this is the doing of the Lord and it is marvellous in our eyes. He goes to work marvellously to put His Son in the place assigned to Him in His own purpose. No opposition on the part of earth and hell combined can prevail against Him to keep Him out of that place which God has given Him; or to keep from Him aught of all the glory which God has appointed for Him. Regarding Him, God has said: This stone is head of the corner, and head of the corner this stone is become. Head of the corner this stone shall be, and all that is set up by hand of man in which He is not Head of the corner stands condemned of God, and is appointed to destruction. Head of the corner in the church, the house of God, the pillar and ground of the truth. Head of the corner in the family. Head of the corner in human society. Head of the corner in the constitutions of nations—in their legislation and administration of all civil government. Head of the corner over all things. "And many nations shall come and say: Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will

walk in His paths : for the law shall go forth of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And He shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore, but they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid, for the mouth of the Lord of Hosts hath spoken it" (Micah iv. 2-4). "And the multitude of all the nations that fight against Ariel, even all that fight against her and her munition, and that distress her, shall be as a dream of a night vision. It shall even be as when an hungry man dreameth, and behold he eateth; but he waketh and his soul is empty; or as when a thirsty man dreameth and behold he drinketh but he awaketh and behold he is faint, and his soul hath appetite; so shall the multitude of the nations be that fight against Mount Zion" (Is. xxix. 7, 8).

The head of the corner, the chief stone of all the building, the prime stone in all the structure, the post of honour and importance given to it. This is the doing of the Lord and it is marvellous in our eyes. His ways are not our ways, and His thoughts are not our thoughts. What is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God. In nothing else do the thoughts and ways of God transcend the thoughts and ways of men as in the matters concerning Jesus Christ. The opposition made to Him by men; the contempt with which He is treated by them and the glory which God gives Him; and the delight which He has in Him; and the marvellous things which He accomplishes by Him stand in the most striking contrast and opposition. Christ is all in all in the purposes and works of God, but in those of men, except as they are led and taught by grace, Christ is nothing—has no place. And when any place is given, it is usually the last. But in God's plans Christ is the centre, the beginning and the end. Which is to prevail, the ways of men or those of God? Whose purposes shall stand, those of God or those of men concerning Jesus of Nazareth? Seemingly men's decisions prevail. They form purposes against Him, and they succeed in them. They plotted to take His life away, to load Him with shame, and to make Him the sport of the nation, and they carried out their purpose into execution. But in all that they plotted against Him, they were actually working out the purpose of God regarding Him,

and laying the foundations of His eternal power and glory as Mediator between God and man. His enemies combined against His name and truth and people to oppose and ridicule and persecute them. And might and power are in their hand to do all that is in their heart to do against Him by opposing and ridiculing His truth, and persecuting His people even to the death. And yet the ends which they aimed at securing are departed. Fresh armies take the field in room of the fallen, and stand forth as soldiers and witnesses for Jesus of Nazareth. His truth goes on making converts, conquering hearts, overturning dominions none the less because of the opposition made to it on the part of others. Howsoever the enemies of Christ may seem to gain and triumph for a brief moment, all their successes and victories redound to His glory, and turn to their own shame. God's purposes regarding Christ stand fast and entire. There is no departure from it in any way or in any degree. "Head of the corner" is the decree that regulates all the movements of His providence towards nations, churches, and families, and every human being in His individual personalty. "Head of the corner" sounds forth in the earthquake and the tornado. "Head of the corner" peals forth in all judgments—in the earthquake, the tornado, the overturning of thrones and dynasties, the crash of falling nations, the clash of contending armies. These are strokes from His iron rod which God has put in His hands, and cannot cease until the nations submit themselves to His rule.

Tyndale's Work.

THE publication by the Clarendon Press of the facsimile of the fragment of Tyndale's first translation of the New Testament is a fitting memorial to the beginning of a tremendous enterprise, to which the pioneer gave his life. Dominions and Powers were leagued against William Tyndale; he defied them, and they slew him in the end, but not before he accomplished his work, which was nothing less than the English Bible. For although Tyndale's Bible was succeeded by the Great Bible of 1539, the Geneva Bible of 1560, the Bishops' Bible of 1572, the Jesuit version of 1582, and the Authorised Version of 1611, which is read to-day, in that version ninety per cent. is the original translation of William Tyndale. Thus the magnificent style of that notable scholar and incomparable artist

survived the ordeal of the scrutiny of the most learned men in Europe, and remains unsurpassed and (as the Revised Version shows) unsurpassable. Incidentally, the immortality of Tyndale's version proves once again that a work of art must always be the achievement of one man, and that it can never be attained by a committee. Nor is Tyndale's towering genius more remarkable than his heroic tenacity. Delated by the clergy of Gloucestershire for heresy, Tyndale told one of his opponents that "If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough should know more of the Scripture than thou dost." And within seven years of Tyndale's martyrdom, King Henry VIII. had ordered the Great Bible to be placed in every parish church in England.

Finding, as he said, there was no place in all England in which he could translate the Bible, Tyndale, in 1524, went to Germany. During the next year he was supervising the printing of his translation of the New Testament at Cologne. Thence he was compelled to flee to Worms. Eight of the sheets printed at Cologne repose in the British Museum. Of that unique relic Mr Alfred W. Pollard gives an interesting account in his introduction to the Clarendon Press publications. The sheets are in quarto, with marginal notes, which Tyndale added that "the laye people" might "se the processe, ordre and meaninge of the texte." Tyndale's annotations were used by his enemies as evidence of his Lutheran and heretical tendencies. The Worms (octavo) edition of the New Testament was published in 1526. It would appear that a printer of Antwerp, one Christoffel van Endhoven, pirated the Worms edition and smuggled it into England at a lower price. That adventure seriously annoyed the merchants who had supplied Tyndale with money to defray the cost of printing, and who perceived their profits vanishing into the pocket of Christoffel van Endhoven. As for Tyndale, he went resolutely on with his translation of the Old Testament. Harassed alike by friends and foes, perpetually in danger, this extraordinary man, in spite of all, completed the greatest monument in English literature. In 1536 Tyndale was arrested and cast into prison at Vilvorde. Thomas Cromwell tried to save Tyndale from execution. The King, it appears, would do nothing. Foxe asserts that Tyndale's last prayer was—"Lord, open the King of England's eyes." So died a hero, bequeathing to the English people the greatest treasure they possess.—"Morning Post" (26th February 1926).

Jesus and the Jews.

THE Ghetto* has its reasons that reason often fails to understand. For nearly fifteen hundred years it had no attitude to Christianity and to its founder. The name of Jesus was never mentioned in the Ghetto. In early Rabbinic literature He is sometimes referred to as "The Man" without mentioning His name, and later the learned rabbis would refer to Him as the Nazarene: that, too, occurred but very seldom. In all those fifteen hundred years not a line was written by a representative Jew on Jesus, either in Hebrew or in any other language. From time to time Jewish heretics would voice a strong protest against this attitude toward the Founder of Christianity. Sanchez, the French heretic of the sixteenth century and the actual founder of French agnosticism, as well as Spinoza in the seventeenth century, had something to say about Jesus, but since both were "outsiders" their remarks made no impression on the Jews. In the eighteenth century, the famous German theologian, Lavater, tried to induce Moses Mendelssohn to change his own attitude to the Founder of Christianity and to help bring about a change of attitude on the part of the Jewish masses, but his efforts were in vain. Throughout the nineteenth century, the same conditions obtained. The believers clung to the old belief and the non-believers of the type of Heine, Boerne, Saphir, and many other illustrious Jews who emerged from the Ghetto, to attain world-wide fame as poets and writers, took a somewhat cynical attitude to religion altogether. The enlightened Western European few stood under the spell of French Encyclopedists until a few decades ago. This, of course, loosened the Jewish morale and led to many baptisms. However, the fact is that the more the Jews in Western Europe have adopted Christianity in the course of the nineteenth century—and their number is

This article appeared in the "Jewish Tribune" (New York), and was reprinted in the July issue of "The Dawn" under the title, "The Galilean and the Ghetto," and is from the pen of Dr S. M. Melamed. It will give our readers some idea of the change of attitude of the Jews towards the Lord Jesus. That attitude is still very far short of the allegiance He claims and shall yet receive from them, but it is an attitude which shows an extraordinary change on their part. Ghetto is the Jews' quarters in a city.—Editor.

supposed to be about two hundred thousand—the more have the Jews of all shades of opinion clung to the old tradition simply to ignore such a world historic phenomenon as the figure of Jesus. This tradition was based not only on religious but on general historical grounds. That it is not a religious principle with the Jew not to mention the name of Jesus can be seen from the fact that the names of Mohammed and Buddha are often mentioned and discussed even by the most pious Jews. The strained relations between the Synagogue and the Church throughout the Middle Ages have largely contributed toward this Jewish state of mind. Finally, one must bear in mind that just because both religions are so closely related to one another, and just because they have the same landscape as their background, the abyss separating them from one another is unbridgeable.

