

The Free Presbyterian Magazine

**Issued by the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland
Reformed in Doctrine, Worship and Practice**

*“Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because
of the truth” Psalm 60:4*

Contents

Our Refuge?	65
“Even so Might Grace Reign” A Sermon by John Kennedy	68
Richard Baxter 3. His Theology	72
God’s Eternal Decree and Preaching (1) Rev H M Cartwright	78
Congregational Contributions for 2007	84
Christ the Judge J C Ryle	86
Keep Unspotted from the World (1) J B Waterbury	88
Protestant View	90
Notes and Comments	94
Church Information	96

March 2008

Vol 113 • No 3

The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland

Moderator of Synod: Rev D A Ross, F P Manse, Laide, IV22 2NB. Tel: 01445 731340.

Clerk of Synod: Rev J MacLeod MA, 6 Church Avenue, Sidcup, Kent, DA14 6BU. Tel: 0208 309 1623, e-mail: JMacL265@aol.com.

Assistant Clerk: Rev J R Tallach MB ChB, F P Manse, Raasay, Kyle, Ross-shire, IV40 8PB. Tel: 01478 660216.

General Treasurer: Mr W Campbell, 133 Woodlands Road, Glasgow, G3 6LE. Tel: 0141 332 9283, fax 0141 332 4271, e-mail: wc.fpchurch@btconnect.com.

Law Agents: Brodies WS, 15 Atholl Crescent, Edinburgh, EH3 8AH. Tel: 0131 228 3777.

Clerks to Presbyteries:

Northern: Rev G G Hutton BA, 11 Auldcastle Road, Inverness, IV2 3PZ. Tel: 01463 712872.

Southern: Rev H M Cartwright, MA, 8 Colinton Road, Edinburgh, EH10 5DS. Tel: 0131 447 1920.

Western: Rev A E W MacDonald MA, F P Manse, Gairloch, Ross-shire, IV21 2BS. Tel: 01445 712247.

Outer Isles: Rev K D Macleod BSc, F P Manse, Ferry Road, Leverburgh, Isle of Harris, HS5 3UA. Tel: 01859 520271.

Skye: Rev J R Tallach MB ChB, F P Manse, Raasay, Kyle, Ross-shire, IV40 8PB. Tel: 01478 660216.

Australia and New Zealand: Rev J A T van Dorp, 14 Thomson Street, Gisborne, New Zealand. Tel: 06 868 5809.

Zimbabwe: Rev SKhumalo, Stand No 56004, Mazwi Road, Lobengula, PO Magwegwe, Bulawayo. Tel: 00263 9407131.

Zimbabwe Mission Office: 9 Robertson Street, Parkview, Bulawayo. Tel: 002639 62636, fax: 002639 61902, e-mail: fpchurch@mweb.co.zw.

Residential Care Homes:

Ballifeary House, 14 Ness Walk, Inverness, IV3 5SQ. Tel: 01463 234679.

Leverburgh Residential Care Home, Ferry Road, Leverburgh, Isle of Harris, HS5 3UA. Tel: 01859 520296.

Website of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland: www.fpchurch.org.uk.

The Free Presbyterian Magazine

Subscriptions and changes of address to be sent to the General Treasurer, Mr W Campbell, 133 Woodlands Road, Glasgow, G3 6LE; tel: 0141 332 9283. The subscription year ends in December and subscriptions should be sent in January for the following 12 months. Prices are on back cover. One month's notice is required for change of address. Queries about delivery of the magazines should be sent to the General Treasurer, not to the printer.

Editor: Rev K D Macleod BSc, F P Manse, Ferry Road, Leverburgh, Isle of Harris, HS5 3UA. Tel: 01859 520271; e-mail: leverburgh@lineone.net. Unsigned articles are by the Editor.

Editorial Board: The Editor, Rev H M Cartwright, Rev N M Ross, Rev D W B Somerset.

Deadline for sending material to the Editor: The beginning of the month previous to publication.

The Gaelic Supplement (quarterly): Editor: Rev J MacLeod MA, 6 Church Avenue, Sidcup, Kent, DA14 6BU. Available free on request.

Youth Magazine: *The Young People's Magazine*. Editor: Rev K D Macleod BSc.

Communions

January: First Sabbath: Nkayi; **Fourth:** Auckland, Inverness, New Canaan.

February: Second Sabbath: Dingwall; **Third:** Stornoway; **Fourth:** North Uist, Zenka.

March: First Sabbath: Ullapool; **Second:** Ness, Portree, Tarbert; **Third:** Kyle of Lochalsh; **Fourth:** Barnoldswick, Gisborne, North Tolsta; **Fifth:** Ingwenya.

April: Second Sabbath: Leverburgh, Staffin; **Third:** Chesley, Laide; **Fourth:** Glasgow; Mbuma.

May: First Sabbath: Aberdeen, Grafton, London; **Second:** Achmore, New Canaan, Donsa, Kinlochberrie; **Third:** Edinburgh; **Fourth:** Chiedza.

June: First Sabbath: Auckland, Farr, Perth; **Second:** Nkayi, Shieldaig; **Third:** Lochcarron, Uig; **Fourth:** Gairloch, **Fifth:** Bulawayo, Inverness.

July: First Sabbath: Beauly, Raasay; **Second:** Bonar, Staffin, Wellington; **Third:** Applecross; **Fourth:** Struan; Cameron.

August: First Sabbath: Dingwall; **Second:** New Canaan, Somakentana, Leverburgh; **Third:** Laide; **Fourth:** Stornoway, Vatten; **Fifth:** Stratherrick, Zenka.

September: First Sabbath: Breascleite, Chesley, Larnie, Sydney, Ullapool; **Second:** Halkirk, Mnaka, Portree; **Third:** Tarbert; **Fourth:** Barnoldswick, Ingwenya, North Uist.

October: First Sabbath: Dornoch, Grafton, Lochcarron, North Tolsta; **Second:** Gairloch, Ness; **Third:** London; **Fourth:** Edinburgh, Gisborne, Lochinver, Mbuma, Uig.

November: First Sabbath: Raasay; **Second:** Glasgow; **Third:** Santa Fe (Texas); **Fourth:** Aberdeen; **Fifth:** Chiedza.

December: First Sabbath: Singapore; **Third:** Bulawayo, Tauranga.

The Free Presbyterian Magazine

Vol 113

March 2008

No 3

Our Refuge?

“**G**od is our refuge and strength,” sang one of the Psalmists (Ps 46:1). This was not presumption, assuming that everything would turn out well, whatever his state before God. Neither was it a natural optimism, which looked at the future through rose-tinted spectacles. Nor was he relying on the superficial idea that God is everyone’s Heavenly Father.

