

The Free Presbyterian Magazine

Vol 110

May 2005

No 5

Given to Be a King

How thankful godly people in Israel would have been when they heard that David had been anointed King over the country! Knowing how unsatisfactorily King Saul had turned out, they would have seen David as a gift from heaven. They could look forward to having a man on the throne of Israel who would rule in the fear of God. And at the end of his days David referred to the importance of a ruler having a right spirit; he said, “He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God”. David was subject to human frailty but, by and large, he ruled the people of God in a right spirit. He administered the affairs of the nation with a view to God’s glory and the good of his subjects, and he protected them from their enemies.

David, of course, is to be seen as a type of a greater King, One who has indeed been given to rule over the people of God and to protect them from their enemies. His people may truly say of Him, as Isaiah prophesied: “Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder”. In the fullness of time He was born and, ever since, in greater or smaller numbers, He has been rescuing sinners from Satan’s kingdom and making them willing to gather under His standard.

These individuals have been brought to recognise the seriousness of their position – the awfulness of existing far off from God. That position is the result of what happened in the Garden of Eden, when Adam – the representative of all mankind – cast off God’s authority. Ever since, each individual has begun life in a state of rebellion against God, yielding allegiance instead to the prince of the power of the air. Before the Fall, Adam and Eve recognised the good rule they were under, but they lost sight of the goodness of that rule. And, unless the eyes of his soul are opened, at regeneration, no sinner has ever recognised that it is good to be under the rule of God. That rule is universally rejected, and always will be, apart from a willingness to gather under Christ’s standard – a willingness which no one has by nature but is brought about by the Holy Spirit in a day of God’s power.

God in His kindness has provided a Mediator; otherwise there could be no possibility of any sinner ever approaching God. And it has pleased God

to exercise His rule through this Mediator, the God-man Christ Jesus. No other king could possibly subdue the rebellion of fallen man, and no other king could have sufficient strength to rescue anyone from the clutches of “the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience”. Satan’s power should never be underestimated; over the generations he has been successful in keeping multitudes from embracing the gospel and bringing them down to a lost eternity. But King Jesus has displayed His power by bringing some unlikely individuals to submit to Him. There was the thief on the cross, within hours of a lost eternity, after a lifetime of sin which had been climaxed by some particular act of wickedness that brought on him the death sentence. Yet, in spite of the awfulness of His own sufferings, the Saviour – acting as king – subdued the thief’s rebellion and, working by the Holy Spirit, brought him to plead, “Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom”. The thief was submitting to the One whom he recognised as God’s gift to a lost world, One who had the authority to care for him and bring him safely into the kingdom of heaven.

Or consider Saul of Tarsus. In many ways he was a remarkable young man. By his own later testimony, he was, “touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless” – so careful was he to keep the commandments in an outward way. Yet he was proud of his activity in opposition to the divinely-appointed King of the Church. It was to become a matter of extreme sorrow that he “persecuted the church of God, and wasted it”, and especially that he did so “beyond measure”. However strong Saul’s opposition to this King had been, he submitted to Him as soon as the Holy Spirit began to work in his heart. On his way to Damascus to harry the Christians there, Saul was made willing to ask, “What wilt Thou have me to do?” He saw the glory of this God-given King, and he yielded himself to His authority.

From then on, Saul committed himself to King Jesus, who had loved him and given Himself for him. Saul well knew that he was completely unable to keep his soul, to go in the right direction, or to protect himself from the devil or any other spiritual adversary. But under the rule of Christ, Saul knew that he was safe; he knew that he would be brought safely along the way that leads to everlasting life, and that ultimately, “at that day” of judgement, his King would call him to eternal blessedness in heaven. “I know whom I have believed,” he wrote when death was looming ever nearer, “and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him” (2 Tim 1:12). Saul had, by divine grace, committed his soul into the care of the King given by God to rule over rebellious sinners like himself. And that King never failed him, in spite of all the difficulties he had to experience. Others among Christ’s subjects may have less assurance of the safety of their souls, but none of

them can have the least doubt that the King of kings is able to keep every soul committed to Him in a living faith.

Saul submitted to King Jesus, but it would seem that the rest of the party travelling with him to Damascus did not submit. Thus far in the history of the world, comparatively few have acknowledged the authority of this King. It was so when the King appeared in the world – not, of course, displaying the majesty which is His as the Son of God, but going about as the One who had “not where to lay His head”. “He came unto His own”, to those who professed to be looking for the Messiah, but “His own received Him not”. They would not submit to His authority; they would not recognise it. They refused to recognise that God had sent Him to be the Saviour and, in particular, to be a King. In the end they put Him to death – the ultimate step in rejection. And today He is rejected by “His own”, those who accept the truths of Christianity, who attend public worship, who may have been baptized, who may – outwardly – live almost indistinguishably from His true subjects. But such rebellion cannot go on indefinitely. Let these rebels, before it is too late, heed the call: “Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little” (Ps 2:12).

If David ruled his kingdom with a view to the well-being of his people, how much more is this true of the One of whom he was such a notable type. What a care Christ has for His subjects! He is joined to them in a union that can never be broken. Yes, there is still sin in them, but measures have been put in place in His kingdom which will ensure that, when they appear on the last day on the right side of their King, they will be without “spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing”; they will be perfectly “holy and without blemish”. And all His dealings with them in this world have that great end in view. As God’s appointed King, He has all power and all authority in this world, and He exercises that power and authority in order that all things will work together for good to His subjects. At the same time, He restrains Satan, their arch-enemy, and all who would do them spiritual damage.

At last He will be seen to be the conqueror, for “He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet”. Then, in the blessedness of the heaven He has purchased for them, they will look back and see that “in all these things” – whether tribulation or distress or even persecution – they were indeed “more than conquerors through Him that loved” them. He loved them so much that not only did He come into this world to die for them, but He rescued them from their rebellion when they were willingly subject to Satan. And their King cared for them throughout their journey to glory, although their obedience was so imperfect. How altogether gracious was God’s gift of a King to sinners in this fallen world!

The Love of God¹

A Sermon by Rev D A Macfarlane

John 3:16. *For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*

We may deal first of all with the case of Nicodemus and use him as a kind of springboard – an introduction to dealing with the general and special love of God – that is, the general benevolence of God as distinct from His love of complacency.

What degree of understanding was given to Nicodemus when he was drawn by the Father to come to Christ, it is perhaps not for us to say. Perhaps he did at this time get the sanctifying liberty of the children of the covenant. One thing is clear when we consider his case from the point of view of chapter 19, where we have the record of Christ's death: His divine self-sacrifice, when He dismissed His Spirit, committing His rational spirit into the hands of the Father, having finished – from the point of view of His positive sufferings – the work given Him to do. By the time that Christ thus laid down His life, Nicodemus must have had a great deal of spiritual, enriching insight into the holy truths which the Saviour had brought before him. These truths were like the leaven in the three measures of meal, or again, like the mustard seed. He was well rooted and grounded in these truths. When he came with the hundred pounds of aloes, he was a tree planted in God's holy place by His almighty grace.

By this time it had been given to him to follow hard after Christ, and he had good understanding. He knew a good deal of what it was to be born of water and of the Spirit – to have the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, if we may borrow the language of Paul to Titus. This is God's miraculous dealing, whereby the soul is begotten again to a lively hope in virtue of Christ's resurrection from the dead, the Spirit washing him from his guilt and uniting him vitally to the Saviour. I do not say that he knew a great deal of the priesthood of Christ, to which the Redeemer was perhaps referring in verse 13: "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven". But the disciples did not know much themselves, though they were in the Redeemer. When the Holy Spirit came officially, then they got an abundant entrance into the way of salvation. But still, Nicodemus had the good of it even then.

When he came with myrrh and aloes, he certainly was getting a view of the Redeemer's glory, and he was a living member of Christ's mystical body.

¹Notes of an address given at a Harvest Thanksgiving service on 5 November 1971 by the then minister of the Dingwall congregation.

It was as if the Redeemer spoke to him in a still, small voice: "Nicodemus, thou didst come to me by night, and thou knowest savingly those things I spoke of. Thou hast now a new disposition, a new relish, a new taste, and thou hast passed from death to life. Now, come forward. Supposing thy father and thy mother are alive and thou hast lands and houses, then thou wilt come and openly forsake all these things, and thine own life also; not furtively, as thou didst once come by night." Now after the evening sacrifice, when the covenant was sealed with Immanuel's own blood, Nicodemus heard a secret voice, saying, "This is the way, walk ye in it". And he came forward, though they would strike him down for doing so. He was aglow with grace. The fire did burn, and these words he did let pass: "I have here a hundred pounds of ointment; I'll give it, and Joseph and I will roll up the body in it". And if you said, "That's a great amount to give", he would have said, "Be quiet; He is lovely. He is holily lovely. He cared for me, and I'm sorry I didn't come sooner."

Now that brings to my mind what was said about Rev Lachlan Mackenzie, Lochcarron. He came on a communion occasion into a church. I rather think that some of the brethren noticed that a man there fell asleep for a little. As far as I remember the matter, he was asked to get up and speak after a little. He got up and said that he had this to say of Christ, "Thou art the beloved of the Father, and Thou art the beloved of the Holy Ghost, and Thou art the beloved of the angels in glory, and Thou art the beloved of the Church in the world, and Thou art *my* beloved. And many a night I was kept awake with Thy love, and last night was one of them." And if you see old people nodding a little, and a little heavy, do not be too hard on them or cherish any hard thoughts. They may have been awake during the night, perhaps rising at midnight to pray to the Lord, for all you know, to pray for you and for the ends of the earth. When they get old and frail and weak, the brain is not so active. Look another way and do not find fault.