However, this old, firm Jewish tradition is now melting away like the snow in the sun. To-day Jesus is not only discussed by liberal Jews, but He is a topic of discussion even in the heart of the Ghetto. Only fifteen years ago one of the most learned Hebrew scholars of his time, the late S. I. Hurwitz, editor of a philosophical Hebrew quarterly, was nearly lynched for having published an essay in his journal, in which he took a positive attitude toward the figure of Jesus. Another Hebrew writer, by the name of Lazar, accused him of missionary machinations, and a public trial was held in the city of Lemberg to determine whether or not S. I. Hurwitz acted in good faith. The famous Jewish historian, Dr Simon Bernfeld, of Berlin, was the main witness for the defence. Of course, Hurwitz was acquitted, but the very fact that such an accusation could be levelled against him goes to prove how strongly the tradition referred to was rooted in Jewish life. To-day such an occurrence would be impossible, because nothing is left of that old tradition. The new attitude towards Jesus dates back to the pogrom year of 1906. The effects of these pogroms following the breakdown of the revolutionary energies in Russia were the same upon the Ghetto as those following the butcheries of the Romans in Palestine in the decades preceding the appearance of Jesus. Free thinkers of yesterday became God-Seekers overnight, and a religious revival swept the Eastern Ghetto. Their hopes for freedom shattered, their expectation for redemption gone, they turned toward God. In those years the younger generation of Jewish writers and poets in Eastern Europe discovered the figure of Jesus, and since those

days Jesus is a topic of discussion in the Ghetto. In the New York Ghetto two well-known Yiddish writers have only recently published remarkable treatises dealing with the Jesus problem, one by S. Setzer and one by Dr Chaim Zhitlowsky. Setzer, who is an historian by profession, represents the German point of view: that the figure of Jesus is mythical, and that the real founder of Christianity was St Paul. Dr Chaim Zhitlowsky, who is more liberal and, by the way, less religious, believes in the historicity of Jesus and demands that the Jews revise their attitude to Him and consider Him one of their great prophets. Zhitlowsky's treatise has created a veritable stir in the New York Ghetto, not because he defends his thesis with vigour, but because of his opinion that the traditional Jewish attitude toward Jesus was based on a miscarriage of justice, and he demands that the historical crime be re-investigated and adjudged with impartiality. At present there circulates in the New York Ghetto a book dealing with the life of Jesus, entitled "Jesus as Others Saw Him." The author of the book is the late Joseph Jacobs, one of the finest literary minds of American Jewry during the last three decades. In this book is told the life story of the Founder of the Christian religion in the form of a series of epistles giving a contemporary picture of the time in which He lived and suffered, and purporting to have been addressed in the year 54 A.D. to Aglaophonos, a Greek physician, by a famous Jewish scribe of Alexandria. The liberal-minded author wanted the Jewish reader to see the figure of Jesus as the enlightened ancients saw Him, without bias or prejudice. The reception of this peculiar and unique book by the Ghetto would go to show that the name of Jesus is no longer anathema to its dwellers.

But nothing is more indicative of the new view of the Ghetto on Jesus than the fact that the foremost orthodox Hebrew scholar of our time, Dr Joseph Klausner, of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, has published in the city of Jerusalem a voluminous book dealing with the life of Jesus. The book, written in Hebrew (recently translated into English) and, according to all critics, Jewish and Gentile, a scholarly work of the first magnitude, has created a veritable sensation throughout the Ghetto all over the world. It happens for the first time in nineteen hundred years that a rabbinical Jew has had the courage to discuss the life of Jesus without prejudice, and that instead of continuing the old Jewish tradition he makes an end of it, and goes a step further by representing the Founder

of Christianity as the embodiment of religious and ethical idealism. He does not propose that the Jews accept Jesus as Christ, but he does propose that they accept Him as a great ethical personality. The revolutionary character of this proposal can only be understood and appreciated when one realises that it was made in Jerusalem by the foremost orthodox Jewish scholar of our time, and that innumerable Jewish generations came and went without pronouncing the name of Jesus.

Needless to say, that from the point of view of contemporary religious history, this is an event of the first magnitude. Whatever the attitude of the Ghetto to Jesus will be, the name of Jesus will no longer be anathema and His personality and accomplishments will henceforth be freely discussed in the most orthodox Jewish circles. Dr Joseph Klausner has broken the ice and from now on new thought-currents will move freely.

It is of absorbing interest to watch how the learned element in the Ghetto go about in explaining to the Jews the personality of Jesus. Dr Klausner, for instance, uses the very latest methods of historical writing to establish the historicity of Jesus and the part He played in the spiritual life of the people. All the moving events of the time, all the struggles and conflicts of the various groups and sects are clearly described, and the entire moral, religious, and political background of Jesus can be seen with great clarity. He collected all the sources of the Talmud, the Rabbinic and the non-Jewish literature relative to the life of Jesus, compared them critically, and established many facts which were contested by a great many modern Jesus biographers. He pitilessly destroys the myth that Jesus was a myth only. After establishing His historic identity beyond a shadow of a doubt, he gives a dispassionate description of His life and martyrdom. But Doctor Klausner goes one step further. He tells his readers that they are all wrong in taking a negative or indifferent attitude to Jesus, for His character and His indisputable idealism deserve a positive valuation. Though this new Jewish attitude cannot possibly be that of an orthodox Christian, it should be the perspective of a people that respects the heroic deeds of its sons.

But at present the Ghetto is finding an approach to Jesus, and this, to my thinking, is one of the outstanding phenomena of our time.

The Good Old King and the Dying Gipsy.

A KING OF ENGLAND [George III.], of happy memory, who loved his people and his God, occasionally took the exercise of hunting. Being out one day for this purpose, the chase led through the shrubs of the forest. The stag had been hard run, and to escape the dogs, had crossed the river in a deep part. As the dogs could not be brought to follow, it became necessary, in order to come up with it, to make a circuitous route along the banks of the river, through some thick and troublesome underwood. The roughness of the ground, the long grass and frequent thickets, obliged the sportsmen to separate from each other, each one endeavouring to make the best and speediest route he could. Before they had reached the end of the forest, the King's horse manifested signs of fatigue and uneasiness; so much so that his Majesty resolved upon yielding the pleasures of the chase to those of compassion for his horse. With this view, he turned down the first avenue in the forest, and determined on riding gently to the oaks, there to wait for some of his attendants. The King had only proceeded a few yards, when, instead of the cry of the hounds, he fancied he heard the cry of human distress. As he rode forward, he heard it more distinctly. "Oh, my mother, my mother! God pity and bless my poor mother!" The curiosity and kindness of the Sovereign led him instantly to the spot. It was a little green plot on one side of the forest, where was spread on the grass, under a branching oak, a little pallet, half-covered with a kind of tent; and a basket or two, with some packs, lay on the ground at a few paces distant from the tent. Near to the root of the tree he observed a little swarthy girl, about eight years of age, on her knees praying, while her little black eyes ran down with tears. Distress of any kind was always relieved by his Majesty, for he had a heart which melted at "human woe"; nor was it unaffected on this occasion. And now, he inquired, "What, my child, is the cause of your weeping? For what do you pray?" The little creature at first started, then rose from her knees and pointing to the tent, said, "Oh, sir! my dying mother!" "What?" said his Majesty, dismounting and fastening his horse up to the branches of the oak, "What, my child? tell me all about it." The little creature now led the King to the tent; there lay, partly