The Psalmist was willing to receive all of God’s revelation; he was not selective in what he believed, like those who claim that God is their Heavenly Father but are not concerned to live a holy life. He was willing to recognise that God’s authority lay behind all of divine revelation – whether through the words of the prophets of his own time, or in those parts of Scripture which had already been written. In particular, he was made willing to receive God’s testimony against himself when the truths about sin were applied to him. He did not try to minimise their seriousness, which had been made so clear in the law of Moses by the repeated emphasis on universal sin and uncleanness and, consequently, on everyone’s need of cleansing. So this was not a man who could readily recognise sin in others while ignoring it in himself.

Further, the Psalmist had submitted to God’s appointed way of salvation. He knew that sin was a burden he could not carry away, but that God had provided a substitute on whom that burden could be laid. And every time the Psalmist offered a sacrifice, he was by faith looking forward to the coming of the Seed of the woman who had been promised to his first parents, in the Garden of Eden. Likewise today those who have a right to express their confidence in God, as their refuge and strength, have received the further testimony of New Testament Scripture that God “the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world” (1 John 4:14). It was by faith that the Psalmist had received God’s testimony about the way of salvation; he had not only received God’s revelation as a series of facts but he had trusted in God as the One who had provided the salvation, in which both God’s justice and His mercy were magnified.

The Psalmist was not alone in having a God-given right to describe Him as “our refuge and strength”; many others have been granted the same right.

How has this come about? What has made them different from those who assume, *without* good reason, that God will protect them from the consequences of sin – although they are going on in unbelief? It was the Holy Spirit enlightening their minds in the knowledge of Christ – bringing the truth, as revealed in the Scriptures, to bear on their minds so that by faith they see Christ as the Saviour of the guilty. Such sinners, in contrast with those who go on in unbelief, come to *know* Christ as the One who came into the world to die for sinners. They see that Christ is able to save to the uttermost, and so they trust in Him.

The believer knows that God has provided salvation, not only from the guilt of sin, but also from its power. God not only justifies the sinner; He also sanctifies him. The believer has learned that God is a sure refuge for sinners; he has fled to that refuge; so he is safe. He therefore has every right to view God as a refuge for him in the face of every danger. But unbelievers refuse to be reconciled to Him through Jesus Christ; it is sheer presumption for them to think of God as their refuge in times of trouble.

This is a fallen world, a world where terrible things happen – illnesses, injuries, quarrels and bereavements, for instance, besides all kinds of spiritual affliction: temptation, unbelief and every other sin, and corruption of the heart. Yet the Psalmist saw God as his refuge in spite of the worst-imaginable disasters; he would be safe “though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea; though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof”. No difficulty, whether temporal or spiritual, could disturb him. “Therefore will not we fear”, he wrote; there was no need to be fearful; God was indeed his refuge, and by faith he would flee to that refuge in the face of every difficulty.

But is every believer free from fear? By no means. Yet, because the Holy Spirit keeps faith alive in his soul – however feeble it may be – every believer will, more or less, make God his refuge. The believer has begun to know God as gracious and all-powerful, and to trust in Him as such. In this imperfectly-sanctified state, his trust may be stronger or weaker – but when faith is transformed into sight, that saint will be totally perfect. In this life, the Psalmist himself could only be free from fear to the extent that he trusted in God.

In the face of trouble, the question may arise: Is God a refuge for me? Another, almost parallel, question may follow: Will He pay attention if I pray? A number of points may be made in response. First, we have no right to expect God’s help if we are determined to go on in sin, despising the offers of salvation which are made to us in Christ. Yet God “is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil” (Luke 6:35); He has answered many a prayer put up by those who were going on in rebellion against Him. And He still invites,

“Call upon Me in the day of trouble” (Ps 50:15). At the same time, when unconverted sinners ask only for temporal benefits, they are rebelliously ignoring the command of Christ: “Seek ye *first* the kingdom of God and His righteousness”. We are not to treat our needs for this life, significant though they may be, as of prime importance, while ignoring the needs of our souls and disregarding God’s sovereign right to our wholehearted obedience.

On the other hand, the divine promise will always hold true: God “will fulfil the desire of them that fear Him: He also will hear their cry, and will save them” (Ps 145:19). That is not to say that He will answer in the very terms that were used to present the petition; we must recognise that many of our petitions are foolish, and God will answer His children according to His perfect understanding of what is good for them and what will be most for His glory. Throughout life’s journey, the promise will hold true: “The Lord thy God, He it is that doth go with thee; He will not fail thee, nor forsake thee” (Deut 31:6). So God’s children may say in the words, twice repeated, of Psalm 46: “The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge” – remembering how often the Most High proved a safe refuge for Jacob.

Whatever trouble God’s children may experience, God is a refuge for them, and that refuge is always open. No matter how difficult their circumstances, no matter how strong the opposition of the world, no matter how wily the temptations of Satan, no matter how prevalent unbelief in their souls, their refuge is always suited to their needs. Even if their testing comes directly from God’s hand, they are to say, as Peter did to the Saviour: “Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life” (John 6:68). The Saviour’s words, and indeed all the Scriptures, are preserved for their encouragement, as well as for other reasons. And they may also say, with their eye on God as their refuge: To whom shall we go, for He has infinite power to deliver from every form of trouble, to protect from all temptation, to save from all sin and carelessness and backsliding?

It is presumption for others to treat God as their Heavenly Father, but not for believers. They have been adopted into His family; they are His children; and He has undertaken to care for them. Some of these children have been given a particularly strong sense of that care. When the Scottish Reformer, George Wishart, faced martyrdom, he was keenly aware that God was a refuge and strength. He besought his Christian friends: “Be not offended in the Word of God for the affliction and torments that ye see already prepared for me. But I exhort you that you love the Word of God and suffer patiently and with a comfortable heart for the Word’s sake, which is your undoubted salvation and everlasting comfort”. But the salvation is no less sure for those whose faith is weak. The call to all is: “Trust ye in the Lord for ever”.

“Even so Might Grace Reign”¹

A Sermon by John Kennedy

Romans 5:21. *That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.*

“**G**od reigneth”, and “*sin hath reigned*” and grace doth reign. How wonderful that these three statements should be true! God and sin are directly opposed. Sin is that abominable thing which His soul hates. It aims with deadly intent at the throne, glory and being of God. And yet it exists though God is almighty, and it reigns. Yes, and it reigns because God reigns. Man introduced sin into the world. By one man sin entered, and in that one man all sinned. The righteous retribution of God results in the sin which man introduced reigning over him unto death. God who is holy withdraws, and sin takes possession. God who is just condemns, and sin is allowed to reign unto death.