If Nicodemus lived on, as one may assume he did, he would of course likely have heard many precious sermons from the Saviour's holy lips. After His death, he would have kept close to Joseph and to the disciples in the upper room. We mention this to show the difference between those loved in a special way and those loved in a general way. Jacob is another example of one loved in a special way. He acknowledged, "I am not worthy of the least of all the mercies, and of all the truth, which Thou hast shown unto Thy servant". (What a suitable text indeed that would have been for such a day as this, if it happened to come specially before one's mind!) What a difference between those specially loved and those left to themselves, who desire to be left to themselves. Those loved especially were loved in Christ, who was

elected to be a Mediator – a Prophet, Priest and King. They enjoy the love of the Father, the love of the Son and the love of the Holy Ghost. God’s love of complacency is as streams from Lebanon. Don’t make excuses: “We’re not elected”. That badness is in myself and in my fellow-creatures. The point is that Christ is offering Himself. We ought to believe. He cannot lie, and we are adding to our sins by not believing.

Now we may give a few examples of those who only experienced the general benevolence of God. And you can get many examples. Cain, though he did what he did, we read that the Lord set a mark on him, and he went and built a city, and the Lord gave him children. The general love of God was seen towards him, where there was no purpose to save him. Again, there were those at the time of the flood. They had crops and were marrying and giving in marriage; they were objects of God’s general benevolence. Still, they spurned Noah’s preaching, and at last their night came, wherein no man can work; they found that “there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, in the grave whither [man] goeth”. Then there were those in Sodom (though we are taking what are on the borders of being extreme examples). They evidently had plenty wine; they had fine weather; they had fulness of bread. The goodness of God was, as it were, knocking at their doors, telling them to repent.

An example happened to come before me from Jeremiah, when he told the people, as others did, that they would go into captivity. He stood there, in the compassion of God, and told them to stand in the old paths (the old paths were the old oracles, His testimony and His law, which in Israel He did place). Indeed Jeremiah gave them (in chapter 23) what was just a brief summary of the old oracles. He told them that a branch would sprout and that His name would be “The Lord our Righteousness”. As far as in him lay, Jeremiah was preaching that and keeping it before them. In chapter 25 we read, “What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord”. These false prophets were saying to the people that they had the temple of the Lord. They were saying, “The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are *these* – there’s the Holy place, and there’s the court of the women, and so on. The Lord will never destroy His temple.” But Jeremiah, through the Spirit, said to them, “My word is a fire, and you’re chaff, and you’re going to be burned up, and Jerusalem too, and the temple of the Lord. And My word is like a hammer, and you’re going to be smashed to pieces. And the only way to get out of it is to belong to the basket of good figs. The bad figs are to go away, but the Lord has good figs too, very good figs, and they are to go away into captivity, for their good.”

But the point is: we see even in regard to these false prophets the general benevolence of God. And wherever any had repentance toward God, as

Nicodemus had, they were received. Wherever such, like Nicodemus, came to Christ, they were loved with a love of complacency, and they are the first to acknowledge the goodness of the Lord. Indeed they are the only ones who do acknowledge it.

Now you may say, "I would like assurance of that". The old godly minister who used to be here² used to say that the language of the faith of adherence is: "To whom shall we go? We'll not go to another. We're going to stick by Boaz, and by the maidens of Boaz." The language of the faith of assurance is: "My beloved is mine, and I am His". You have a note in that excellent book by Archibald Alexander on *Religious Experience* about a person who asked a minister about assurance. "Have you reason to conclude, my woman", the minister said, (I think this is the substance of it) "that you are consciously relying on the Redeemer?" That means that it was a pleasure for her to go out of herself and leave her own wisdom, and so on, and trust in Christ.

The woman said, "I think I can say that I consciously rely on Him". There he had her; the fact that she knew she was relying on Christ meant that she had assurance of faith.

Now pray that you'll get the faith of God's elect, and pray that He will burn up our dross. We have *plenty* dross. But He will purify the sons of Levi, that they may offer unto Him an offering in righteousness. Pray that He will beautify us with the meek of the earth.

John Wesley's Legacy¹

2. Christian Perfection and Women Preachers

Roy Middleton

C*hristian Perfection.* A second strand of Wesley's legacy that has penetrated into some sections of evangelicalism is his doctrine of Christian Perfection. B B Warfield of Princeton Theological Seminary has written, "The historical source from which the main streams of perfectionist doctrine that have invaded modern Protestantism take their origin is the teaching of John Wesley".² Warfield's analysis is unquestionably correct. From 1766, Wesley issued and repeatedly revised his tract, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*.³ This brief document has served as a manifesto for all the holiness

²Rev Donald Macfarlane (1834-1926).

¹The first article in this series dealt with Wesley's contribution to the formation of an Evangelical version of Arminianism.

²Benjamin B Warfield, *Perfectionism*, New York, 1931, vol 1, p 3.

³The tract is contained in *The Works of the Rev John Wesley*, London, 1872, vol 11, pp

groups that have grown out of worldwide Methodism in the last 200 years.

In consequence of Wesley's doctrine, the Methodist societies placed their theological emphasis after justification and made the doctrine of Christian perfection the focal point of their theology. The experience of Christian perfection they variously designated by the terms: heart purity, perfect love, entire sanctification or full salvation. In a letter written just before his death, Wesley observed, "This doctrine [perfection] is the grand depositum which God has lodged with the people called Methodists; and for the sake of propagating this chiefly He appeared to have raised us up".⁴

The concept of Christian Perfection had been growing in Wesley's mind for over a decade before his conversion experience on 24 May 1738 at the Moravian Society meeting in Aldersgate Street, London. He gives explicit credit for the development of these views to authors that came from either a High Anglican or Roman Catholic background. In his *Journal* Wesley identified the reading of Thomas à Kempis as one of the landmarks of his spiritual experience. It was, he believed, the providence of God that directed him to à Kempis.⁵

Following Wesley's perception of the semi-failure of his Aldersgate conversion experience, he believed he needed some further work of grace. In his *Journal* eight months after Aldersgate, Wesley wrote, "My friends affirm that I am mad because I said I was not a Christian a year ago. I affirm I am not a Christian now. Indeed, what I might have been I know not, had I been faithful to the grace then given, when, expecting nothing less, I received such a sense of forgiveness of sins as till then I never knew. But that I am not a Christian at this day I as assuredly know as that Jesus is the Christ. For a Christian is one who has the fruits of the spirit of Christ, which (to mention no more) are love, peace, joy. But these I have not. I have not any love to God. I do not love either the Father or the Son. Do you ask how do I know

366-446 (cited afterwards as *Wesley's Works*). The more readily available edition is the often re-issued Epworth reprint of 1952 onwards, afterwards cited as *Plain Account*.

⁴*Letters of John Wesley*, (edited by John Telford), London, 1931, (cited afterwards as *Wesley's Letters (Telford)*) vol 8, p 238. The letter is to Robert Carr, Brackenbury, and is dated 15 September 1790.

⁵*The Journal of the Rev John Wesley*, (ed, Nehemiah Curnock), London, 1938, (cited afterwards as *Wesley's Journal (Curnock)*) vol 1, p 466. Wesley details the sources of his thinking at the beginning of *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*, in *Wesley's Works*, vol 11, p 366-367, *Plain Account*, pp 1-2. See also A Skevington Wood, *The Burning Heart*, Exeter, 1967, pp 45-46. Wesley was reading à Kempis as early as 1725 (when he was in his early twenties) as is clear from his letters to his mother dated 28 May and 18 June 1725 in *The Works of John Wesley*, vol 25 Letters I, 1721-1739 (ed, Frank Baker), Oxford, 1980, pp 162,168; V H H Green, *The Young Mr Wesley*, London, 1961, p 306.

whether I love God? I answer by another question, 'How do you know whether you love me?' Why, as you know whether you are hot or cold. You *feel* this moment that you do or do not love me. And I *feel* this moment I do not love God; which therefore I *know* because I *feel* it."⁶

In the Moravian circles in which Wesley was moving he heard testimonies that could be interpreted as claiming a state of sinlessness. He began to ask "If there be grace for entire sanctification at the moment of death, why is the same grace not available in life?"⁷ His answer to the question was that the Bible commanded believers to be perfect, therefore, perfection must be attainable. Hence, he preached perfection, wrote about it and claimed in his own lifetime to have found those whom he considered to be the genuine recipients of this grace. Howell Harris records several instances of meeting people who professed sinless experience. He writes, "[I was] with one Mr Wesley says is perfect. I examined her . . . she was so cunning and unwise and unsimple as ever an Attorney could be at the bar. When I asked her one question she would answer with another or an evasion."⁸

One of Harris' correspondents wrote of the effects of perfectionist teaching: "The consequences of that notion have been only sad divisions among many thousands . . . who were alarmed by the late loud call, and wanted to be led to Jesus for pardon . . . and to be taught that in Him was a fullness for all grace . . . for justification and sanctification. But instead of that, the poor souls are directed to look to themselves for comfort, and to receive none till (as they are vainly taught) they have an *absolutely clean heart*. The consequences have been that many have been driven to despair and many vainly puffed up."⁹

A prerequisite for Wesley's concept of Christian perfection was the modification of the Reformed definition of "What is sin?" Instead of defining sin, as the *Shorter Catechism* does, as "any want of conformity unto, or transgression of the law of God", he taught that nothing is strictly sin but the voluntary transgression of a known law. Wesley expressed it in this way: "Not only sin properly so called (that is, voluntary transgression of a known law) but sin, improperly so called, (that is, involuntary transgression of a

⁶*Wesley's Journal (Curnock)*, vol 2, pp 125-126 (the emphasis is Wesley's). On the broader questions surrounding Wesley's conversion see, A Dallimore, *George Whitefield*, London, 1970, vol 1, pp 179-198.