covered, a middle-aged female gipsy, in the last stage of a decline, and in the last moments of life. She turned her dying eyes expressively to the Royal visitor, then looked up to heaven, but not a word did she utter; the organs of speech had ceased their office; "the silver cord was loosed, and the wheel broken at the cistern." The little girl then wept aloud, and stooping down, wiped the dying sweat from her mother's face. The King, much affected, asked the child her name, and of her family, and how long her mother had been ill. Just at that moment another gipsy girl, much older, came out of breath to the spot. She had been at the town of W—, and had brought some medicine for her dying mother. Observing a stranger, she modestly curtsied, and hastening to her mother, knelt down by her side, kissed her pallid lips, and burst into tears. "What, my dear child," said his Majesty, "can be done for you?" "Oh, sir," she replied, "my dying mother wanted a religious person to teach her, and to pray with her before she died. I ran all the way, before it was light this morning to W—, and asked for a minister, but no one could I get to come with me to pray with my dear mother." The dying woman seemed sensible of what her daughter was saying, and her countenance was much agitated. The air was again rent with the cries of the distressed daughters. The King, full of kindness, instantly endeavoured to comfort them. He said, "I am a minister, and God has sent me to instruct and comfort your mother." He then sat down on a pack by the side of the pallet, and taking the hand of the dying gipsy, discoursed on the demerit of sin, and the nature of redemption. He then pointed her to Christ, the all-sufficient Saviour. While doing this, the poor creature seemed to gather consolation and hope; her eyes sparkled with brightness, and her countenance became animated. She looked up—she smiled; but it was the last smile—it was the glimmering of expiring nature. As the expression of peace, however, remained strong in her countenance, it was not till some time had elapsed that they perceived the struggling spirit had left mortality.

It was at this moment that some of his Majesty's attendants, who had missed him at the chase, and who had been riding through the forest in search of him, rode up, and found him comforting the afflicted gipsies.

He now rose up, put some gold into the hands of the afflicted girls, promised them his protection, and bade them look to heaven. He then wiped the tears from his eyes, and mounted his horse. His attendants,

greatly affected, stood in silent admiration. Lord L—— was going to speak, but his Majesty, turning to the gipsies, and pointing to the breathless corpse, and to the weeping girls, said, with strong emotion, "Who, my Lord, who, thinkest thou, was neighbour unto these?—"The Gipsies' Advocate."

The Relation of the Church of Scotland to the Confession of Faith.

(Continued from p. 139.)

IN the former article on this subject the legislation of Parliament and the General Assembly as to creed subscription in the Church of Scotland was traced up to 1711. From that date until 1889 no change was made, but in the latter year the movement for the relaxation of creed subscription bore fruit in the Act on Subscription of Office-bearers of the Church (Act 17, 1889). It was reported to the General Assembly that Overture I. on Subscription of Office-bearers had been approved by 64 presbyteries, while 16 disapproved, and 4 had suggested alterations. It was moved and seconded and agreed to that this Overture be now converted into a standing law of the Church. The preamble of the Act reads:—"Whereas it is expedient that the formulas presently in use in this Church should be so revised and amended that, while affording security on the part of all who subscribe them for their adherence to the 'true Reformed religion heretofore received in this realm,' and to 'the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of this Church,' they should at the same time be in accordance with statute law, and so expressed as not to present any unnecessary impediment to the acceptance of office by duly qualified persons: For these causes the General Assembly . . . enact and ordain, that ministers at their ordination, and licentiates when receiving licence, shall subscribe to the Confession of Faith as required by Act of Parliament, 1693, cap. 38. . . . And further . . . that all elders at the time of their ordination, in accordance with the Act of Assembly, 1690, shall subscribe their approbation of the Confession and Presbyterian government of the Church, in terms of the formula hereinafter prescribed for them. . . . The General Assembly, while desiring by these changes to enlarge rather than curtail any liberty heretofore enjoyed, and to relieve

subscribers from unnecessary burdens as to forms of expression and matters which do not enter into the substance of the faith, declare, at the same time, the adherence of the Church to the Confession of Faith, as its public and avowed confession, and containing the sum and substance of the doctrine of the Reformed Churches." In the new questions put to Probationers before licence the first reads—"Do you believe the Word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, to be the supreme rule of faith and morals?" instead of—"Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and manners" of the 1711 Act. The change is decidedly for the worse. "Contained in the Scriptures," while quite correct if viewed from the Westminster Divines' viewpoint, is very suspicious in the phraseology of modern divines, because of its meaning in the terminology of the Higher Critics. Then there is a great difference between "the only rule of faith and manners" and "the supreme rule of faith and morals." "A supreme rule" is not necessarily an "only rule." Question 2 reads—"Do you declare the Confession of Faith of this Church to be the Confession of your faith?" This is a great departure from the 1711 Question, which is—"Do you sincerely own and believe the whole doctrine of the Confession of Faith . . . to be the truths of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments? And do you own the whole doctrine therein contained as the confession of your faith?" Between these two questions there is a world of difference. The 1889 Question omits "the whole doctrine" of the Confession as required to be believed. The 1711 stresses this "whole doctrine" to be "the truths of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments." This is omitted in the 1889 Act. In Question 3 of the latter Act acknowledgment of the Presbyterian Church government, as now settled by law, to be the only government of the Church of Scotland, is all that is required, while in the 1711 Question acknowledgment to this government being founded upon and agreeable to the Holy Scriptures was required. Questions 4 to 8 of the 1711 Act are omitted in the 1889 Questions. In the questions put to ministers at their ordination the following is omitted from the 1889 Questions:—"Do you disown all Popish, Arian, Socinian, Arminian, Bourignon, and other doctrines, tenets, and opinions whatsoever, contrary to and inconsistent with the foresaid Confession of Faith." In the Formula to be subscribed

by ministers and probationers "whole doctrine" of the Confession is omitted in the 1889 Formula, and the "Presbyterian government and discipline" instead of being acknowledged as "founded upon the Word of God and agreeable thereto" is only acknowledged "as now and for long time settled by law." The Questions put to elders and the Formula signed by them is sufficiently non-committal to account for the class of men one sees too often in the Established Church eldership. The only question put to them is—"Do you approve of the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of this Church, and promise never directly or indirectly to attempt the prejudice or subversion thereof?" The Act of 1889 at one step moved far from the Confession of Faith, and, it may be asked, how was it, in view of the Church of Scotland's relation to the State, that such a change in relation to her creed was permissible? The answer is that the ecclesiastical leaders were very careful not to come into conflict with the Acts of Parliament of 1690 and 1693. It was their own Act of the General Assembly of 1711 they departed from. The next move from the old position required careful engineering, and an unexpected opportunity presented itself in 1905, which was at once taken advantage of by the astute ecclesiastical leaders who were at the head of affairs in the Church of Scotland. It may have been regarded as rather a clever move by those responsible for getting the fifth clause inserted in the "Act to provide for the Settlement of certain Questions between the Free Church and the United Free Church in Scotland, and to make certain amendments of the law with respect to the Church of Scotland," but outsiders will have quite a different opinion as to the propriety of the opportunism that fished in troubled waters, even though it was successful. The Clause referred to in the Act of 1905 is as follows:—"The formula of subscription to the Confession of Faith required from ministers and preachers of the Church of Scotland as by law established, and from persons appointed to Chairs of Theology in the Scottish Universities and the Principal of Saint Mary's College, Saint Andrews, respectively, shall be such as may be prescribed by Act of the General Assembly of the said Church with the consent of the majority of the presbyteries thereof. The formula at present in use in any case shall be required until a formula in lieu thereof is so prescribed. This clause as stated in the Schedule (Second) to the Act repeals the words, "The same to be the Confession of his faith, and that he owns the doctrine therein con-