And if God reigns and sin has reigned, how strange that grace reigns! Sin reigning because God reigns, and reigning unto death, and yet under the same divine government grace reigns unto life. Sin’s *destroying* reign and grace’s *saving* reign are both on earth under the rule of God. And those over whom sin has reigned are those over whom grace reigns. Sin’s reign must result in death and yet grace has opportunity to reign! How can this be? The text furnishes the key with which the mystery is opened.

Grace is divine love to sinners. God loved sinners with an electing love from all eternity. He purposed to save the objects of His love. This was His grace in purpose towards them. But how may that grace be extended to them? They are under the reign of sin, which is a reign unto death. It must result in death. Here, notwithstanding, grace is represented as reigning. Its reign is, too, the most marked result of God’s sovereignty, and if sin did not reign, grace could not reign! The text:

1. Informs us how grace may reign: “*through righteousness*”.
2. Shows us grace actually enthroned in the Person of Christ.
3. Tells us how it reigns: “*unto eternal life*”.

Or, the *foundation*, the *form* and the *character* of this reign.

- Or: 1. How grace came to the throne: “*through righteousness*”.
2. How it is in possession of the throne: “*by Jesus Christ our Lord*”.
 3. How it acts upon the throne: it reigns “*unto eternal life*”.

¹Preached in Dingwall on 4 September 1864 and taken, with slight editing, from *Dr John Kennedy of Dingwall – Sermon Notes 1859-65*, recently published by the James Begg Society (hardback, 418 pp, £18.00, available from the Free Presbyterian Bookroom). These are Kennedy’s own notes and are printed here by kind permission of the Society.

1. How grace came to the throne: “*through righteousness*”. “*Sin hath reigned unto death*” and “the strength of sin is the law” (1 Cor 15:56). “Who-soever committeth sin transgresseth also the law” (1 John 3:4). Whosoever transgresses is condemned by the law to death. The law is therefore the strength of sin. It is because of the curse of the law that it reigns unto death.

And the sinner is shut out from God’s favour under the law. Till the law’s claims are met, the favour of God can never be extended to the sinner. While he is shut out from God, and God’s favour shut up from him, he must be under the dominion of sin. Sin reigns in him as well as over him. The law in its very holiness is thus indirectly the strength of sin as it reigns in the heart.

Until, therefore, a righteousness is provided which can meet the demands of justice and the requirements of the law, grace can never reign. But *there is such a righteousness*. If so, it must be wrought out by *another* than the sinner. Only by eternal dying can the sinner satisfy divine justice, and to satisfy it thus would put him for ever beyond the reach of grace. And the carnal mind in him “is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be” (Rom 8:7).

That other must have been the sinner’s kinsman and substitute. He must be his *kinsman*, for the righteousness must be wrought out in human nature. In that nature He must stand in *the relation to God* which God in His sovereignty has, under the law, assigned as a covenant to Adam and his seed. But God has “sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law” (Gal 4:4). His work is the righteousness through which grace reigns.

Being substituted for His people, He represents them as *guilty persons*. All therefore that was chargeable against them must be imputed unto Him. “The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all” (Is 53:6). For these He is now answerable. For these He has made atonement by blood. He “by Himself” has atoned for sin. He has done so by His blood, by His sufferings unto death. See here sin reigning unto death. It had condemning power over Him. He dies because sin is imputed to Him. But sin has not made an end of Him. He has made an end of sin. Having fully atoned by His death, sin has no dominion over Him. He died unto sin once, but He now lives unto God.

Being substituted for His people He represents them as *subjects under the law*. He charges Himself with meeting the claims of the law for obedience. He has fulfilled all righteousness. And now therefore grace may reign. Sin in its guilt no longer stands in the way. It has been made an end of. Its reign terminated in death and the death is accomplished and past. The law’s cause is exhausted. Justice was fully satisfied with the blood of Jesus Christ the Son. And the law’s claims are met. It cannot any longer stand between grace and the sinner. It has been magnified and made honourable.

Grace may therefore reign. *Truth* is not disposed to protest. It has been glorified. The sentence of death has been executed, and the promise of grace must therefore be fulfilled, and truth and mercy are now together both concerned in giving effect to the promise. *Justice* is not disposed to protest. Never was it glorified as by the righteousness of Emmanuel. The *magnified law* will not oppose the enthroning of grace. God is committed by His purpose of salvation. It is in the interests of His glory to enthrone His grace.

2. How grace is in possession of the throne: “by Jesus Christ our Lord”. “By one man sin entered” (v 12) and by one comes grace. By Adam, the fallen head of the covenant of works, sin entered. By Christ, the infallible Head of the covenant of grace, grace reigns. As the covenant Head, He undertook to remove the legal barriers to the reign of grace. By His righteousness He has done so.

It was promised to Him that He would be raised up on high and receive all the provision of the covenant in order that covenant blessings might be dispensed to His redeemed. In Him this exalted grace reigns. If such was the end for which He was exalted, grace verily reigns in Him. Jesus Christ reigns; therefore grace reigns.

Jesus the Saviour whom God provided and sealed is Lord; all fulness of grace is in Him; and all power in heaven and on earth is His. He is a Prince and a Saviour; therefore grace reigns – “by Jesus Christ our Lord”. All who can rightly say, “Jesus Christ is our Lord,” are subjects of grace.

There is a difference between the second Adam and the first which must here be noted. The first Adam by his disobedience introduced the reign of sin and death. But he was not the prince of this kingdom. The first man as an individual was, we hope, delivered from the reign of sin, so as to be neither monarch nor head in the kingdom of sin. He puts forth now no influence in promoting the reign which he introduced by his disobedience. But it is not so with the second Adam. He by His obedience introduced the reign of grace. But this is not all. Grace reigns in His Person. He reigns. It is His power that continually advances the reign of grace. They who were reconciled by His death are saved by His life.

How the reign of grace is identified with, and secured by, the reign of Christ will appear if we consider: (1) that Jesus Christ is the anointed Saviour just in order to the accomplishment of the purposes of grace; He is the gift and embodiment of divine grace; (2) how completely He has laid the foundation of the throne of grace in His finished work. The reign of grace not only consists with, but conduces to, the glory of God; (3) how highly God has exalted Him; He has given Him all the fulness of His grace to dispense; He has given Him all power in heaven and in earth; He has given Him the Holy

Ghost; (4) that the reign of Jesus is the reign of God as surely as the reign of grace; all the resources of Jehovah are forthcoming for the advancement of the kingdom of grace.