⁷Cited in Melvin Easterday Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, Metuchen, 1980, p 132.

⁸*Bathafarn – The Journal of the Historical Society of the Methodist Church of Wales*, vol 9, 1954, p 34, cited in Arnold Dallimore, *George Whitefield*, Edinburgh, vol 2, 1980, p 32.

⁹*The Journal of the Historical Society of the Presbyterian Church in Wales*, XXXV, no 2, p 17, cited in Dallimore, vol 2, p 32.

divine law, known or unknown), needs atoning blood I believe a person filled with love to God is still liable to those involuntary transgressions. Such transgressions you may call sins, if you please: I do not!"¹⁰

Moreover, according to Wesley, a believer could by God's grace be freed not only from sinful acts but also from the desire of sinful motives and from the power of sin. This state of entire sanctification usually involved both a growth in grace and a distinct second work of grace. Perfection once attained had, in his view, to be maintained at all times, as it was a condition from which Christians might fall.

In *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* Wesley asks several questions:

"Q. When may a person judge himself to have attained this [that is, entire sanctification]?"

"A. When, after having been fully convinced of inbred sin, by a far deeper and clearer conviction than that we experienced before justification, and after having experienced a gradual mortification of it, he experiences a total death to sin, and an entire renewal in the love and image of God, so as to rejoice evermore and to pray without ceasing and in everything to give thanks."

"Q. What is implied in being a perfect Christian?"

"A. The loving God with all our heart and mind and soul (Deut 6:5).

"Q. Does this imply that all inward sin is taken away?"

"A. Undoubtedly, or how can we be said to be saved from all our uncleanness (Ezek 36:29)."¹¹

In concise summary this was Wesley's doctrine.¹² It was the source of the teaching of the American holiness movement. It was out of this American movement that twentieth-century Pentecostalism came. Wesley's doctrine was also the intellectual basis of the teaching of the British holiness movement, which includes such bodies as the Salvation Army (General Booth began his career as a Methodist), the Church of the Nazarene and the Faith Mission.¹³ These movements did not always adopt Wesley's position without

¹⁰Wesley's Works, vol 11, p 396; *Plain Account*, p 45.

¹¹Wesley's Works, vol 11, pp 401,387, *Plain Account*, p 33,52.

¹²Detailed expositions of Wesley's perfectionist theology will be found in: W E Sangster, *The Path to Perfection: An examination and restatement of John Wesley's doctrine of Christian Perfection*, London, 1943; A Skevington Wood, *Love Excluding Sin: Wesley's Doctrine of Sanctification*, Ilkeston, nd; H Lindstrom, *Wesley and Sanctification*, London, 1950; C W Williams, *John Wesley's Theology Today*, London, 1960, pp 167-190; J L Peters, *Christian Perfection & American Methodism*, Grand Rapids, 1985; C E Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism, 1867-1936*, Metuchen, 1974; T L Smith, "George Whitefield and Wesleyan Perfectionism" in *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, vol 19:1, Spring 1984.

¹³For early Salvation Army teaching see Harold Begbie, *Life of William Booth*, London,

modification. William Booth is an example of this. His biographer describes his position in the following terms: "The doctrine he held on this subject was a variant of the doctrine known as Entire Sanctification. This doctrine, as the extremists hold it, teaches that a converted man can so grow in grace, can so open the doors of his volition to the will of God, that sin ceases to have the least power over him; that he is cleansed of all evil, and becomes perfectly pure, perfectly holy, even in the sight of God. William Booth never held this doctrine, but he did seek perfection in love after conversion, and taught men to aspire after entire sanctification of the will."¹⁴

Other significant groupings that inherited this aspect of Wesley's legacy are: the Oberlin Perfectionism of Charles Finney, the Victorious Life Movement and the Higher Life Movement. The originators of the Keswick Convention derived their doctrine from John Wesley.¹⁵

Women Preachers. A third strand of Wesley's legacy is the public preaching of women. Rupert Davies, a modern Methodist advocate of women preachers has written: "Of all the Christian denominations, only the Quakers have an unblemished record in the treatment of women as equals to men. John Wesley, however, comes a reasonably close second. The high intelligence and pastoral gifts of his mother pre-disposed him to accept the ministry of women and he has no difficulty about giving responsible tasks to women and appointing them as leaders of 'classes'."¹⁶ During one of Samuel Wesley's absences in London his wife supplied the deficiencies of his curate. She did

1926, vol 1, pp 338-347. These pages give a description of Salvationist holiness meetings. On the Faith Mission see, I R Govan, *Spirit of Revival: The story of J G Govan and the Faith Mission*, Edinburgh, 1960, especially pp 31-35, which link Govan's preaching of "Full Salvation" to the Salvation Army, and to the perfectionists Charles Finney and Asa Mahan. The histories of the Church of the Nazarene in both its United Kingdom and American sections link its holiness teaching to Wesley and Methodism. The title of the history of the British branch details this link: J Ford, *In the Steps of John Wesley: The Church of the Nazarene in Britain*, Kansas City, nd. The first volume of the American history is, T L Smith, *Called unto Holiness: The story of the Nazarenes – The formative years*, Kansas City, 1962.

¹⁴Begbie, pp 341-342.

¹⁵For a devastating critique of these movements see B B Warfield, *Perfectionism*. The literature on the history and theology of the Keswick Convention is very extensive. For the background see, S Barabas, *So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention*, London, 1957, C Price and I Randall, *Transforming Keswick*, Carlisle, 2000, D Bebbington, *Holiness in Nineteenth-Century England*, Carlisle, 2000, pp 51-90. The Keswick version of holiness teaching drifted away from the Wesleyan approach in the early 1900s. A Wesleyan critique of Keswick is A M Hills, *Scriptural Holiness & Keswick Teaching Compared*, Salem, Ohio, nd.

¹⁶Rupert E Davies, "The Ordination of Women in Methodism: A Personal Account", in *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, (cited afterwards as PWHS) vol 48, p 105.

this by reading prayers and a sermon on the Sabbath evening at the rectory to her family and around 200 of her neighbours.¹⁷

It was, however, by gradual steps that John Wesley came to approve of the ministry of women. In 1761 he received a letter from Sarah Crosby, one of his favourite followers, who incidentally was one of the main causes why John Wesley's wife left him in a fit of jealousy.¹⁸ Crosby records in her diary that she had conducted a class meeting, given out a hymn, prayed, told the congregation what the Lord had done for her and then persuaded them to flee from sin. Her diary entry is as follows, "I found an awful, loving sense of the Lord's presence, and much love to the people: but was much affected both in body and mind. I was not sure whether it was right for me to exhort in so public a manner, and yet I saw it impracticable to meet all these people by way of speaking particularly to each individual. I therefore gave out a hymn, and prayed, and told them part of what the Lord had done for myself, persuading them to flee from all sin".¹⁹ Immediately she wrote to Wesley asking for his ruling on this unorthodox procedure. His response to her was as follows:

"Hitherto, I think you have not gone too far. You could not well do less. I apprehend all you can do more is when you meet again, to tell them simply, 'You lay me under great difficulty. The Methodists do not allow of women preachers; neither do I take upon me any such character. But I will just nakedly tell you what is in my heart.' This will in a great measure obviate the grand objection . . . I do not see that you have broken any law. Go on calmly and steadily. If you have time you may read them the *Notes* [that is, Wesley's *Notes on the New Testament*] on any chapter, before you speak a few words, or one of the most awakening sermons as other women have done long ago."²⁰

Ten years later, in 1771, he was encouraging Crosby to intermix short exhortations with her prayers. In a letter to her he writes, "Even in public you may properly enough intermix *short exhortations* with prayer; but keep as far from what is called preaching as you can: therefore never take a text; never speak in a continued discourse without some break, about four or five minutes. Tell the people, 'We shall have another *prayer meeting* at such a

¹⁷Article by Alexander Gordon on Samuel Wesley in *Dictionary of National Biography*, eds: Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, London, 1937-1938, vol 20, p 1127.

¹⁸Frank Baker, "John Wesley and Sarah Crosby", in *PWHS*, vol 27, pp 76-77. Crosby's autobiography "contains hints of some estrangement from her husband, and on 2 February 1757 he seems to have deserted her". Shortly after this she claims to have received the "second blessing" of holiness or perfect love.

¹⁹*Methodist Magazine*, 1806, pp 517-518, cited in Baker, *PWHS*, vol 27, p 78.