tained to be the true doctrine which he will constantly adhere to" in the Act of 1693, and the words, "Do and shall acknowledge and profess" and "as the confession of their faith" in the Act of 1707. The Assembly of 1906 received the report dealing with the Formula of Subscription to the Confession of Faith "with deep satisfaction" and "expressed their gratitude to all those who contributed to the result." They appointed a Special Committee "to consider the situation now presented, with power to submit to the next General Assembly, if so advised, a formula such as in their opinion is suitable for adoption by the Church." The satisfaction expressed by the Assembly was very natural in view of the efforts that had been made in the Supreme Court towards the goal so unexpectedly reached through the troubles of others. The Act of 1889 had given relief to some tender (?) consciences, but to those with super-sensitive consciences the words, "I own the Confession of Faith . . . to be the confession of my faith" was more than they could bear, and instead of seeking pastures new and wider liberty in another fold, they pursued the course so dear to those troubled with so-called tender consciences by working within the Church to bend its creed, or at least subscription to it, to suit their views. Accordingly a Committee was appointed in 1899 "to consider the power which the Church possesses of modifying the terms of the ministers' Formula of Adherence to the Confession of Faith." The Committee was authorised to consult counsel, and the opinion given by Messrs Asher, Rankine, and Constable, was to the effect that "the provisions of the Act of 1693, c. 38, with regard to the subscription of the Confession of Faith and the relative declaration were still in force, had not been abrogated, and were still binding on the Church." These learned counsel also gave as their opinion that the Formula of 1711 was more stringent than the statute of 1693 warranted, and that it "could not lawfully be revived." The Special Committee accordingly reported to the Assembly of 1901 that the Church could by a Declaratory Act explain or define doctrinal points as to which the Confession was silent or ambiguous, "but so long as the Act of 1690 remains in force, the Church has no power by a Declaratory Act or otherwise to modify, abridge, or extend any article of the Confession." A motion resolving to proceed no further meantime was carried by a majority of 178 to 146. This, however, did not stop the agitation, and in 1903 the matter came up again to the Assembly. Three motions came be-

fore the Assembly. The second, which was carried, asked the Assembly "to declare that the Confession of Faith is to be regarded as an infallible rule of faith and worship only in so far as it accords with Holy Scripture interpreted by the Holy Spirit." Much dissatisfaction was afterwards found with this finding, inasmuch as it was said to be based on a very doubtful interpretation of the Confession which it professed to follow, and because it apparently made the assent of the individual the criterion of truth. Dr Mair said of it—"The Resolution quite plainly puts Scripture in place of the Confession as the document to be signed, and therefore violates an Act of Parliament." The hope of getting rid of this Declaration was soon realised. The House of Lords gave their famous decision in 1904, shattering the well-planned schemes of astute ecclesiastics and the Church Interests Committee, seeing that an appeal was likely to be made to Parliament in connection with the Lords' Decision, presented a draft bill to the General Assembly. Their report was given in by Lord Balfour on 26th May 1905, and in speaking to it he said: "Whatever we ask from Parliament should be asked for by a vote that represents a very large majority of the Church, and makes it perfectly clear that as a Church we remain loyally bound to the Reformation faith." The motion was carried unanimously. The General Assembly asked Parliament that in subscribing the Confession their ministers and professors of theology should "declare their faith in the sum and substance of the doctrine of the Reformed Churches contained in the Confession"; what they got in the Act was only "such as may be prescribed by Act of the General Assembly" with the consent of the majority of presbyteries. The new Formula caused some trouble in framing, but it is not necessary to go into the history of it here. In 1909 a draft Formula came before the Assembly, in which the subscriber declared that he accepted the Confession as the Confession of the Church, and that he "believed the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith contained therein." Dr Wotherspoon says in his "Memoirs of Dr Cooper": "This may or may not be a formula of subscription to the Confession." It certainly does not look like it. When the draft Formula came before the Assembly of 1910 the words "contained therein" were omitted. The Formula as thus revised became the recognised Formula of the Church.

John Ross: A Story for the Young.

I.

THERE was once a little boy who went into a church-yard to look at the tombs; and, as he walked about, he began to measure the size of the graves, to see how big they were. He found that many of them were less than himself. When he saw this, he was much afraid, and began to say to himself, "If I should die soon, and be laid there, what would become of me?"

Now, I am going to tell you of a little boy, now lying in the church-yard, whose grave is shorter than most of you; and if you should be taken away as early as he was, what will become of you? He was ready to die, for his hope was in Jesus Christ, his Saviour; but are you as ready as he was? Often did he say how glad he would be to depart and "to be with Christ, which is far better." And often did he speak about Enoch, that holy man, whom God took to himself, and wish that like Enoch, he might walk with God, that God would take him too. Would you, then, my dear children, like to die as soon, and be with Christ, or to remain in this sad, sinful world? This good little boy, of whom I am going to tell you, thought it far better to be with his Saviour in heaven; and one day when he came home from school he told his mother how the teacher had been saying to the scholars how well he would like to see them all when they were grown up: "But, mother," said he, "I'll never be big; and I would'nt like to be big; I would far rather die and go to God."

John Ross was born in Glasgow on the 17th of February 1828. He seems to have been one of those whom the Holy Ghost sanctifies from the womb, for before he was two years old, he began to show how much he thought about God. One day, after family-worship at his grandfather's house, he got hold of the Psalm book, and, laying it upon his knees, began a sort of scream as if trying to imitate the singing in which the family had been engaged. When asked what he was doing, he answered in the imperfect way of a child so very young, "Me singing to God; high, high up there: holy, holy God." Another time, when about the same age, his mother was teaching him the words which say,

"God sees when children dwell in love,
And marks them for His own."

At hearing these words he stopped, and said: "Will God mark little children like me for His own?" His mother told him that God would do so. "Oh, happy, happy Johnny," he said, "if God would mark him for His own."

At another time, when he was a little older, he was out with his mother in the street, at a time when they were in great poverty. A gentleman, as they were passing, happening to let fall a half-penny, little Johnny looked eagerly at it, and the gentleman allowed him to pick it up and keep it. As soon as he had passed, Johnny said: "Mother, was you praying as we were walking along?" "What makes you ask that?" said his mother. "Because," said he, "that half-penny came from heaven. It was God that sent it. He saw it in the gentleman's pocket, and He said, 'That half-penny is for Johnny,' and so the gentleman could not lift it." Now, does not this show how little Johnny, although he was scarcely five years old at that time, had learned to put his trust in God as His heavenly Father, and to know that everything came from Him alone? Have you learned this?

As he grew older, this work of God's Spirit in his heart became more remarkable. In all that he spoke and did, he showed that, young as he was, he had become a new creature in Christ Jesus. He was not only free from the outward sins which are common amongst children, but he could not bear the idea of offending God. On one occasion he said: "It's just like to break my heart to see people sinning against God." On another, he came into the house much agitated, and evidently in great distress. His mother asked him if anyone had been hurting him. He answered: "Oh, mother, they'll let none of the Persons of the Godhead alone; as I came along the street just now, I heard a person swearing by the Holy Ghost." Though he was of a happy, cheerful, contented disposition, he would often seem sad for some time after hearing people swear on the street. On these occasions he would take his pencil and write: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty." If he found a piece of paper on the street with God's name upon it, he would lift it up and fold it carefully and bring it home. And often he would say, "How grieved am I to see His holy name despoiled!"

Oh, how sweet a thing were it for us to learn to make our burdens light, by framing our hearts to the burden, and making our Lord's will a law!—*Rutherford.*

Aidmheil A' Chreidimh.

CAIBIDEAL V.

Mu Fhreasdai Dé.