3. How grace acts upon the throne: it reigns “unto eternal life”. If grace reigns it must have subjects. And where shall these be found? All men are under the reign of sin. From among these, grace must find its subjects. There are none else on earth. And, strange to tell, none else could be the subjects of grace. Grace has suitable material for making up its subjects in sinners.

Christ comes forth in a day of His power to make His people among men willing. He knows who were given to Him. He knows who were redeemed by His blood. He has a right to these. He has been promised them (Ps 110). His visit and His work may not be recognised as gracious when He comes by His Spirit. But so it is. He causes them to feel the bondage in which they live as prisoners and as slaves. This brings them to self-despair. But He is the resurrection and the life, and there is hope even for the dead. He quickens them by His Spirit. They now know Him and are willing to receive Him.

The righteousness which is of God by faith is imputed to them. They are justified freely by grace. They enter in through righteousness to be under the reign of grace. Grace can now take its own way with them. They are in the kingdom of grace. *Adoption* results.

And the kingdom of grace is *in* them. It may seem strange that if they are so under the reign of grace, the kingdom of grace should be in them as it is. We must not think that grace does not reign in them. The kingdom of grace is not all an outside thing. Yet many think so.

Grace reigns in them. How? Has it expelled all sin from the soul? No. There is the company of two armies in the subjects of grace. Why so? They are thus made to feel that it is a kingdom of grace in which they are. The old man in all his members is still within them. He puts forth his power as a law in their members and prevents them doing what they would; it is not inactive. Yea, the power of sin often succeeds in drawing them aside from the ways of the Lord. Yet, notwithstanding, grace does reign in them:

(1.) Because it alone has a title to be king within them. All besides are usurpers who attempt to reign. Sin, originally a usurper, has lost its strength from the law when they were being justified.

(2.) Because grace has actual possession of the throne. The will has been changed now, and this conquest will not be lost.

(3.) Because the power of grace as a divinely-royal power keeps the soul from the power of sin.

(4.) Because supplies of grace are given out of the royal treasure in Christ the Head – guiding, restoring, sanctifying.

And thus shall it be till eternal life is reached and fully and eternally enjoyed. To this they had a title, of this they had a foretaste, and for this they were prepared.

Application. We may see here what the only alternative is: either to be under the reign of sin or under the reign of grace. There is no neutral state. How many think there is!

How dismal the condition of all who are not subjects of grace! They are slaves to the enemy of God – engaged in a service of enmity to God, toiling for the wages of death. What are they working for? For the pain of being consumed by the worm that does not die, for a fulness of divine wrath, for the companionship of devils, for the suffering of fire unquenchable.

How great the obligation under which the subjects of grace are! Think of what you were. Think of what was done for you. Think of your prospect. Prove to the world that grace is reigning, by resisting temptations, and enduring trials under which the flesh must fail.

Behold here a door of hope for sinners and of comfort for God’s people.

Richard Baxter¹

3. His Theology

In several areas, Baxter’s doctrine leaves much to be desired. A contemporary authority on Baxter has written, “As a theologian he was, though brilliant, something of a disaster”.² It would be well to remember that Baxter’s formal education was limited; in theology he was very much a self-taught man. He was at first thoroughly Calvinistic, but from the later 1640s onwards he took up an essentially-Amyraldian position on the atonement. This deviation from Scripture teaching was originally due to John Cameron, a Scot who taught in the seminary at Saumur, in France, but is named after his colleague Moise Amyraut – though Baxter came to his conclusions in this area independently of the Saumur theologians.

Amyraldianism holds to a universal atonement – teaching that Christ died for all mankind. It is something of a halfway house between Calvinism and

¹This is the final section of a paper given at the 2007 Theological Conference. The first two articles focused on Baxter’s life.

²J I Packer, *Among God’s Giants*, Kingsway Publications, 1991, p 209. Packer also notes that “as pastor, evangelist, and devotional writer no place for him can be too high”, though clearly his faulty theology affected, more or less, these other areas of his work also. It should be noted that while this book and *some* others written by Dr Packer are almost-uniformly excellent, the weakness in his attitude to Rome gives serious cause for concern.

Arminianism; so it further teaches that only the elect believe and are saved. Among others who held to this position of hypothetical universalism were Archbishop Usher and Bishop Davenant. Baxter wrote that Christ “purchased all men from the legal necessity of perishing that they were in, into His own power, as their owner and ruler, that so He might make over reconciliation, remission and salvation to all if they will believe, and might send forth sufficient means and help of grace to draw all men towards Him, resolving to draw His elect infallibly to Him”.³ Yet Christ’s work of redemption, according to such teachings, avails nothing for those who never come to faith, even though the claim is made that He actually suffered unto death for them.

As so often, Baxter was trying to steer a middle course, this time between fully-Reformed teaching and Arminianism. If the gospel is to be offered to all, he argued, then all must have been redeemed. He was convinced that the Bible “makes it as clear as the light that Christ died for all”.⁴ Yet if we do turn to the Bible, we find that the truth is otherwise. For instance, in one chapter, John 10, Christ taught, first, that He was to give “His life for the sheep” (v 11) – not for all mankind – and went on to say that these same sheep hear His voice, they follow Him and He gives eternal life to them, so that “they shall never perish” (vv 27,28). In other words, those who for whom Christ died are – no more and no fewer – those who believe and are saved.

Hypothetical universalism, Baxter’s doctrine, loses sight of the fact that Christ, in working out redemption, was the representative of His people and only His people, who individually have the right to say, “He was wounded for *our* transgressions, He was bruised for *our* iniquities: the chastisement of *our* peace was upon Him; and with His stripes *we* are healed” (Is 53:5). In the whole of His work – in particular, in His sufferings and death – Christ was their substitute, enduring for each of them the punishment which they deserved to suffer, as well as working out a righteousness for them. Perhaps it is no wonder that John Owen uses scathing words to describe a treatise by Amayraut to which Baxter had referred in attempting to refute various statements in Owen’s *Death of Death*. He finds that treatise “full of weak and sophistical argumentations, absurd contradictions, vain strife of words”.⁵ Yet, at the same time, he pays a handsome tribute to Baxter’s abilities.

Highly influential in Baxter’s thinking was what he called the “political method”. In this he was strongly influenced by the writings of Hugo Grotius,

³Quoted in J I Packer, *The Redemption and Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter*, Paternoster Press, 2003, p 223.