²⁰*Wesley's Letters, (Telford)*, vol 4, p 133.

time and place'.²¹ Then at last, in 1777, he becomes explicit, in the face of what seemed, even to him, the clear ruling of Scripture, in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35, against women preaching. He writes to Crosby: "The difference between us and Quakers in this respect is manifest; they flatly deny the rule itself (of 1 Corinthians 14) though it stands clear in the Bible. We allow the rule: only we believe it admits of some exceptions."²²

The exception was that women, like male lay-preachers, could have an extraordinary call to preach. When Wesley was asked why he encouraged certain females in preaching he answered, "Because God owns them in the conversion of sinners, and who am I that I should withstand God".²³ It was because Wesley was faced with so many instances of what he considered the useful ministry of women that he felt obliged to alter his views.

In a letter to another woman preacher, Sarah Mallet, less than two years before his death, he gives her advice on preaching: "Never continue the service above an hour at once, singing, preaching, prayer, and all. You are not to judge by your own feelings, but by the Word of God. Never scream. Never speak above the natural pitch of your voice; it is disgustful to the hearers. It gives them pain not pleasure. And it is destroying yourself. It is offering God murder for sacrifice".²⁴ This letter, according to Leslie Church, a leading Methodist historian, is probably the most complete approval of a woman preacher that Wesley ever gave.²⁵ In 1787, he wrote a note explicitly authorising her to preach. It read: "We give the right hand of fellowship to Sarah Mallet and have no objection to her being a preacher in our connection so long as she preaches the Methodist doctrines and attends to our discipline".²⁶

Mary Bosanquet (1739-1815)²⁷ was another female Methodist preacher. In 1781, she married Wesley's close associate, John Fletcher of Madeley,

²¹ *Wesley's Letters, (Telford)*, vol 5, p 130 (emphasis his).

²² *Wesley's Letters, (Telford)*, vol 6, pp 290-291.

²³ Leslie F Church, *More about the Early Methodist People*, London, 1949, p 137. Chapter 6 of this volume is titled "Women Preachers" and is most instructive on the development of Wesley's thinking.

²⁴ *Wesley's Letters, (Telford)*, vol 8, p 190.

²⁵ Church, p 141.

²⁶ Zechariah Taft, *Biographical Sketches of the Lives and Public Ministry of Various Holy Women*, London, 1825, 1828, vol 1, p 84, cited in Church, p 170.

²⁷ For Bosanquet, see John A Vickers (ed), *A Dictionary of Methodism in Britain and Ireland*, Peterborough, 2000, p 37. See also the standard biographies of her husband John Fletcher: Luke Tyerman, *Wesley's Designated Successor – The Life, Letters, and Literary Labours of the Rev John William Fletcher*, reprinted Stoke on Trent, 2001; Patrick Streiff, *Reluctant Saint? – A Theological Biography of Fletcher of Madeley*, Peterborough, 2001. After her husband's death, she continued her work at Madeley, acting as an unofficial curate to his successor.

and had her own preaching room built near the vicarage. She is said to have shared in Fletcher's ministry. She wrote of her preaching: "For some years I was led to speak from a text; of late I feel greater approbation in what we call expounding, taking a part or whole of a chapter and speaking on it. We have lately found the Lord very present and many souls have been blest."²⁸

Though contrary to Scripture, at the centre of Wesley's legacy is the public ministry of women. It was a feature of Methodism long before it was even considered in most other Protestant denominations.²⁹ Not all the Methodists, however, approved of this. Forty-four years after his death the main Methodist conference prohibited women preaching.³⁰ It continued, however, in some of the Methodist secessions such as the Primitive Methodists and the Bible Christians. These were groups that grew into distinct denominations; they broke away from the main Wesleyan body as a protest against the larger body abandoning Wesley's testimony.

The Thains of Blairgowrie

Rev D W B Somerset

The Disruption of 1843 was the fruit of a powerful revival of religion which had been taking place in Scotland since the second decade of the nineteenth century. The towns of Perth, Montrose and Dundee had been specially favoured with the gospel at the time of the Reformation; and, with their neighbouring small towns and villages, they were blessed once again in the years around the Disruption. The names of Robert Murray M'Cheyne (1813-1843) of Dundee, Andrew Bonar of Collace, John Milne and Andrew Gray of Perth, James MacLagan of Kinfauns, James Hamilton, assistant at Abernyte, and others are known to this day. It was in this godly circle that the family of the Thains of Blairgowrie moved, and they are especially remembered because of their close connection with M'Cheyne. Mrs Thain was one of his principal correspondents, while Jessie, the daughter, is understood to have been his fiancée at the time of his death. Four of the sons are mentioned in his *Memoir and Remains*, as we shall see.

The father, John Thain, was born about 1796, and was an influential ship-

²⁸Bosanquet's account of her work at Madeley is contained in a letter written by her on 28 November 1803 to Mrs Taft. See Taft, vol 1, p 20. Cited in Church, p 146.

²⁹For a recent discussion of the place of women in Methodism see, John Kent, *Wesley and Wesleyanism: Religion in Eighteenth Century Britain*, Cambridge, 2002, especially chapter 4, "Women in Wesleyanism" pp 104-139.

³⁰"In 1835 the [Methodist] Conference expressed its strong disapproval of 'female preaching', and it was discouraged and deprecated for many years afterwards" (Church, p 137).

owner in Dundee. He was prominent in public affairs and was both a town councillor and a baillie. In 1837 he bought Heath Park, near Blairgowrie, and became an elder in the Established Church there. The family spent the summer at Heath Park and the winter at Park Place in Dundee. In Blairgowrie they were under the ministry of Robert Macdonald (1813-1893) and in Dundee they attended St Peter's, where M'Cheyne was minister.¹ John Thain regarded the six years of M'Cheyne's ministry at St Peter's as "the brightest chapter in his life".²

Robert Macdonald was minister of Blairgowrie from 1837 until 1857. He was a close friend of M'Cheyne's, and they often invited one another to communions. In October 1839 M'Cheyne was travelling back from Palestine, and Macdonald assisted at the communion at St Peter's which took place in his absence. William Chalmers Burns, who was deputising for M'Cheyne, describes how on the Friday night he, Macdonald, and others met "at Mr Thain's gate" (that is, at Park Place, which was near the church) and how they "drove up together, praying each by himself for the solemn work of the evening". This was in the middle of the time of revival. A few months earlier Burns had spent a Sabbath with the Thains in Blairgowrie and had noted in his diary: "Mrs Thain is, I think, a truly pious woman, and both she and Mr Thain with all the family are most kind and interesting".³ In 1843 Robert Macdonald published M'Cheyne's *Brief Expositions of the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia*, which consisted of notes of Thursday night prayer meetings at St Peter's in 1838. He was the leader, after the Disruption, of the movement to establish a system of Free Church schools throughout Scotland.

In 1839 an edition of John Brown of Wamphray's *Christ the Way, the Truth, and the Life* was published in Edinburgh "by the liberality of an excellent Christian merchant in Dundee".⁴ This is likely to have been John Thain, and it is just the sort of anonymity that he preferred. In 1837, 1838, 1840 and 1842 he was a commissioner to the General Assembly. The second year he represented the Burgh of Dundee, and the other three years the Presbytery of Dundee. Blairgowrie is in the Presbytery of Meigle, but it was common prior to the Disruption for ruling elders to represent Presbyteries of which they were not members. The Assembly minutes of 1837 record that John Thain dissented, along with two other Evangelicals, against a decision

¹The signature of James Thain, an elder at St Peter's, appears in a document reproduced on page 268 of L J Van Valen's biography of M'Cheyne: *Constrained by His Love*, Fearn, 2002. Possibly this was a relation of John Thain's.

²W Norrie, *Dundee Celebrities*, Dundee, 1873, p 271.

³Islay Burns, *Memoir of Rev William C Burns*, London, 1870, pp 75,123.

⁴*Edinburgh Christian Instructor*, December 1840, p 444.

of Assembly to sustain an appeal against a Synod in the case of a Mr Samuel M'Cartney. Unfortunately no other information is provided, not even the name of the Synod.⁵ From 1838 to 1842 John Thain was on the Assembly Committee for Promoting the Religious Interests of Presbyterians in the British Colonies, and in 1842 he was also on the Commission for the Distribution of the Royal Bounty.

John Thain had been a prominent supporter of the Non-Intrusionist (that is, the Evangelical) party in the Church of Scotland prior to the Disruption and, when the Disruption came, he joined the Free Church without delay. He at once provided sail canvas for a huge tent in which the Free Church congregation of Blairgowrie could meet until they had a building, and almost certainly he was the "kind friend in Dundee" who supplied the canvas for the similar tent in which Andrew Bonar and the Collace congregation met.⁶

In June 1843 Robert Macdonald described his home-coming from the Disruption Assembly to Blairgowrie as follows: "We had been in Edinburgh attending the never-to-be-forgotten Assembly of May 1843, and returned home on Friday, June 2, reaching the manse in the course of the afternoon. The first object which greeted our view was a large tent that had been erected in our absence on a piece of ground adjoining the glebe-field, conspicuous from the manse, and still more so from the only road leading up to the Established Church, so that it was impossible to go there without beholding this speaking testimony of the people's faithfulness to the crown rights of the Redeemer. It was put up while we were in Edinburgh at the General Assembly, begun and finished in about two days, and capable of holding nearly a thousand people – a labour of love in which many willing hands and loving hearts helped. And it will ever be associated in our memory as a sanctuary which God hallowed by His presence – making it a birthplace of souls, and greatly refreshing to his people. We owed it mainly to the kindness of our dear elder, Mr John Thain, shipowner in Dundee. He it was who furnished us with sailcloth sufficient for its covering; and, when finished, with its patchwork cover of black and white sails, a thinner piece of canvas round the sides serving as walls, windows, and blinds, we thought it a wonderful structure."⁷

After the Disruption, John Thain was a commissioner for the Presbytery of Meigle at the Free Church Assemblies of 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1852, and 1854. He also sat on a Special Commission appointed by the 1846 Assembly to resolve certain difficulties in the congregation of St George's,

⁵*The Principal Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1837*, p 34.