I. Tha Dia àrd Chruith-fhear nan uile nithe, a' cumail suas, a' suidheachadh, agus a' riaghladh, nan uile creutairean, ghnìomhara, agus nithe, o 'n mhòr gus a' bheag, le a fhreasdai ro ghlic, agus ro naomh, do réir a roimhe-lais neo-mhearachdaich, agus comhairle shaor agus neo-chaochlaideich a thoile féin, chum cliù glòir' a ghliocais, a chumhachd, a cheartais, a mhaitheis, agus a thròcair.

II. Ged tha na h-uile nithe, do thaobh roimhfhis agus òrduigh Dhé, an ceud aobhar, a' teachd gu crìch, gu neo-chaochlaideach, agus gu neo-mhearachdach; gidheadh, tha e leis an fhreasdai cheudna, a' tabhairt orra tachairt do réir nàduir nan dara h-aobhara, gu neo-sheachnach, gu saor, no gu tuairmseach.

III. Tha Dia 'n a fhreasdai gnàthaicht' a' déanamh feum do mheadhonaibh, gidheadh tha e saor gu oibreachadh as an eugmhais, os an ceann, agus 'n an aghaidh, mar is àill leis.

IV. Tha neart uile-chumhachdach, gliocas do-rannsaichte, agus maitheas neo-chrìochnach Dhé, 'g am foills-eachadh féin, co mòr 'n a fhreasdai, 's gu bheil iad a' ruigh-eachd gus a' cheud tuiteam, agus uile pheacaidhean eile nan Aingeal, agus nan daoine, agus sin cha 'n ann o lom cheadachadh, ach le ceadachadh aig am bheil cuimse ro ghlic agus ro chumhachdach maille ris, agus a ta air mhodh eile 'g an stiùradh, agus 'g an riaghladh, ann am frithealadh eug-samhuil, chum a chrìochaibh naomha féin; gidheadh 's ann air chor 's gu bheil peacaichead a' pheacaidh a' teachd o 'n chreutair a mhàin, agus cha 'n ann o Dhia; neach air dha bhi ro naomh, agus ro cheart, nach 'eil, agus nach feud a bhi 'n a ùghdair peacaidh, no 'n a neach ris an taitinn e.

V. Tha 'n Dia ro ghlic, ro cheart-bhreitheach, agus ro ghràs-mhor, gu minic a' fàgail a chloinne féin rè seal, gu h-iomadh buaireadh, agus truailidheachd an cridhe féin, chum an smachdachadh air son am peacaidhean a rinn iad roimhe, no chum neart foluichte na truailidheachd, agus mealltaireachd a' chridhe a nochadh dhoibh, chum gu 'm biodh iad air an irioslachadh; agus fòs gu 'n dùisgteadh suas iad gu greimeachadh ni's teinne agus ni's dlùithe ris féin, chum an cumail suas; agus chum an dèanamh ni 's furachaire an aghaidh gach uile chion-fàth

peacaidh 's an aimsir ri teachd, agus a chum iomadh crìoch eile a ta ceart agus naomh.

VI. Mu na daoineibh aingidh, neo-dhiadhaidh sin, a tha Dia mar Bhreitheamh ceart-bhreitheach a' dalladh, agus a' cruadhachadh air son peacaidhean a rinn iad roimhe, uatha-san tha e, cha 'n e mhàin a' cumail air ais a ghràis leis am feudadh iad bhi air an soillseachadh 'n an tuigse, agus air an taiseachadh 'n an cridhibh: ach air uairibh fòs, a' tarruing air ais nan tiodhlac bha aca, agus 'g am fàgail mu choinneamh nan cuspair sin d' an dèan an truailidheachd féin cion-fàth peacaidh, agus le so uile, tha e 'g an toirt thairis d' an ana-miannaibh féin, do bhuairidhibh an t-saoghail, agus do chumhachd Shatain: leis am bheil e tachairt, gu bheil iad 'g an cruadhachadh féin, seadh fuidh na meadhonaibh sin a ta Dia a' gnàthachadh chum daoin' eile a mhaothachadh.

VII. Mar a tha freasdal De gu coitchionn a' ruigh-eachd gus na h-uile chreutairean, is amhluidh a ta e air mhodh ni 's sònruichte a' gabhail cùraim d' a Eaglais, agus a' suidheachadh nan uile nithe chum a maith.

CAIBIDEAL VI.

Mu thuiteam an duine, mu pheacadh, agus mu pheanas air a shon.

I. Air do ar ceud sinnsear a bhi air am mealladh le ais-innleachd, agus buaireadh Shatain, pheacaich iad, leis a' mheas thoirmisgte itheadh. Chunnaic Dia iomchuidh, do réir a cìomhairle ghlic agus naoimh, am peacadh-san fhulang, air do rùn a bhi aige an ni so òrduchachadh chum a ghlòire féin.

II. Leis a' pheacadh so, thuit iad o 'n ceud fhìreantachd, agus o 'n co-chomunn ri Dia, agus mar sin dh'fhas iad marbh ann am peacadh, agus truailidh gu h-iomlan, ann an uile bhuaidhaibh an anama, agus ann an uile bhuill an cuirp.

III. Do bhrìgh gu 'm b' iadsan Freumh a' chinne-dhaoine uile, bha ciont a' pheacaidh so air a mheas, agus am bàs ceudna 's a' pheacadh agus anns an nàdur thruailidh, air iomchar a dh'ionnsuidh an sliochd uile a ta teachd uatha tre ghinealaich ghnàthaichte.

IV. O 'n truailidheachd cheudna so, leis am bheil sinn gu tur air ar cur o ghleus a chum aon ni maith, air ar dèanamh neo-chomasach maith air bith a choimhlionadh, agus air ar suidheachadh 'n a aghaidh, air ar n-aomadh gu h-iomlan chum an uile, tha na h-uile peacadh gnìomha a' teachd.

V. Fad na beatha so, tha truailidheachd so an nàduir a' fantuinn 's a' mhuinntir a tha air an ath ghineamhuinn; agus ged tha i air a maitheadh, agus air a claidh trid Chrìosd, gidheadh is fìor-pheacadh do rìreadh i féin, agus a h-uile ghluasachd.

VI. Air do gach aon gin agus gnìomha araon, bhi 'n a bhriseadh air lagh ceart Dhé, agus 'n a aghaidh, tha e 'n a nàdur féin, a' tarruing cionta air a' pheacach, leis am bheil e air a cheangal thairis a chum feirge Dhé, agus a chum mallachd an lagha; agus mar sin tha e buailteach do 'n bhàs, agus do gach uile thruaighe spioradail, aimsireil, agus shìorruidh.

CAIBIDEAL VII.

Mu cho-cheangal Dé ris an duine.

I. Tha an t-eadar-dhealachadh eadar Dia agus an creutair co mòr 's ged dhlighear o chreutairibh reusonta ùmhlachd dha-san mar an Cruith-fhear, gidheadh cha 'n fheud iad am feasd a mhealtuinn air chor air bith mar an sonas agus an duais, ach trid aontachadh saor-thoileach air taobh Dhé, ni a chunnacas iomchuidh leis a chur an céill air-modh co-cheangail.

II. An ceud co-cheangal a rinneadh ris an duine, bu cho-cheangal oibre e, anns an robh beatha air a gealltuinn do Adhamh, agus ann-san d' a shliochd, air chumha ùmhlachd iomlan Adhaimh féin.

III. Air do 'n duine trid a thuiteam, e féin fhàgail neo-chomasach ruigheachd air beatha trid a cho-cheangail ud, thoilich an Tighearna co-cheangal eile dhéanamh, d' an goirear gu coitchionn, co-cheangal nan gràs: anns a bheil e a' tairgsinn gu saor do pheacachaibh, beatha agus slàinte trid Iosa Crìosd, ag iarraidh orra creidimh ann-san, chum gu 'm biodh iad air an téarnadh; agus a' gealltuinn an Spioraid Naoimh a thabhairt do na h-uile a tha air an òrduchadh chum beatha, g' an déanadh déonach agus comasach chum creidsinn.