⁴Quoted in Packer, *Redemption and Restoration*, p 231.

⁵*Of the Death of Christ*, in *Works*, vol 10, p 479.

a Dutchman who supported the Arminian party in his home country and held other serious errors. Baxter accordingly believed that the Bible's teaching about God's kingdom and rule should be understood in the light of the political ideas of the time: God must be regarded as Governor of the world and the gospel treated as part of His legal code; further, God must be free to change His laws if this leads to a desirable outcome.

If we are to be saved, Baxter taught, we need a twofold righteousness; one element of this is Christ's righteousness, because of which God is able to set forth a new law. (This concept of a new law led to such teachings being described as *Neonomianism*.) By satisfying the requirements of the old law, Baxter held, Christ received the right to relax the law of works; in other words, He procured a new law for mankind. The second element in his theory is human righteousness, the result of obeying the new law by faith and repentance. Faith, rather than Christ's righteousness, is imputed to the believer because, in Baxter's eyes, it is real obedience to the gospel.

In his *A Call to the Unconverted*, for instance, his views on the atonement allowed him to address "all unsanctified persons that shall read this book" as those whom God had *bought* "at so dear a rate as the blood of . . . Jesus Christ". Yet the book contains much excellent matter. For instance, with fine discrimination he identifies "a wicked man" thus: "He is one that placeth his chief content on earth, and loveth the creature more than God, and his fleshly prosperity above the heavenly felicity. He savoureth the things of the flesh, but neither discernth nor savoureth the things of the spirit. Though he will say that heaven is better than earth, yet doth he not really so esteem it to himself. If he might be sure of earth, he would let go heaven, and had rather stay here than be removed thither. A life of perfect holiness in the sight of God and in His love, and praises for ever in heaven, doth not find such liking with his heart as a life of health and wealth and honour here upon earth. . . . In a word, whoever loveth earth above heaven, and fleshly prosperity more than God, is a wicked, unconverted man."⁶

Yet Charles Simeon, while heaping great praise on Baxter's *The Saints Everlasting Rest*, commented, "Baxter was deficient in one thing, that of holding up the glory and excellence of Christ as the great means of drawing and transforming the heart. It is by beholding His glory that we are changed into the same image."⁷

Baxter wrote more on the subject of justification than on any other, but it

⁶Quoted from the volume of Baxter's writings in *The Works of the English Puritan Divines* series, London, 1846, p 83.

⁷Quoted in Iain H Murray, "Richard Baxter – 'The Reluctant Puritan'?" in *Advancing in Adversity*, Westminster Conference papers for 1991, pp 18,19.

is at this point that other Puritans were most concerned about his theology. Yet we must bear in mind that his terminology was influenced by his “political method” and that he was constantly using expressions in a different sense from everyone else; so words such as *law*, *works*, *merit*, *righteousness*, *justification* and *imputation* all meant something different from these same words as used by other authors. Thus, if one could understand what Baxter wrote, as he intended it to be understood, certain statements which read like false doctrine may not be so far removed from Scripture truth. However, by writing as he did, he left himself wide open to misinterpretation and, more seriously, pointed others down various by-paths of false doctrine.

Justification is the imputation to the sinner of Christ’s righteousness. But does this include His active righteousness? No, said Baxter, and in place of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness he spoke of a real, personal compliance with the terms of the new law of grace. Although Baxter may not so have understood it, this sounds very much a religion of works. He was afraid that a doctrine of imputed holiness – which, at least in the common use of words, is distinct from an imputed *righteousness* – would take away any stimulus for the believer to lead a holy life, and thus lead to practical Antinomianism.

The fact is that, ever since his experiences in the army, Baxter was constantly reacting against those whom he called Antinomians – in particular, the strange idea that the justified person is no longer, for instance, an idolater, a persecutor, a thief, or even a sinful person; he is, they claimed, “as pure in the sight of God as the righteousness of Christ can make him”.⁸ Further, they taught that the sins of God’s people can do them no harm; thus, no matter how deeply they may fall into sin, there is no reason for them to question their salvation.⁹ Clearly Baxter was on strong ground in reacting against such doctrines; the trouble was that his way of thinking led him onto distinctly shaky ground.

Baxter saw three distinct parts in justification: (1) The sinner’s first act of faith is in obedience to the command of God’s new law; and God, according to Baxter, imputes his faith to the sinner, in line with his understanding of the statement in Romans: “Faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness” (4:9).¹⁰ The sinner benefits from Christ’s obedience because He, by

⁸Quoted in Packer, *Redemption and Restoration*, p 249; the words are those of John Saltmarsh. Initially a minister in Northampton, Saltmarsh’s writings are described by Benjamin Brooks as “strongly tinged with the principles of Antinomianism” (*The Lives of the Puritans*, Soli Deo Gloria reprint, 1994, vol 3, p 74).

⁹More scripturally, Thomas Scott wrote, “I would not give a farthing for that assurance which sin does not shake” (quoted in *The Christian’s Daily Companion*. Glasgow, 1845, p 168).

¹⁰Contrast John Calvin: “We say that faith justifies, not because it merits justification for us by its own worth, but because it is an *instrument* by which we freely obtain the right-

dying, procured the new covenant. Thus the sinner is justified when he believes. (2) There is, in Baxter's thought, a further justification at the day of judgement, when the believer's faith is proved to have been genuine through the evidence of his works. (3) The third form of justification has to do with the bestowal of the benefits and rewards, both in this life and in the next, which are promised to those who obey the law.

Apart from the fact that the last two points have nothing to do with the doctrine of justification, as that term is normally understood, the first is defective because it omits the imputation of Christ's active obedience to the sinner, something that Baxter denied. Indeed it has been argued that Baxter's 11 arguments against the imputation of Christ's active obedience apply also to the imputation of Christ's passive (that is, His suffering) obedience.¹¹

But not only does Scripture teach that Christ suffered the penalty due to the believing sinner because of his sins, so that he is justly forgiven, but also that the believer is treated as if he had personally kept the law, because Christ kept it as his substitute. A present-day writer, reflecting on the teaching of the Reformation, has put the matter like this: "What one needs to stand in the judgement, Calvin declares over and over again, is a perfect righteousness. No matter how much progress one makes in grace during this life, so that one's life becomes holier, holier and holier, it will never get to that point where it will be able to stand in the judgement."¹²

The result of Baxter's thinking on this doctrine, whatever may be said by way of mitigation, was to leave the subject in a state of dangerous confusion. Controversy was to break out in the 1690s between the Neonomians and those who were accused of Antinomianism, a controversy which brought forth Robert Trail's valuable little volume, *A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification from the Unjust Charge of Antinomianism*. Traill complains that the Neonomians "hold 'that Christ died to merit this of the Father: namely, that we might be justified upon easier terms under the gospel than those of the law of innocency. Instead of justification by perfect obedience, we are now to be justified by our own evangelical righteousness, made up of faith, repentance and sincere obedience'. And if we hold not with them in this, they tell the world we are enemies to evangelical holiness, slighting the practice of all good works, and allowing our hearers to live as they list [wish]. But they slander the preachers of free grace, because we do

eousness of Christ" (*Institutes* 3.18.8, Beveridge translation, emphasis added).