⁶T Brown, *Annals of the Disruption*, Edinburgh, 1892, p 228.

⁷*Annals of the Disruption*, pp 230-231.

Montrose. The Commission, apparently, was successful in this. After 1854, John Thain seems to have retired from public life, presumably on account of ill health. He died at New Rattray on Thursday, 14 June 1866.⁸ Heath Park had been sold in 1858 to Thomas Clark. The house is still standing, though very considerably altered.

John Thain's wife, Janet, must also have been well known in Dundee. She was born on 16 June 1803, and her father David Davidson (1750-1825) had been minister of the second charge in Dundee from 1782. "He was a very popular preacher, and he preserved his popularity in the pulpit entire, from the first day he ascended it until, broken down by age and infirmity, he became unable for his pastoral office. When it was his turn to preach in any of the town churches, there was uniformly a large audience. On sacramental occasions, he very often preached in the open air in the romantic den adjoining the old churchyard at the Den of Mains, and at these times large numbers of persons flocked to hear him from Dundee and the surrounding district. The old people of both sexes marked their affection for him, and their appreciation of his ministrations, by warm commendations."⁹ The old churchyard at Den of Mains is just off the main Aberdeen-Dundee road, and is now in a somewhat neglected condition; it contains a number of interesting seventeenth-century gravestones. David Davidson received a Doctorate in Divinity from Marischal College, Aberdeen, in 1810 and died on Tuesday, 25 December 1825. He is buried in St Andrew's Churchyard, Dundee.

By his wife, Janet Sword, David Davidson had two sons and two daughters. One of the sons, also called David, was born in 1801. He became minister of Broughty Ferry Chapel of Ease in 1827, but had to retire from active work before the Disruption because of ill health. He joined the Free Church at the Disruption, and was on the membership roll for the first Free Church Assembly in May 1843. His health cannot have permitted him to attend, however, because he did not sign the Act of Separation and Deed of Demission until June 14, at which time he was in Edinburgh.¹⁰

The Free Church *Annals* describe him as signing the Protest on his deathbed,¹¹ but this statement is difficult to reconcile with the fact that he assisted at the first Free Church communion in Keith after the Disruption. "It proved", says the account, "a most interesting and solemn occasion. On the Thursday before serving out tokens, every room in the house we occupied was filled

⁸Norrie, p 271.

⁹Norrie, p 35.

¹⁰*The Subordinate Standards and Other Authoritative Documents of the Free Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1933, p 367.

¹¹W Ewing, *Annals of the Free Church of Scotland 1843-1900*, Edinburgh, 1914, vol 2, p 158.

with anxious men and women, many of the stoutest men in tears, confessing their past sins, and the sin especially of unworthy communicating. The place was verily a Bochim.”¹² Perhaps the explanation is that David Davidson was on his deathbed on 22 August when the Established Presbytery of Dundee declared that he was no longer a minister of the Church. He died three days later, on 25 August 1843. One of his sons, John Thain Davidson (1833-1904), was Free Church minister of Maryton near Montrose, before moving to England where he had three different charges. He was Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in England in 1872 and merited an entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. He was not, however, theologically conservative. His second name ‘Thain’ suggests that there may have been more than one link between the Thains and the Davidsons.

John and Janet Thain were married on 28 August 1820, and their eldest child, Janet, or Jessie, was born on 31 July 1821. She seems to have been engaged to M’Cheyne for a considerable length of time,¹³ but very little is known about her other than what can be gleaned from her *Diary*. Extracts from this, which covered the period from December 1843 to November 1847, were first published in 1955. The *Diary* ends abruptly in mid-sentence, and Murdoch Campbell suggests, in the Introduction, that she died soon afterwards.¹⁴ She was, however, still alive, at the time of the census in 1851.

The Thains’ second child, Alexander, was born in Dundee about 1823.¹⁵ He contracted scarlet fever on 11 May 1839, which happened to be the Saturday when W C Burns was staying with the Thains in Blairgowrie. “On Sabbath night”, says Burns, “he was very anxious to see me regarding the state of his soul; however, we were afraid to increase the fever, and I only stood at his bedside and repeated a few of the invitations to come to Christ for all. I was brought by this event nearer to eternity, and felt more of the reality and awfulness of perdition than I remember ever having before.”¹⁶ M’Cheyne had a special affection for Alexander, and particularly mentions him as one among the crowd who welcomed him on his return to Dundee in November 1839. From 1840-43 he attended Edinburgh University, and letters that he wrote to M’Cheyne at this time are preserved in New College Library, Edinburgh. He was exceedingly distressed at M’Cheyne’s death in 1843, regarding it as the loss of the best friend he had on earth.¹⁷

¹²*Annals of the Disruption*, p 704.

¹³A Smellie, *Robert Murray M’Cheyne*, 1913 (reprinted Fearn, 1995) pp 153,156.

¹⁴Murdoch Campbell (ed), *Diary of Jessie Thain*, Inverness, 1955, pp 8,9.

¹⁵He was 27 at the census on 30 March 1851. Ewing, vol 1, p 339, gives 1821 as his date of birth, but this cannot be correct.

¹⁶*Memoir of W C Burns*, pp 75,76.

¹⁷Smellie, pp 111,156.

From 1844 to 1848 he studied Divinity at New College.¹⁸ William MacDougall, later Free Church minister of Fodderty and Contin, entered New College in November 1846, and he refers to a prayer meeting that some of the students had at the start of term “to implore a blessing on the studies of the session”. Alexander Thain was one of three students asked to engage in prayer on that occasion. “My soul”, says MacDougall, “felt the presence of the King, and sweet melting drops from the upper sanctuary. Lord, let these meetings be watering places to our poor souls in the midst of our studies!”¹⁹ In 1847 the works of Francis Turretine, the famous professor of theology in Geneva, were republished in Edinburgh and Alexander Thain acquired a set which still survives. The 1851 census refers to Alexander as a Free Church probationer, and he was perhaps acting as an assistant for some of the time after 1848. It is likely too that his health was not good.

He was finally ordained in March 1858, when he became minister of New Machar, a few miles north of Aberdeen. The previous minister, George Moir, had been inducted to the parish in 1840 and had joined the Free Church at the Disruption. A new church and manse were built on sites provided by the wealthy Alexander Thomson of Banchory, and the manse is still standing. George Moir’s gravestone records that “his ministrations were faithful, zealous and acceptable, and not without fruit. He died respected and beloved on 17 June 1857.”²⁰ The congregation seems to have numbered about 500 at this time.

The principal employer in the area was the Crombie textile factory at Cothall Mill, and on 23 June 1859 Alexander Thain was married to Elizabeth Crombie (1827-1910), whose brothers James and John were running the business.²¹ Alexander and Elizabeth had at least two children: Catherine, who was born in March 1862; and Alexander, who was born after his father’s death, on 26 December 1863. Alexander senior was a commissioner for the Presbytery of Ellon to the General Assemblies of 1858 and 1863, but died in the second half of 1863. On 21 December of that year Andrew Bonar recorded in his *Diary* that on the Sabbath night preceding he had been dream-

¹⁸ An Alexander Thain is mentioned as having matriculated at St Andrew’s University in the class of Chemistry in February 1844, but whether this is the same man is uncertain.

¹⁹ J S McPhail, *Memorial Sermons of Rev W S MacDougall*, Edinburgh, 1897, p 7.

²⁰ A specimen of George Moir’s handwriting can be seen in a letter to M’Cheyne in *Constrained by His Love*, p 342. In 1840 the Aberdeen Presbytery was divided over the revivals which had occurred in 1839 and 1840. A committee was appointed to investigate, with George Moir as clerk. M’Cheyne’s reply is in A A Bonar, *Memoir and Remains of Robert Murray M’Cheyne*, reprinted Edinburgh, 1966, pp 543-551.

²¹ Ewing, vol 1, p 339, gives the date of the marriage as 1858. Elizabeth’s brother James was a great-great-grandfather of Princess Diana.

ing of “being with M’Cheyne, Alexander Thain and some others,” who had entered into rest.²²

John and Janet Thain had at least four other sons apart from Alexander: David Davidson, who was born about 1829 and died in November 1859; John, who was born about 1830 and died, aged 11, on 28 February 1842; James, who died aged four in January 1837; and Herbert, who was born about 1834. Herbert is not mentioned in the 1851 census, so perhaps he had died by then. David, John and James are all buried in the Howff Burying Ground in Dundee. On 21 January 1842, shortly before his early death, John Thain wrote to M’Cheyne as follows:

“I have been thinking that I would like much to write you a note, hoping that you will take the trouble to write me, as I am not well and very seldom get to hear you preach. The Lord has thought it necessary to afflict me, to try me and bring me to himself. He hath said, ‘He doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men’. I feel I am a lost sinner but Christ has said, ‘Him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out’.