IV. Bheirear 's an Sgrìobtur gu tric, Tiomnadh, mar ainm do cho-cheangal so nan gràs, do thaobh bàis Iosa Crìosd an Fhir-thiomnaidh, agus do thaobh na h-oighreachd shìorruidh, maille ris na h-uile nithibh a bhuineas dhi sin, a ta air am fàgail mar dhilib ann.

V. Bha an co-cheangal so air a fhrithealadh air dhòigh eile ri linn an lagha 's a tha e nis, ri linn an t-soisgeil: fuadh 'n lagh, bha e air a fhrithealadh le geallannaibh, fàidhead-airreachd, lobairtibh, timchioll-ghearradh, an t-uan-càisg, agus samhluidhibh, agus òrduighibh eile, a thugadh do

shluagh nan Iùdbach, agus gach ni dhiubh sin uile a' ciallachadh roimh làimh Chrìosd ri teachd; agus bha na nithe so 's an àm ud, dìongmhalta agus éifeachdach, trid oibreachadh an Spioraid, a chum teagaisg agus togail suas nan daoine taghta, ann an creidimh air a' Mhesiah a chaidh a ghealltuinn, trid an robh aca làn mhaitheanas peacaidh, agus slàinte shìorruidh; agus goirear de 'n fhrithealadh sin, an Seann Tiomnadh.

VI. Fuidh 'n t-Soisgeul, 'n uair a thaisbeanadh Crìosd, brìgh nan nithe ud, 's iad na h-òrduighean anns am bheil an co-cheangal so air a fhrithealadh—Searmonachadh an fhocail, agus frithealadh Shacramaintean a' bhaistidh agus suipeir an Tighearna; agus ged tha iad so ni 's teirce ann an àireamh, agus air am frithealadh le ni 's mò do shimplidheachd, agus le ni 's lugha do ghlòir o 'n leth muigh; gidheadh tha an co-cheangal so air a thaisbeanadh anns na meadhonaibh so le barrachd iomlanachd, soilleireachd, agus éifeachd, do na h-uile fhineachaibh, Iùdhaichibh agus cinnich araon; agus goirear dheth an 'Tiomnadh Nuadh. Cha 'n 'eil ann, uime sin, dà cho-cheangal gràis eadar-dhealaichte do thaobh brìgh, ach an t-aon co-cheangal ceudna, fuidh atharrachadh frithealaidh.

The Letter Killeth, but the Spirit Giveth Life.

THE words, "The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life," are held to involve a contrast between the "letter" of the law and the "spirit" of the law; they are held to mean that literalism is deadly, while attention to great principles keeps a man intellectually and spiritually alive.

Thus has one of the greatest utterances in the New Testament been reduced to comparative triviality—a triviality with a kernel of truth in it, to be sure, but triviality all the same. The triviality, indeed, is merely relative; no doubt it is important to observe that attention to the general sense of a book or a law is far better than such a reading of details as that the context in which the details are found is ignored. But all that is quite foreign to the meaning of the Apostle in this passage, and is, though quite true and important in its place, trivial in comparison with the tremendous thing Paul is here endeavouring to say.

What Paul is really doing here is not contrasting the "letter" of the law with the "spirit" of the law,

but contrasting "the law of God" with "the Spirit of God." When he says, "The letter killeth," he is making no contemptuous reference to a pedantic literalism which shrivels the soul; but he is setting forth the terrible majesty of God's law. The letter, the "thing written," in the law of God, says Paul, pronounces a dread sentence of death upon the transgressor; but the Holy Spirit of God, as distinguished from the law, gives life.

The law of God, Paul means, is, as law, external. It is God's holy will to which we must conform, but it contains in itself no promise of its fulfilment. It is one thing to have it obeyed. In fact, because of the sinfulness of our hearts, because of the power of the flesh, the recognition of God's law only makes sin take on the definite form of transgression; it only makes sin more exceeding sinful. The law of God was written on tables of stone or on the rolls of the Old Testament books, but it was quite a different thing to get it written in the hearts and lives of the people. So it is to-day. The text is of very wide application. The law of God, however it comes to us, is "letter"; it is a "thing written," external to the hearts and lives of men. It is written in the Old Testament; it is written in the Sermon on the Mount; it is written in Jesus' stupendous command of love for God and one's neighbour; it is written in whatever way we become conscious of the commands of God. Let no one say that such an extension of the text involves that very anti-historical modernizing which we have just denounced; on the contrary, it is amply justified by Paul himself. "When the Gentiles," Paul says, "which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves." The Old Testament law is just as clear, authentic presentation of a law of God under which all men stand.

And that law, according to Paul, issues a dreadful sentence of eternal death. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die"; not the hearer of the law is justified but the doer of it. And, alas! none are doers; all have sinned. The law of God is holy and just and good; it is inexorable; and we have fallen under its just condemnation.

That is at bottom what Paul means by the words, "The letter killeth." He does not mean that attention to pedantic details shrivels and deadens the soul. No doubt that is true, at least within certain limits; it is

a useful thought. But it is trivial indeed compared with what Paul means. Something far more majestic, far more terrible, is meant by the Pauline phrase. The "letter" that the Apostle means is the same as the curse of God's law that he speaks of in Galatians; it is the dreadful handwriting of ordinances that was against us; and the death with which it kills is the eternal death of those who are for ever separated from God.

But that is not all of the text. "The letter killeth," Paul says, "but the Spirit giveth life." There is no doubt about what he means by "the Spirit." He does not mean the "spirit of the law," as contrasted with the "letter"; he certainly does not mean the lax interpretation of God's commands which is dictated by human lust or pride; he certainly does not mean the spirit of man. No real student of Paul, whatever be his own religious views, can doubt, I think, but that the Apostle means the Spirit of God. God's law brings death because of sin, but God's Spirit applying to the soul the redemption offered by Christ, brings life. The thing that is written killeth; but the Holy Spirit, in the new birth, or, as Paul says, the new creation, giveth life.

The contrast runs all through the New Testament. Hopelessness under the law is described, for example, in the seventh chapter of Romans: "Oh wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death"?

But this hopelessness is transcended by the Gospel. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." The law's just sentence of condemnation was borne for us by Christ who suffered in our stead; the handwriting of ordinances which was against us—the dreadful "letter"—was nailed to the cross, and we have a fresh start in the full favour of God. And in addition to this new and right relation to God, the Spirit of God also gives the sinner a new birth and makes him a new creature. The New Testament from beginning to end deals gloriously with this work of grace. The giving of life of which Paul speaks in this text is the new birth, the new creation; it is Christ who liveth in us. Here is the fulfilment of the great prophecy of Jeremiah: "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts." The law is no longer for the Christian a command which it is for him by his own strength to obey, but its requirements are fulfilled

through the mighty power of the Holy Spirit. That is the glorious freedom of the Gospel. The Gospel does not abrogate God's law, but it makes men love it with all their heart.

How is it with us? The law of God stands over us; we have offended against it in thought, word, and deed; its majestic "letter" pronounces a sentence of death against our sin. Shall we obtain a specious security by ignoring God's law, and by taking refuge in an easier law of our own devising? Or shall the Lord Jesus, as He is offered to us in the Gospel, wipe out the sentence of condemnation that was against us, and shall the Holy Spirit write God's law in our heart, and make us doers of the law and not hearers only? So, and only so, will the great text be applied to us—"The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life."—(Prof. Machen's "What is Faith?" p. 192).

The Love of God.

"I used to think," said David Steven, Bower, "that the love of God was procured by the work of Christ, but, oh! but the view I got that day [as he listened to a sermon by Rev. Alexander Gunn, Watten, on John iii. 16] of the love of the Father from eternity, and that it was because of that love that the Saviour was sent into the world. My heart was filled and melted with a sense of God's love to lost and guilty sinners in giving His only begotten Son for their salvation. How I longed, when the congregation broke up, to get home that I might find a secret place in which to give vent to my feelings; and when I did reach my own dwelling, I could not well contain, but felt as if my bodily frame could not hold such measure as I had received, and went stumbling over what lay in my way into the barn, and there poured out my heart in adoration of the Lord's love and mercy, and I had there a sweet word of promise given me—"Behold I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it" (Rev. iii. 8). Many a miserable and perplexing time has gone over my head since then, but that was a time I can never forget."