¹¹Hans Boersma, *A Hot Pepper Corn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in its Seventeenth-Century Context of Controversy*, Regent College Publishing reprint, 2004, p 223.

¹²W Robert Godfrey in *Covenant, Justification, and Pastoral Ministry*, edited by R Scott Clark, P & R Publishing, 2007, p 277.

not place justification in our own inherent holiness, but in Christ's perfect righteousness, imputed to us upon our believing in Him."¹³

Robert Baillie, the Scottish Church leader, concerned about what Baxter had published on justification, wrote to Simeon Ashe, his former colleague at the Westminster Assembly: "Why take you no care either to gain the man from his errors, or yoke with him some able divines to guard against his infection? Sundry here are thinking of taking him to task; but I love and highly esteem the man, for much good I find in his writings." Ashe replied, "As for Mr Baxter, he is doubtless a godly man, though tenacious in his mistakes. Mr Burgess and Mr Vines dealt with him to reduce him [bring him back], but could not convince him to satisfaction." Years later Edward Stillingfleet, best-known for his book on *Popery*,¹⁴ described Baxter as one "who seldom takes the advice of friends".¹⁵ More was the pity, because he had good friends, men who had a much sounder grasp of doctrine than he did.

Baxter's "political method" had serious consequences. It was essentially rationalistic, imposing a human framework on God's eternal Word. Thus he "sowed the seeds of moralism with regard to sin, Arianism with regard to Christ, legalism with regard to faith and salvation, and liberalism with regard to God. In his own teaching, steeped as it was in the . . . Puritan tradition, *these seeds lay largely dormant*, but later Presbyterianism in both England and Scotland reaped the bitter crop. It is sadly fitting that the Richard Baxter Church in Kidderminster today should be – Unitarian."¹⁶

There is much to evoke admiration in Baxter's life; there is much to cause dismay, particularly in his doctrine. And, as it has recently been expressed, "Hold fast the form of sound words' is not a Baxterian emphasis. . . . Baxter opened a door to the attitude which identified charity with a refusal to contend for the truth and he thus contributed to the ethos which made moderation and 'open-mindedness' the supposedly great virtues of the Church in the eighteenth century."¹⁷ This attitude caused considerable harm to many students for the ministry in the eighteenth-century dissenting academies, such as that run by Philip Doddridge in Northampton. In lecturing on the Trinity, he described both the orthodox and heterodox opinions of contemporary theologians with-

¹³*Works of Robert Traill*, Banner of Truth reprint, 1975, vol 1, p 258. The work on justification is currently in print in paperback from the same publishers.

¹⁴When this volume was reprinted in 1837, William Cunningham wrote an extensive preface which provides a devastating analysis of the Roman Catholic system. However, Stillingfleet was a Latitudinarian (see footnote 14 in the previous article).

¹⁵The last three quotations are from Murray, p 13.

¹⁶Packer, *Among God's Giants*, p 210, emphasis added.

¹⁷The comment is from Murray, p 20.

out giving any indication as to which of these should be accepted as scriptural and which should be rejected. “Many things”, he told his students, “asserted on the one side and on the other relating to the Trinity are not fundamental in religion.”¹⁸

Yes, Baxter had serious weaknesses, but we have also noted positive comments by respected contemporaries on his godliness. We may give himself the last word, as in his older years he expressed his spiritual outlook: “I am more solicitous than I have been about my duty to God and less solicitous about His dealings with me, as being assured that He will do all things well”.¹⁹

God’s Eternal Decree and Preaching (1)¹

Rev H M Cartwright

RB Kuiper comments that “it behoves us to remember that we are dealing with a profound mystery, that we are here on holy ground where angels fear to tread, that finite man cannot begin to comprehend the infinite God, and that therefore we must be sober, scrupulously avoiding human speculation and abiding strictly by the sure Word of God”.² In beginning their *Confession* with a chapter on *The Holy Scripture*, the Westminster Assembly made it clear that they sought to formulate their doctrines under the authority and in the light of the Word of God. It is most appropriate and logical that the chapter on *God’s Eternal Decree* should immediately follow that on *God and the Holy Trinity*, for the Decree of God is intimately bound up with the Being and glory of God and is fundamental to everything that God has revealed and to everything that has taken place in time.

In this paper, after a brief introductory summary of the doctrine set forth in the third chapter of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, we shall concentrate attention on particular aspects of the teaching. Then we shall try to consider the relation between the doctrine and preaching – the place which preaching has in God’s decree and the place which God’s decree has in preaching.

1. Introductory summary. The gist of the chapter is summed up in the statement of the *Shorter Catechism* that “the decrees of God are His eternal

¹⁸Quoted in Robert Strivens, “Philip Doddridge and Theological Education”, in *Puritans and Spiritual Life*, Westminster Conference papers for 2001, p 73.

¹⁹*Autobiography*, Everyman edition, edited by J M Lloyd Thomas, 1931, p 125.

¹This discussion of chapter 3 of *The Westminster Confession of Faith* was first presented to the Theological Conference in December 2007.

²In the chapter, “God’s Sovereign Election and Preaching”, in *God Centred Evangelism*, p 33.

purpose, according to the counsel of His will, whereby, for His own glory, He hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass” (answer 7). This traces everything which takes place in time, without exception, to God's purpose – a purpose as eternal as Himself, a purpose characterised by the sovereignty of His own will and by His infinite wisdom, a purpose which aims at and secures the manifestation of His own glory.

The *Confession* deals with these matters in more detail and particularly deals with the predestination of some men and angels to everlasting life and the foreordination of others to everlasting death. In doing so it draws attention to some of the characteristics of God's decree and of the divine will coming to expression in it – such as wisdom, holiness, freeness, unchangeableness. It asserts that the Decree is such that it does not make God the author of sin, it does not do violence to the will of the creature, and it does not take away from the liberty of second causes and the real dependence of one event on another, but rather secures these. It clearly affirms that God does not decree things because He foresees what is going to happen, though He knows all that is going to happen and all that could possibly happen on any given condition.