“I would like to be His, to be saved in the Lord. O may the Lord bless this affliction to my soul and make me one of His lambs. It would make me very happy if you would write me a letter, which I hope may do me good. I am reading the life of James Halley²³ and I enjoy it very much.

“Mama had a note from Alex the other day, and he asked her to tell you that he saw a Jew at Mrs Coutts²⁴ whom Mr Wingate²⁵ hopes soon to see an enquiring one. He says too that a Mr Layeron, a Jew at present seeking baptism, had told Mr Wingate that two Jews had come to him in an anxious state on account of the address the General Assembly sent out to the Jews.

“Mama sends her love.”²⁶

M’Cheyne’s reply on 27 January can be found in his *Memoir and Remains*,

²²A A Bonar, *Diary and Letters*, ed M Bonar, London, 1894, p 227.

²³James Halley (1814-41) was an exceptionally promising Church of Scotland divinity student whose life was cut short by tuberculosis. He wrote an extensive review of Robert Haldane on *Romans*, comments from which were incorporated by Haldane into subsequent editions. His *Memoir* by William Arnot was published in December 1841.

²⁴Mrs Coutts (1776-1849) was the widow of Robert Coutts, minister of Brechin, and was the subject of more than one memoir. She was the granddaughter of William M’Culloch, the minister of Cambuslang at the time of the revival. Her house in Edinburgh was a resort for Evangelicals.

²⁵William Wingate (1808-1899) was sent by the 1842 General Assembly to Budapest to work with Rabbi Duncan among the Jews. In 1843 he married Duncan’s step-daughter. Their grandson, Charles Orde Wingate (1903-1944), was famous as a general in Burma during World War II. In the 1930s he taught Jewish settlers in Palestine how to defend themselves against terrorism, and there is a museum in Israel devoted to him.

²⁶A facsimile of the first part of this letter is given in *Constrained by His Love*, p 352.

together with the letter which he wrote to Alexander after John's death.²⁷ This concludes: "Remember David and Herbert at the throne of grace. If God had taken them, where would they have been? Learn also that ministers must care for lambs – 'Preach the gospel to every creature'. Pray for me, also, that I may do so – that I may be made a better man and a more faithful pastor of old and young. Ever yours, till we meet in glory."

The *Memoir and Remains* closes, appropriately, with the poem that M'Cheyne wrote on John Thain's death, entitled: "On J T, a Believing Boy".²⁸ Evidently M'Cheyne was present at his burial on 3 March 1842:

I stood beside thy silent bed:
Thy marble brow was cold and dead,
Thy gentle soul was fled – was fled –
Dear boy, we'll meet again.

I saw thee in thy narrow rest,
The clods upon thy coffin pressed;
The clouds dropped tears, yet in my breast
God said, "We'll meet again".

They met again, we believe, just over a year later, on 25 March 1843, when M'Cheyne himself passed into glory.

The Wisdom of God in Redemption¹

3. The Effects on the Universe

W S Plumer

The wisdom of God is manifested in the effects of redemption on the universe:

(1.) Let us see how it illustrates God's perfections. In the cross we have the strongest possible expression of benevolence. The infinite dignity of the Sufferer, the unparalleled humiliation He underwent, the debased condition of those He would save, and the utter impossibility of ever adequately requiting His love, all show the amazing extent of the divine compassion. If any ever doubted God's hatred of sin, all such uncertainty comes to a full end at Calvary. If God would not spare His own Son, when He suffered the Just for the unjust, surely He is the awful and determined enemy of all un-

²⁷*Memoir and Remains*, pp 310-312.

²⁸*Memoir and Remains*, pp 647-648.

¹Taken, slightly edited, from the volume *The Rock of Our Salvation*. The previous extract appeared in February.

righteousness. The scheme of saving mercy shows at once the greatest love to the sinner and the strongest abhorrence of his sins. "Christ was no partisan with the sinner against the law." In like manner it would be easy to show how God's truth and faithfulness and power and all His perfections are displayed in redemption.

(2.) The influence of redemption on holy angels is both great and benign. It affords them the most wonderful theme of inquiry; they desire to look into it. It gives them new and delightful employment; they minister to the heirs of salvation. It gives them a new Head; though Christ is not their Saviour, He is their Lord. It brings them and men into relations of friendship and brotherhood, so that they make one family in heaven and earth. It gives them great and new sources of joy. They are glad with exceeding joy when a sinner repents (Luke 15:10). Nor have they any theme for songs so sublime as those concerning salvation.

(3.) To man the effects of redemption are glorious and elevating. He who is saved from death should be most of all struck with his deliverance – most of all drawn towards his Deliverer. None are so changed by redemption as the redeemed themselves. They pass from the lowest depths to the greatest heights; from just, perfect and awful condemnation to full, free and irrevocable justification; from a state of the lowest depravity to a state of purity and holiness fitting them for fellowship with God; from a state of misery that cannot be conceived by sinless creatures to a state of comfort and joy unspeakable; from a state of fearful estrangement from a holy God and holy angels to a state of lasting friendship with their Maker and all right-minded creatures. The bond which binds them to God and to angels binds them also to one another, and that for ever.

Obituary

Mr Iain MacRae, Elder, Inverness

The subject of this obituary was born at Carbost, Isle of Skye, in 1932 and departed this life on Sabbath, 16 May 2004, to be, we believe, with his Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. After his early education, Iain came to Inverness, where he served an apprenticeship in the plumbing trade. He later became, in the providence of God, successful in his business; he also offered his experience as a Board member of the Inverness College.

Although regularly attending the means of grace, Iain remained spiritually dead in his sins until the time came for the Lord to visit him with quickening, saving power. We have no record of how the Lord awakened him spiritually,

but his concern arose from a realisation that he was a guilty sinner in the sight of a holy God and that no one was able to deliver him but the Saviour God Himself had provided, who is "able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him". During conversation with friends on occasions, he spoke of the joy he experienced on the Sabbath evening of a communion in Fort William as the result of a sermon preached by the late Rev M MacSween, Oban, from Matthew 11:28, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest".

In 1969, at the January communion in the Inverness congregation, Iain was enabled to obey the Saviour's command, "This do in remembrance of Me", becoming a member in full communion. After being ordained a deacon in 1970, he was ordained to the office of the eldership in January 1977. He discharged his duties with marked devotion, taking a very active interest in the congregation and was thus a source of genuine encouragement to both his pastor and the brethren who shared office with him. He gave help willingly, as required, in holding services in the congregation. It was in this duty and in his public prayers that his knowledge and understanding of the Scripture became obvious. We believe he spent time in secret pleading at the throne of grace for Christ's cause and particularly for the faithful preachers of the gospel as they went forth in the path of duty. He had come by grace to understand in some measure the terrible wickedness and deceitfulness of the human heart and the many subtle temptations with which the wicked one assails the followers of the Saviour. On numerous occasions we heard him express with the Psalmist of old: "My sin I ever see", and often with the Apostle: "O wretched man that I am".

Our late highly-esteemed friend was a faithful, cheerful and obliging Christian. His Christian profession was supported by his walk and practice. He was a kind and warmhearted friend to those who had the privilege of his friendship, always sincerely and warmly attached to all who feared the Lord. He was zealous in every good word and work in endeavouring to further the cause of the gospel. Devoutly attached to the branch of Christ's Church in which he was brought up, and to which he believed he owed much under God spiritually, he nevertheless admired grace in any with whom he came in contact. He often used the words of the Psalmist, "I am companion to all those who fear, and Thee obey." The Lord's people were Iain's people.

His departure from this world came suddenly in Raigmore Hospital after a short, yet severe, illness, which he bore with calm and gracious resignation. His soul was much comforted, and his faith strengthened, from the words in John 6:20, "It is I, be not afraid". During this time of illness, he gave much evidence that he was fast maturing for the heavenly country, often expressing

a longing to be there with his Saviour. The words constantly upon his lips during his last hours in this world were: "Come Lord Jesus, come quickly". We believe he has entered, with the godly who have gone before him, into that rest that remains for the people of God, where all his desires are now fully satisfied.

We are left to mourn our loss as he is missed in the courts of God's house on earth but we believe that he has his place in God's house above. The Church's loss is very real. Nevertheless we rejoice that the grace, which we believe kept him, brought him to glory. The large gathering at his funeral was an indication of the esteem in which he was held.

In extending our heartfelt sympathy to his sorrowing, like-minded widow, and also to his sons, brother and other members of the family circle, we pray that they also may follow those who now, "through faith and patience, inherit the promises". "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them" (Rev 14:13).

(Rev) George G Hutton

Book Reviews¹

Faith and Revelation, Works of Thomas Halyburton, vol 3, published by the James Begg Society, hardback, 455 pages, £12.99.

The previous two volumes in this edition of Halyburton's *Works* were warmly welcomed in this magazine. This third volume is of the same high standard, but would prove difficult for many readers. Halyburton (1674-1712) was one of Scotland's most noted ministers and was a professor of theology in St Andrews for the last two years of his life. He wrote this book to oppose Deism, then a powerful force, among the educated classes of Europe, in favour of an unbelieving attitude to the Scriptures.

Halyburton focuses here on the difference between "natural and revealed religion". He sets out two main principles of the Deists: they all (1) "reject revealed religion and plainly maintain that all pretences to revelation are vain, cheat and imposture", (2) "maintain that natural religion is sufficient to answer all the great ends of religion, and the only rule whereby all our religious practices are to be squared". He then proceeds, at considerable length, to argue against the Deists' ideas. He shows the insufficiency of natural religion because it cannot make God known to us or show us how to worship Him; it cannot show us where our happiness lies or point us to "a sufficient rule of duty"; and it cannot show us how to obtain pardon of sin.