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

Short Exposition

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

“AND Samuel grew and the Lord was with him and did let none of his words fall to the ground. And all Israel from Dan to Beersheba knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord. And the Lord appeared again in Shiloh. For the Lord revealed Himself to Samuel in Shiloh by the word of the Lord. And the word of Samuel came to all Israel” (I. Sam. iii. 19). It was by the word of the Lord that the Lord revealed Himself to Samuel; that is, the Lord spoke to him, and told him what He was going to do. The Lord spoke, and the Lord did as He said He would do, and Samuel heard and told what the Lord told him. He was but a child, and he had nothing to do but what a child could do. He heard and told what was spoken to him simply and faithfully. He did not modify or change or add or take from or keep back aught of all that the Lord made known. This is very different from prophesying out of one’s own heart and by one’s own judgment and giving one’s own opinions. These would be of no value. They would, indeed, infallibly lead astray. Samuel had the word of the Lord and declared it, and the Lord let none of His words fall to the ground.

Notes and Comments.

The Chicago Eucharistic Congress.—In continuation of our note in last issue, we are now in a position to give an account of the views expressed by some of the leading American papers—secular and religious—from summaries in an article in the “Literary Digest” (New York). As was to be expected, the Roman Catholic papers ransacked the dictionary for superlatives in their descriptions. The Eucharistic Congress was a red-letter day to the American Roman Catholic community. A Roman Catholic correspondent said that “Christ has come to Chicago, and Chicago has used every force at its command to receive Him with fitting dignity.” Another wrote:—“He came in triumph as Eucharistic King.” If Christ actually came to Chicago He would not have received the welcome accorded to the so-called princes of the Church of Rome, and her gorgeously be-

robed prelates and dignitaries. But it is more particularly the Protestant denominational press that is to be criticised for its fulsome and laudatory articles on the Eucharistic Congress. From reading some of these one would think that the Eucharistic Congress brought a great religious revival to America. False charity is one of the gods of a certain type of American religious life. It is gratifying to note that quite a number of religious journals of the robust type wrote strongly against the Christ-dishonouring exhibition at Chicago. As for the secular press, American journalists must write something—the more sensational it is the better—and as for accuracy and accordance with the eternal principles of truth, that is only a very secondary question with too many American journalists. Rome played her part well. She staged a magnificent show, and captured the imaginations, if not the allegiance, of many unstable Protestants.

The Papacy and the United States.—"We are apt," says the "National Review," "to forget the power of the Papacy in the United States, which it is important for us to bear in mind, as it helps to explain not a little that is obscure in Anglo-American relations on which this factor exercises no small influence. Doubtless in accordance with the amiable, though mischievous, habit of misleading public opinion in this country concerning American actualities, there has so far been little reference to the International Eucharistic Congress held in Chicago late in June. It was an imposing affair of peculiar interest to us owing to the predominance of Irish Papists in the propaganda of the Roman Church across the Atlantic, and the political frenzy of the Hearst press, whose Anglophobe proprietor, Mr William Randolph Hearst, is, we believe, a rabid Papist, though this, like most material facts, is never mentioned by our Anglo-Americanising journals. Cardinal Bonzano, as Papal Legate, crossed the Atlantic to attend this function. According to the New York correspondent of the 'Daily Telegraph'—who was almost alone among his confreres in notifying the event—no less than 15 cardinals, 500 bishops, 3000 priests, and 10,000 nuns have foregathered in celebration of 'the greatest religious congress ever assembled in the United States.' According to the latest census returns, there are nearly 19,000,000 Roman Catholics resident in U.S.A., and the estimates of the total attendance at the Chicago congress vary between 750,000 and 1,000,000. In New York and Brooklyn alone, the

Roman Catholics number over 2,000,000. The Papal Legate, Cardinal Bonzano, who had spent ten years in Washington as Nuncio, is "persona grata" in America. He was greeted with much pomp and ceremony on landing in New York, which boasts a Roman Catholic mayor, and forms part of a State with a Roman Catholic Governor, while its traffic is regulated, as the 'Daily Telegraph' correspondent reminds us, by Roman Catholic policemen of Irish extraction—who, we may say, in passing, are never so happy as when breaking Anglo-Saxon heads. The city demagogues are of the same persuasion. Altogether, it was a red-letter day in the history of the Papacy, with many more triumphs to follow in Chicago, though Roman Catholics will not be happy until they have placed one of their number in the presidency of the United States. Will it be Mr William Randolph Hearst?"

Czecho-Slovakia and the Papacy.—"In a recent issue," says "the English Churchman," "we drew attention to the enthusiastic manner in which the anniversary of John Hus [born, 6th July 1369; burned, 6th July 1415] was celebrated by the Czecho-Slovaks. President, Ministers of State and the people all joined in paying fervent tribute to the memory of their great Reformer. Now we hear that, as a result, a complete breach has taken place between the Vatican and Prague, and that the Pope will no more be represented by a nuncio at the Czecho-Slovak Court. Previously to the celebrations rumour had it that the diplomatic relations had only been suspended, and that they would in all probability be soon renewed. But now it is announced that they have been finally severed. Thus Rome has displayed its unchanging character, proving itself to be on the side of intolerance still. This is doubtless not surprising, but the action of the Italian dictator is rather remarkable and significant. It appears that he forbade the Italian Minister at Prague and the personnel of the Italian missions and institutions there to join in celebrating the martyr's undying fame. We are told also that he took this course in order to emphasise the growth of political alliance and co-operation between the Pope and himself."

Moslem Missionaries.—From an article which appeared some time ago in "The Moslem World," it appears that there is considerable missionary activity among a certain sect of the Moslems. The Ahmadiya movement—so called from its founder, Mirza Ghulam Ahmed, who claimed to be Christ—is actively mission-

ary, and has spread to Europe. In Woking, England, a mosque has been built, and a certain measure of success has been attained, converts having been made among the titled classes. In Berlin there are two mosques, and another in Paris. But it is specially in America that the activity is greatest. New York City is a centre of this activity. In Yonkers, New York, there are 900 Moslems, some of these are converts and whites. St Louis, Los Angeles, Chicago, and other American cities are centres of this missionary Moslem zeal. Bahaism, an offshoot of Persian Islamism, is represented by some few thousands of adherents, all American converts. Efforts to spread Bahaism in Great Britain were made a number of years ago, but with what success we cannot say. However, one thing is evident, both the Beast and the False Prophet are active, and it becomes the followers of the Lord Jesus that they, too, would have their loins girt and their lamps burning.

Church Notes.

Communions.—September—First Sabbath, Ness and Ullapool; second, Tolsta and Strathy; third, Vatten, Stoer, and Tarbert (Harris). October—Second Sabbath, Gairloch; third, Scourie; fourth, Lochinver; fifth, Wick. South African Mission.—The following are the dates of the Communions:—Last Sabbath of March, June, September, and December. Note.—Notice of any additions to, or alterations of, the above list should be sent to the Editor.

Winnipeg.—The new church in McGee Street (off Ellis Avenue) was opened by the Rev. William Matheson, Chesley, on 4th June. The building is seated to hold from 150 to 160 with comfort. A beautiful oak pulpit stand, with three chairs to match, with a handsome money contribution to the building fund, was given by Ontario friends. Our congregation in Winnipeg have had their own troubles, but we sincerely trust that these have not been without fruit, and it is gratifying to all the friends of our cause in Canada to know that our people have now a place of worship of their own. There is a considerable debt still on the building, but our Winnipeg congregation are facing the burdens with willing hearts, and we trust that friends of

the cause, both in the States and Canada, and also at home, will not forget our young fellow-countrymen and women in giving a helping hand to speedily clear off the debt on the building. Our prayer is that it may be a house where the pure gospel will be preached and owned of the Lord, and that it may be the birth-place of souls. As Mr D. J. Matheson is coming home in October, the Canadian Mission Committee have arranged that Mr James Tallach, on being ordained, will take his place.