In dealing with predestination and foreordination it emphasises how particular and unchangeable God's purpose is. The Decree which provides for the eternal salvation of those whom God has chosen unto salvation in Christ “out of His mere free grace and love”, and not on account of anything in those elected, also provides for all the means, objective and subjective, necessary to bring about their salvation. In dealing with that aspect of the Decree according to which God passes by those whom He does not elect and ordains them to dishonour and wrath, the *Confession* ascribes the passing by to God's sovereign will but ascribes the consequences of that to their own sin, though these consequences also belong to God's ordination.

2. Particular aspects of the teaching.

2 (a) *The fact and nature of God's decree.* The title and content of this chapter speak of God's decree in the singular. The *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms* speak of God's decrees in the plural. This may suggest that the question of whether we speak of the decree or the decrees was not regarded as significant. It may also suggest that the different documents had in view different aspects of the subject. The distinction may be useful when we take account of differences in what people believe concerning what they call “the order of the decrees” – the difference between the Supralapsarian and Infralapsarian schemes.

We have to bear in mind the unity of the divine decree. As Dabney puts it, “It is one act of the Divine mind; and not many . . . *prothesis* a “purpose”,

a “counsel”. It follows from the nature of God . . . the whole decree is eternal and immutable. All therefore must co-exist together always in God’s mind. . . . God’s plan is shown, in its effectuation, to be one; cause is linked with effect, and what was effect becomes cause.” As he goes on to say, “All who call themselves Calvinists admit that God’s decree is, in His mind, a contemporaneous unit”.³ But as Herman Bavinck explains, “The one and only and eternal decree of God is gradually and little by little unfolded before the eye of the creature, unfurling itself in many events and happenings, each of which in turn points back to a definite moment in the single decree of God, so that in our human language we speak of the decrees of God in the plural. This manner of speech should not be condemned as long as we maintain and recognise the close relation that obtains between the several decrees and the fact that in God the decree is one.”⁴

As another Dutch theologian puts it: “In considering God’s decree we must differentiate between viewing this decree relative to the decreeing God, it being a singular act of His will, or relative to the matters which have been decreed. In the latter there are as many dimensions to this decree as there are matters to which this decree relates”.⁵ *Decree* describes God’s eternal will, purpose, good pleasure, plan, as the single unit that it is in the mind of the eternal and unchangeable God. *Decrees* describes that purpose as it comes to expression in all its variety in its outworking and in the observation of finite creatures of time.

2 (b) Freedom within the absolute and totally comprehensive decree. *God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass: yet so, as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established* (Westminster Confession 3:1).

The absolute and totally comprehensive nature of the Divine decree could not be stated more unambiguously. Every single thing which takes place takes place in accordance with the purpose of God, a purpose determined by Himself in the exercise of His own free will, characterised by infinite wisdom, and put into effect inevitably and in every detail. Nothing is excluded from this positive foreordination of God. And it is free from all change. As A A Hodge says in his *Outlines of Theology*: “There can never be any addition to His wisdom, nor surprise to His foreknowledge, nor resistance to His power; and therefore there never can be any occasion to reverse or modify

³*Lectures in Systematic Theology*, pp 214,232.

⁴*The Doctrine of God*, p 372.

⁵Wilhelmus à Brakel, *The Christian’s Reasonable Service*, vol 1, pp 196-7.

that infinitely wise and righteous purpose which, from the perfection of His nature, He formed from eternity".⁶

This is something quite different from the heathenish doctrine of fate. It is different in that, instead of being the product of the blind necessity of material causes, all that comes to pass is determined by the living and true God, who is "a Spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable, in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth".⁷ It is also quite different from fate in that it does not deprive agents of responsibility for what they will and do and in that it does not do away with the meaningfulness of second causes or the reality of the connection between second causes and their effects. As A A Hodge says in *The Confession of Faith*: God's decree "is in all things consistent with His own most wise, benevolent, and holy nature" and "is in all things perfectly consistent with the nature and mode of action of the creatures severally embraced within it".⁸

A wide and very important field of enquiry opens up here in which we have to tread warily, as it is full of man-made pitfalls. Whatever attempts may be made by theologians or philosophers to try to explain, or explain away, how that which is infallibly and unchangeably decreed by God can yet be the free action of the person who does it, we have ultimately to accept both sides of the proposition because they are affirmed in Scripture.

Three classic expressions of this truth are found in what we may think is one of the least theological books of the New Testament, the Acts of the Apostles: "Him being delivered by the *determinate* counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by *wicked* hands have crucified and slain" (2:23); "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together *against* the Lord, and *against* His Christ. For of a truth *against* Thy holy child Jesus, whom Thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, *for to do whatsoever Thy hand and Thy counsel determined before to be done*" (4:26-28); "And now I exhort you to be of good cheer: for there shall be no loss of any man's life among you, but of the ship. For there stood by me this night the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Caesar: and, lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee. Wherefore, sirs, be of good cheer: for I believe God that it shall be even as it was told me. . . . And Paul said to the centurion and to the soldiers, Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved" (27:22-26,31).

A A Hodge affirms that "all the decrees of God are equally efficacious in

⁶P 168.

⁷*Shorter Catechism*, answer 4.

⁸P 63.

the sense that they all infallibly determine the certain futuration of the event decreed. Theologians, however, classify the decrees of God thus: (1.) As efficacious, in as far as they respect those events which He has determined to effect through necessary causes, or by His own immediate agency. (2.) As permissive, as far as they respect those events which He has determined to allow dependent free agents to effect.” These references to “permission” and “allowing” are attempts to conserve the biblical truth that God is not the author of sin and that intelligent creatures act according to their own will and on their own responsibility.