¹Both books reviewed here are available from the Free Presbyterian Bookroom.

He also emphasises the insufficiency of natural religion to subdue sin's power.

One might be inclined to question the value of reprinting a volume which deals with a heresy which no longer exists as such. But, although probably no one today would call himself a Deist, we must bear in mind that the same principles underlie much of modern religion. B B Warfield, pointed out in 1895 that the doctrine of Albert Ritschl, a German modernist theologian, implied that God is far away and silent, working always and only through natural causes. He asked, "When will the Church at large awaken to the fact that the problem which 'the new religious thinking' is putting before her is simply the old eighteenth-century problem in a fresh form?" He went on: "Is Christianity a natural religion, the crown and capstone it may be of natural religion, but only natural religion for all that? Or is Christianity a supernatural religion – supernatural in origin, in sanctions, in power and in issue?" Halyburton's work on Deism is thus still valuable today; the arguments against such heresies are always fundamentally the same.

The Case for Traditional Protestantism: The Solas of the Reformation, by Terry L Johnson, published by Banner of Truth Trust, paperback, 182 pages, £6.25. This book is an exposition of five Biblical truths rediscovered at the Reformation, which became the motivating and energising principles of the Reformers – the unique place of Scripture, of Christ, of faith, of grace and of the glory of God as the great aim in life. The first chapter introduces these truths generally, very much through an account of how they were made matters of consciousness and conviction to Martin Luther. The next four chapters deal in turn with Scripture, Christ, faith and grace. Two further chapters consider the implications of a concern to do all to the glory of God. An Appendix brings together some of the most significant statements of the Reformed Confessions on the doctrine of justification.

The worthy aim of the author is indicated in his Preface: "We share their vision of a gospel purged and purified according to the Word of God and a church restored to its biblical and apostolic integrity". The thoroughness and extent of the reformation wrought by the proclamation of these rediscovered truths with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven is seen in that "the reformation in the theology of the church quickly spilled over into the church's worship and form of government . . . into family life . . . into society, as educational, political, economic and cultural institutions and activities were reformed to the glory of God" (pp 16,17).

Scripture is set forth (in the light of 2 Tim 3:16,17) as inspired by God, infallible, inerrant, authoritative and sufficient, and the roles of tradition, the Church and reason are examined in relation to Scripture. The uniqueness of

Christ is discussed in terms of His being the only Saviour, the only sacrifice for sin and the only Mediator. Faith is discussed particularly in its relation to justification, along the lines indicated by a study of the Epistle to the Romans, justification by faith being what Calvin called “the principal hinge on which religion turns” and what Luther described as “the article by which the Church stands or falls”; it was “this article of faith more than any other which brought the Reformers into conflict with medieval Roman Catholicism” (p 76). The chapter on faith is largely a discussion of the nature, ground, means and elements of justification, and the contrast with Roman doctrine then and now is shown. “We should not view this conflict as a remote history lesson, unrelated to ministry. It is instead the heart of the gospel and the key to mission today” (p 77).

The grace of God is explained (from Eph 2:1-10) in terms of the favour, the provision and the power of God. The election and predestination of God are given their place as essential to preserving “the graciousness of grace” (p 121). The chapters on the glory of God show that “zeal for the glory of God provided the driving energy behind the Protestant programme of reform” (p 124) and led to reformation not only in theology but in worship, church government, family life, culture and society. The point is well made that “family worship in the home became a hallmark of Protestantism for generations and right up to the recent past. Few practices of our forefathers are in more need of reviving today than this” (p 149).

The book sets these truths forth over against Romanism ancient and modern and against much modern Evangelicalism, but it is written in the form, not so much of a polemic against error, as a positive statement of truth. Someone in error on these truths should be able to study the matter without the manner giving needless offence. While some things might be put differently, it can be commended to those who would like an attractively-written and easily-read introduction to, or refresher course in, these important truths.

One blemish is the failure to adhere to the Authorised Version of the Bible in quotations – the source of the translation used is not indicated. Apart from arguments for the Authorised Version drawn from the authenticity of the original text and the faithfulness of the translation, we believe that the proliferation of translations has contributed considerably to ignorance of Scripture, inability to recall the words of Scripture accurately and lack of confidence in the authority of Scripture – and so has undermined Reformation achievements.

Some aspects of the treatment of the reform of worship are also unsatisfactory. It is properly recognised that Luther retained the basic structure and ritual of the Latin service, “less the canon of the mass” (p 125), and that the other Reformers went further than he did in reforming worship because they

acted on the regulative principle, explained here as meaning “that worship must be ‘according to Scripture’ . . . governed by biblical principles and filled with biblical content. All extra-biblical ceremonies and rituals must be eliminated so as not to detract the attention of the worshippers from the God-given elements and signs.” William Cunningham states the principle somewhat more precisely: “It was Christ’s mind and will that nothing should be introduced into the government and worship of the Church unless a positive warrant for it could be found in Scripture” (*The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation*, p 32).

Our author says that “the Reformation saw a great outpouring of biblical hymns, whether Lutheran chorales or Calvinistic Psalmody. Our hymn book today continues to reflect this Protestant commitment to rich biblical content in sung praise, that ‘the Word of Christ’ may ‘dwell richly’ in us (Col 3:16)”. In view of the wide variety of hymn books used in Protestant churches and controversies over them, we wonder at the use of the term “*our hymn book*”. The regulative principle loses much of its significance if it cannot identify the psalms, hymns and spiritual songs which we are to sing with grace in our hearts to the Lord.

(Rev) Hugh M Cartwright

Protestant View

Homage to a Dead Pope

Documents such as the Bill of Rights and the 1701 Act of Succession demonstrate beyond shadow of doubt that the written part of the British constitution is Protestant in its character. So clearly is this the case that we find writers in several national newspapers expressing their amazement at the spectacle of our Prime Minister and Prince Charles paying tribute to the late Roman pontiff as if these enactments did not exist. Along with other dignitaries, including the Archbishop of Canterbury and cabinet ministers, they were present at a service held in his honour in the Roman Catholic Westminster Cathedral in London. Then, a few days later, they were present at the blasphemous service held in Rome on the occasion of the Pope’s burial.

Cormac Murphy-O’Connor, Archbishop of Westminster, who himself was, not so long ago, under media investigation on account of his alleged failure to discipline paedophile priests, basked in the publicity generated by the attendance of these dignitaries at the funeral. “The Petrine ministry is of service not just to the Church but to the world,” he declared – thus subtly perpetrating the falsehood that Peter was the first pope. And the sight of so many flags flying at half-mast throughout Protestant Britain, including that over the

Scottish Parliament, would encourage him to believe he was right. One national newspaper article bore the title: "It's as if the Reformation never happened", and the writer goes on to suggest that a new Act of Settlement is required. That, we fear, will now become a priority and it is not to be expected that the present powers that be will offer much resistance.

How can we account for the presence at the funeral of the serving President of the United States (accompanied for good measure by two ex-Presidents), and kings and queens and heads of states from all over the world, professing to represent millions and millions of the human race – all obsequiously paying their homage at the shrine of the Roman Antichrist? We find the answer in the Bible: it is because all such have not received "the love of the truth . . . and for this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie". We may safely assert that never in the history of the Papacy has there been a gathering on this scale at the seat of Antichrist, and when we bear in mind that television enabled millions, the world over, to view the spectacle, it is difficult not to think of the scripture, "And all the world wondered after the beast". The wound inflicted on Babylonian paganism by the coming of Christianity was healed, but are we now seeing, in these events, its further restoration, in the guise of paganised "Christianity", to the place it occupied when the Roman Empire was at the height of its power? Little wonder that Calvin regarded the whole system of Romanism as "Satan's masterpiece"!

Loyal Protestant subjects of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II – and there are still many of them in this land – feel both degraded and betrayed. How demeaning to find the heir to the British throne postponing his own marriage in deference to Rome! It is even more demeaning if it is true – and there is reason to believe it is – that the Prime Minister indicated that he would go to the Pope's funeral rather than attend the Prince's marriage if the two events clashed. And it would seem that the Archbishop of Canterbury and many others on his guest list took the same attitude. It was surely not unknown in Rome that the Prince's marriage date had been arranged long before the death of the Pope and the fact that the funeral was arranged to clash with it smacks of Jesuit cunning.

If, as is also reported, the Pope died a day earlier than was officially declared, the timing of the funeral becomes even more significant. "The rumour", a journalist wrote in *The Daily Telegraph* (5 April 2005), "may sound far-fetched but the fact that it is circulating among – and is believed by – informed liberal Vatican-watchers was an indication of the febrile mood possessing Rome after the death of the most influential Pope of modern times." It is said that this deception was practised by those in charge of the situation in order to gain time to mobilise Opus Dei, among others, with a view to creating a huge turnout for the funeral.

But all is not lost, far from it. The enemy may now be coming in like a flood, but the Spirit of the Lord will raise up a standard against him. God has fixed the bound beyond which the waves of that flood shall not pass. The time is approaching when the “Wicked” depicted in 2 Thessalonians will be fully revealed, and we rest assured that this is he “whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming”. It is well, if we are able to say that greater is He that is with us than all that be against us. There will yet be an answer to the prayer which the Covenanter Richard Cameron offered up on the border of heaven, in which he earnestly sought the fall of Antichrist. And William Cowper’s prediction shall become a reality:

“Rome shall perish, write that word, in the blood that she has spilt.”