Student Licensed.—At a meeting of the Northern Presbytery, held at Bonar-Bridge, on Wednesday, 11th August, Mr Finlay Macleod, divinity student, was licensed to preach the Gospel.

Acknowledgment of Donations.

John Grant, Palmerston Villa, Millburn Road, Inverness, General Treasurer, acknowledges, with thanks, the following donations:—

SUSTENTATION FUND.—Friend, Plockton, per Rev. N. Cameron, £1; Mrs Macphail, Sandbank, per H. S. Macgillivray, Dunoon, 6s 8d; Miss E. Macbean, Newtonmore, £1; A. McL., Tomich, Strathglass, 2s 6d; Mrs H. Mackenzie, Foremost, Alberta, 12s 5d.

AGED AND INFIRM MINISTERS' AND WIDOWS' FUND.—Miss Kerr, Pitlochrie, 4s.

COLLEGE FUND.—Miss Kerr, Pitlochrie, 5s.

JEWISH AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.—A Friend, Gairloch, per Rev. N. Cameron, £1; a Friend, Broadford, per do., £1; a Friend, o/a Rev. J. Tallach & Car Fund, per do., £1; F.P. Friend, Muir of Ord, o/a do., per K. Matheson, Dingwall, £1.

The following lists have been sent in for publication:—

CLYDEBANK CHURCH DEBT.—Mr James Nicolson acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the following donations:—Friend, Edinburgh, 10s; M. Macleod, Kilwinning, 10s.

EDINBURGH CHURCH PURCHASE FUND.—Rev. N. Macintyre acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the following donations:—A Friend, Dingwall, £10; A. Mackenzie, Ullapool, £3; Mrs Mackenzie, Scorraig, 6s. Mr A. Maclean, 16 Marchmont Crescent, Edinburgh, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the following:—A Friend, Stornoway, 10s, per Jas. Mackay; W. B. K., Haddington, 15s, per General Treasurer.

GREENOCH CHURCH PURCHASE FUND.—Rev. N. Cameron gratefully acknowledges the following donations:—Rod. Macfarlane, £1; Friend, Plockton, 7s; Friend, Strathpeffer, £2; Friend, Poolewe, £1; J. I. M., 5s; Friend, Broadford, £1; A. M., Braes, 5s; D. F., Braes, 5s; J. N., Braes, 2s.

HALKIRK CHURCH AND MANSE ALTERATIONS FUND.—The Rev. William Grant acknowledges, with sincere thanks, £20 from "Friend," Halkirk; A. E. M. (in remembrance of Ps. lxxvii. 5), £1; W. B. K., Haddington, 15s.

TALLISKER CHURCH BUILDING FUND.—Mr John Macintyre, Carbstmore, Portree, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the following:—Per F. Morrison, missionary, Flashadder—C. C., £4 2s. Per Miss K. Nicolson, Schoolhouse, Glens—C. C., £1. Per D. Morrison, Portnalong—A. Fraser, Ballachulish, C. C., £4 2s 6d. D. J. Matheson, Winnipeg, \$2 44/100 cents; D. Matheson, missionary, Vancouver, \$5. A Friend, Gairloch, per Miss K. Maclean, Muir of Ord, 6s. Donations in June issue, per D. J. Macleod, Portnalong, should read £2 instead of £5.

The Magazine.

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED FOR MAGAZINE—4s SUBSCRIPTIONS.—

Mrs Gollan, Slumbeg, Lochcarron; Don. Gillies, jun., Callakillie, Shieldaig; Don. Matheson, Rearquhar, Dornoch; Mrs George Matheson, Glackin, Clashnessie; John McCuish, baker, Leverburgh; John McCuish, Malaglate; Mrs A. Macleod, 2 Braes, Inverisdale; Angus Macleod, Strond; Mrs M. Macfarlane, Woodlands, Onich; Finlay Mackay, 17 Skigersta, Ness; Angus MacLennan, 6 Cheesebay, N. Uist; Kenneth Maciver, 18 Breasclete; Donald Mackay, 60 W. 66th Street, New York; D. J. Mackenzie, Scholhouse, Ardgay; Mrs Maclean, 10 Mellon Charles, Aultbea; Mrs J. Mackenzie, Brae House, Ullapool; Duncan Macleod, Skegra, Kinlochbervie; Mrs Mackinlay, 27 High Street, Lochwinnoch; Mrs H. Mackenzie, Foremost, Alberta; Mrs MacLennan, Girtan, Bridge of Orchy; Donald Leslie, Badminish, Skelbo; Mrs Oman, Evelix, Dornoch; Mrs V. Ross, 6 Fasack, Glendale.

4s 1d SUBSCRIPTIONS.—Mrs Andrew Clark, Parkhill, Ontario; Mrs Geo. Clark, Alisa Craig, do.; Mrs Jas. Craig, 234 Alfred Street, Detroit; William Elliot, Chesley; Mrs Colin Gillies, Arkona, Ontario; Miss Joan Macdonald, Alisa Craig, Ontario; M. Macdonald, 115 East Lynn Ave., Toronto; J. F. Mackay, Box 31, Bucks Falls, Ontario; S. Macpherson, 8928 Commercial Ave., So. Chicago; D. M. Ross, R.R. 7, Parkhill, Ontario; Mrs John Siddall, Ilderton No. 2, do.; Mrs C. W. Stewart, 100 Millwood Road, Toronto; Mrs P. Stewart, 14 Gerrard Street, London, Ontario; Alex. Sutherland, 23 Mount Noel Ave., Toronto; Hugh Scott, R.R. 1, Denfield, Ontario; Math. Schilz, 225 Simcoe, do.; Mrs Ed. H. Wheal, Dauphin, Manitoba; Mrs C. Urquhart, 19 Belmont Street, Toronto; Colin Mackenzie, Suffield, Alberta, Canada.

5s SUBSCRIPTION.—Miss A. Burns, 78 Main Street, Callander; Mrs Brown, 62 Portland Place, Hamilton; Hugh Brown, Craw, Arran; Miss E. Macbean, Clune House, Newtonmore; R. Macbean, Matubatuba P.O., Zululand, Natal; Mrs Cath. Mackenzie, Fernabeg, Shieldaig; Miss Sutherland, Tannachy, Rogart; Kenneth Fraser, Royal Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh; Mrs MacLennan, 23 Gress, Stornoway.

OTHER SUBSCRIPTIONS.—Mrs William Finlayson, 241 Delaware Ave., Toronto, 8s 2d; Mrs Janet Frame, 1646 Pacific Ave., Winnipeg, 8s 2d; Miss May Mackay, 80 Earl Gray Road, Toronto, 8s 2d; Miss A. MacLachlan, Laurel Bank, Grafton, N.S.W., £1; D. H. F. Macpherson, 520 So. Serrano Ave., Los Angeles, 3s; Miss Annie Macquarrie, P.O., Scarinish, 12s; Alex. Macleod, Duart Nedd, Drumbeg, 10s; Mrs Macphail, Glenlean, Sandbank, 3s 4d; John Mackenzie, Saltburn, Invergordon, 4s 6d; John Macsween, Connel Ferry, Argyll, 5s 6d; Miss Mary Macvean, Box 283, Kincardine, Ontario, 12s 4d; Hugh Ross, 8 Back Street, Hilton, Fearn, 8s.

FREE DISTRIBUTION.—Mrs Campbell, Glasgow, per A. Matheson, 39 Old Dumbarton Road, 5s; Mrs James Craig, 234 Alfred Street, Detroit, 15s 11d; Miss May Mackay, 80 Earl Gray Road Toronto, 8s 3d; Miss E. Macbean, Clune House, Newtonmore, 5s; D. J. Mackenzie, Schoolhouse, Ardgay, 4s; Mrs Colin Gillies, Arkona, Ontario, 4s 1d; Mrs C. Urquhart, 19 Belmont Street, Toronto, 1s 0s 7d.