JM

Notes and Comments

Free Church Decision

Judgement has now been pronounced in the action brought in the civil courts by the Free Church Continuing (FCC) against the Free Church of Scotland. Fundamental to the FCC case was the claim that aggrieved parties had the right to continue protesting against what they would regard as a faulty decision of church courts, until the matter was remedied. The judge, Lady Paton, ruled in favour of the Free Church (residual) and declared: “I have been unable to identify a right of continued protest as a fundamental constitutional principle of the Free Church”. It is reported that an appeal is being considered.

As mentioned in a previous comment on this case, there ought to be no doubt that the true successor of the 1843 Free Church is the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland. It has endeavoured to preserve the principles of the Reformation Church of Scotland until today. The Free Presbyterian claim was never tested in court as the founding fathers of the Church felt that they ought not to bring a church question before the civil courts, but it still remains valid. For an analysis of the background to the Free Church division in 2000, readers are referred to the editorial in the *Free Presbyterian Magazine* for March of that year.

Episcopal Confusion

Earlier this year, the Church of England’s General Synod took its first step towards allowing women bishops into the Church. It agreed to continue its debate on the subject in the summer, and a vote in favour could result in women being consecrated by 2011.

The chairwoman of the organisation Women in the Church claimed: “We

have a Church that wants to be representative of the whole people of God". But the Church of England has long since largely departed from the position described in its authorised standard, the Thirty-Nine Articles, that "the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in which the pure Word of God is preached". In any case, the early Christian Church was representative of the whole people of God although the ministry was only open to men; Paul insisted, "I suffer not a woman to teach".

Summarising the position of those in favour of women bishops, the Bishop of Rochester said they believed the Church is "damaging its credibility" by preventing the move. It must then be asked: "In whose eyes?" Certainly not in the eyes of those who take the Bible at face value, although very possibly in the eyes of those who reject the testimony of Scripture and follow those who are increasingly minimising the distinction between the sexes – a distinction inherent in the way God created the human race.

Meanwhile there has been dissension in the Scottish Episcopal Church on the issue of confessed homosexuals in the ministry. Bishop Bruce Cameron, of Aberdeen and Orkney, Primus of the Church, has confirmed that someone would not be automatically barred from the ministry because he was guilty of this sin. In consequence, the Scottish Anglican Network, an Evangelical body, said to include some of the wealthiest and best-attended churches in Scotland, has written to all bishops voicing its concern and is threatening to reconsider its position within the denomination if it does not get a swift, and presumably satisfactory, response. A Glasgow minister has described the Bishop's statement as "a move away from what the Bible teaches us". Of course it is, and we are glad that some in that Church have opposed such a serious development – particularly when the Scottish bishops have also admitted that clergy have on occasion "responded to requests to give a blessing to same-sex couples". Yet such men and congregations have remained within a body which has never been renowned for its adherence to scriptural truth.

The issue has caused particular turmoil ever since an American Episcopal Church ordained a practising homosexual as Bishop of New Hampshire. The action resulted in the Church being asked to withdraw from the Anglican Communion for the next three years. But it is particularly sad that a body in Scotland should be in the vanguard of those who condone such seriously-immoral behaviour.

The Assisted Dying Bill

A House of Lords committee has published its report on the implications of the Assisted Dying for the Terminally Ill Bill, introduced by Lord Joffe. The committee, chaired by Lord Mackay of Clashfern, was divided, but has recommended several changes to the Bill. A spokesman for the Voluntary

Euthanasia Society described the report as “very powerful”, and added, “It is a huge step forward and it brings the possibility of changing the law in this country forward by many years”.

Lord Mackay declined to say if the law should be changed but told reporters that it should be debated in Parliament. *The Times* reports that he “hinted . . . that a Bill permitting assisted suicide – where the doctor provides a lethal prescription and the patient makes the choice over whether to take it – had a better chance of success than one that also legalises voluntary euthanasia, where the doctor is responsible for both prescribing and administering the fatal dose”.

It is also alarming that this power is being sought for doctors in Scotland by the proposed Dying with Dignity Bill of MSP Jeremy Purvis, which is to be brought before the Holyrood Parliament at the end of April. If these Bills become law, medical ethics in the UK will certainly decline. Charlotte Vincent of the Lawyers’ Christian Fellowship said, “A change in the law would give doctors power that could be too easily abused, and a responsibility that they should not be entitled to have”.

What will such legislation lead to? In Holland one adult death in every 40 is the result of legalised euthanasia. In Belgium, similar legislation has led to illegal infant euthanasia. A recent report in *The Lancet* says that Belgian doctors were directly responsible for nearly half of the 253 deaths of newborn babies during the period August 1999 to July 2000 and that infant euthanasia has become commonplace in the most liberal regions of northern Europe.

We fervently hope that these Bills will never become law. It is disturbing that this committee of the House of Lords did not act as a similar medical ethics committee of a decade ago did when it rejected proposed legislation on assisted dying. It is some consolation that the present committee was split down the middle, but it remains to be seen if this will inhibit Parliament in dealing with the Bill. Meantime, while letting MPs and government know our opposition to this legislation, we must pray that the endeavours of its promoters will be thwarted. “Arise, Lord, let not man prevail.” *NMR*

Church Information

Meeting of Synod

The Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland will meet in St Jude’s Church, Glasgow, on Tuesday, 17 May 2005, at 6.30 pm, when the retiring Moderator, Rev Roderick MacLeod, will conduct public worship. It is expected that on this occasion the afternoon sederunt on the Wednesday will be held in private. *(Rev) John MacLeod, Clerk of Synod*

Student Received

The Southern Presbytery, meeting in Glasgow on 6 April 2005, received, on the recommendation of the Richmond, Texas, Kirk Session, Mr Jett D Smith as a student studying for the ministry of the gospel in the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

(Rev) H M Cartwright, Clerk of Presbytery

Meetings of Presbytery (DV)

Zimbabwe: At Bulawayo, on Tuesday, June 14, at 11 am.

Outer Isles: At Stornoway, on Tuesday, June 14, at 1 pm.

Western: At Laide, on Tuesday, June 14, at 6 pm.

Southern: At Glasgow, on Wednesday, June 15, at 4 pm.

Skye: At Portree, on Tuesday, June 21, at 11 am.

Northern: At Dingwall, on Tuesday, June 28, at 2 pm.

Australia & New Zealand: At Wellington, on Friday, July 15, at 2.30 pm.

Home Mission Fund

By appointment of Synod, the first of this year's two special collections on behalf of the Home Mission Fund, is due to be taken in congregations during May.

R A Campbell, General Treasurer

Acknowledgement of Donations

The General Treasurer acknowledges with sincere thanks the following donations:

College & Library Fund: Anon, £500 per Rev DC; The McCarter Family, USA, \$300; A Friend, Is 54:10, £40.

Eastern Europe Fund: NF, Berwickshire, £15.

Congregational Treasurers acknowledge with sincere thanks the following donations:

Gairloch: *Congregational Funds:* Anon, £50 per Rev AEW.

Glasgow: *Bus Fund:* Anon, £10; Anon, £100 per RAC. *College & Library Fund:* Anon, £60. *Congregational Funds:* The estate of the late Mr Ian MacDonald, £67.34 per RAC; The estate of the late Mr Neil Cameron, £1000; Anon, North Uist, £20 per Rev RML. *Eastern Europe Fund:* Anon, £25; £45; £50; £40; £40; £40; £35; £25; £40; £30; Anon, for Eastern Europe literature, £10. *Jewish & Foreign Missions Fund:* Anon, for African relief, £40; Anon, for work in Israel, £30; £50.

Greenock: *Eastern Europe Fund:* Anon, £20. *TBS:* Anon, £20; £20; £43.

Inverness: *Congregational Funds:* Anon, £25; £25; Mrs CB, £20. *Jewish & Foreign Missions Fund:* Anon, £25. *TBS:* Mr DMP, £30. *Where Most Needed:* A Friend of the Cause, £20.

Lochbroom: *Where Most Needed:* An absent friend, £60.

North Harris: *Congregational Funds:* Relative of the late M A MacLeod, £5 per Rev BJ. *Fabric Fund (Stockinish):* MM, Cluer, £100.

North Uist: *Communion Expenses:* Anon, Glasgow, £50. *Induction Expenses:* A Friend, Stornoway, £40; A Friend, Stornoway, £20 per AML.

Portree: *Congregational Funds:* "In memory of loving parents", £20; A Friend, Tunbridge Wells, £40 per FM. *Door Collection:* A Friend, £20 per SYM. *Sustentation Fund:* A Friend, £25 per SYM.

Raasay: *Congregational Funds:* Anon, North Uist, £20. *Jewish & Foreign Missions Fund:* A Friend, for Zimbabwe Mission, £25. *Sustentation Fund:* A Friend £25. All per JRT.

Staffin: *Door Collection:* Anon, Staffin House, £40 per SMK.

Stornoway: *Jewish & Foreign Missions Fund:* Anon, for Kenya Mission Poor Relief, £20. *Manse Expenses:* Anon, £20; £20; £10. *TBS:* Anon, £181.