Hodge goes on to say: “All the sins which men commit, the Scriptures attribute wholly to the man himself. Yet God’s permissive decree does truly determine the certain futuration of the act; because God, knowing certainly that the man in question would in the given circumstances so act, did place that very man in precisely those circumstances that he should so act. But in neither case, whether in working the good in us, or in placing us where we will certainly do the wrong, does God in executing His purpose ever violate or restrict the perfect freedom of the agent”.⁹

In *Evangelical Theology* A A Hodge says that “the decree at the same time determines that man shall be a free agent, shall possess a certain character, shall be surrounded by a certain environment, shall be specifically solicited by certain external influences, shall be internally moved by certain spontaneous affections, shall deliberately canvass certain reasons, and shall freely make certain choices. The man thus is, as far as a finite creature may be, entirely self-moved and self-determined, and therefore he is free.”¹⁰ James Fisher, in *The Assembly’s Shorter Catechism Explained* asks, “Is the permissive decree a bare inactive permitting of evil? No, it determines the event of the evil permitted, and overrules it to a good end, contrary to the intention of the work and worker. . . . It is permissive with respect to the sinfulness of the action as a moral evil; and efficacious with respect to the matter of it as a natural act”.¹¹

Because of the liability to misconceptions, it is best to keep clear of the terminology of permission, as the *Confession* itself does here, unless carefully guarded and qualified, and just to recognise the truth which it is seeking to conserve, which is well expressed by Dabney: “God’s decree ‘foreordains whatsoever comes to pass’; there was no event in the womb of the future, the futuration of which was not made certain to God by it. But we believe that this certainty is effectuated in different ways, according to the different natures

⁹*Outlines of Theology*, pp 172,174.

¹⁰p 130.

¹¹His questions 28 and 30 on Question 7 of the *Shorter Catechism*.

of God's creatures. One class of effects God produces by His own immediate agency. . . . The other class of effects is the spontaneous acts of rational free agents other than God."¹² As A A Hodge says of these free acts of free agents: "If the plan of God did not determine events of this class, He could make nothing certain, and His government of the world would be made contingent and dependent, and all His purposes fallible and mutable"¹³

We have to be content to assert the fundamental teaching of the first section on the basis of the Biblical revelation, and agree with John Dick that "upon such a subject no man should be ashamed to acknowledge his ignorance. We are not required to reconcile the divine decrees and human liberty. It is enough to know that God has decreed all things which come to pass, and that men are answerable for their actions. Of both these truths we are assured by the Scriptures; and the latter is confirmed by the testimony of conscience"¹⁴ This first section enforces Calvin's advice in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*: "Let it, therefore, be our first principle that to desire any other knowledge of predestination than that which is expounded by the Word of God is no less infatuated than to walk where there is no path, or to seek light in darkness. Let us not be ashamed to be ignorant in a matter in which ignorance is learning" (3.21.2).

2 (c) *The relation between God's decree and His knowledge.* *Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions; yet hath He not decreed any thing because He foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions* (Westminster Confession 3:2).

This section is reminding us that God's foreordination of all things does not depend upon His foresight. What He purposed was not conditioned by what he saw His creatures would do. God's foresight depends upon His foreordination, and His foreordination does not depend upon conditions to which He has to adapt His purpose. There are events in God's purpose which are dependent upon certain conditions, but the conditions are secured by the decree of God just as surely as the events depending on them. He does not foreordain certain persons to life because He foresees that they will believe, but He ordains that those whom He intends to bring to life eternal shall believe. There are no conditional decrees, although there are conditions which are provided for within the decrees of God.

God's knowledge is infinite. He knows everything that is possible. What actually happens comes to pass because He has determined it, but it is not conditioned by anything that He has not decreed and does not control.

¹²*Systematic Theology*, pp 213-4.

¹³*Confession of Faith*, p 64.

¹⁴*Lectures on Theology*, 1846 edition, p 186.

Christ the Judge¹

J C Ryle

These verses throw light on two subjects which we can never understand too well. Our daily peace and our practice of daily watchfulness over ourselves are closely connected with a clear knowledge of these two subjects.

One thing shown in these verses is *the dignity of our Lord Jesus Christ*. We find Him saying, “He that seeth Me seeth Him that sent Me. I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on Me should not abide in darkness.” Christ’s oneness with the Father, and Christ’s office, are clearly exhibited in these words.

Concerning the unity of the Father and the Son, we must be content to believe reverently what we cannot grasp mentally or explain distinctly. Let it suffice us to know that our Saviour was not merely like the prophets and patriarchs: a man sent by God the Father, a friend of God and a witness for God. He was something far higher and greater than this. In His Divine nature He was essentially one with the Father; and in seeing Him, men saw the Father that sent Him. This is a great mystery, but a truth of vast importance to our souls. He that casts His sins on Jesus Christ by faith is building on a rock. Believing on Christ, he believes not merely on Him but on Him that sent Him.

Concerning the office of Christ, there can be little doubt that, in this place, He compares Himself to the sun. Like the sun, He has risen on this sin-darkened world with healing in His wings and shines for the common benefit of mankind. Like the sun, He is the great source and centre of all spiritual life, comfort and fertility. Like the sun, He illuminates the whole earth, and no one need miss the way to heaven if he will only use the light offered for his acceptance.

For ever let us make much of Christ in all our religion. We can never trust Him too much, follow Him too closely, or commune with Him too unreservedly. He has all power in heaven and earth. He is able to save to the uttermost all who come to God by Him. None can pluck them out of the hand of Him who is one with the Father. He can make all their way to heaven bright and plain and cheerful, like the morning sun cheering the traveller. Looking unto Him, they will find light in their understandings, see light on the path of life they have to travel, feel light in their hearts, and find the days of darkness – which will sometimes come – stripped of half their gloom. Only let us abide in Him, and look to Him with a single eye. There is a mine

¹An extract, slightly edited, from *Expository Thoughts on John*, vol 2. Ryle is here commenting on John 12:44-50.

of meaning in His words: "If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light" (Matt 6:22).

Another thing shown in these verses is *the certainty of a judgement to come*. We find our Lord saying, "He that rejecteth Me, and receiveth not My words, hath One that judgeth Him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day".

There is a last day! The world shall not always go on as it does now. Buying and selling, sowing and reaping, planting and building, marrying and giving in marriage – all this shall come to an end at last. There is a time appointed by the Father when the whole machinery of creation shall stop, and the present dispensation shall be changed for another. It had a beginning, and it shall also have an end. Banks shall at length close their doors for ever. Stock exchanges shall be shut. Parliaments shall be dissolved. The very sun, which since Noah's flood has done its daily work so faithfully, shall rise and set no more. Well would it be if we thought more of this day? Rent days, birthdays and wedding days are often regarded as days of absorbing interest. But they are nothing compared to the last day.

There is a judgement coming! Men have their reckoning days, and God will at last have His. The trumpet shall sound. The dead shall be raised incorruptible. The living shall be changed. All, of every name and nation and people and tongue, shall stand before the judgement-seat of Christ. The books shall be opened and the evidence brought forth. Our true character will come out before the world. There will be no concealment, no evasion, no false colouring. Everyone shall give account of Himself to God, and all shall be judged according to their works. The wicked shall go away into everlasting fire, and the righteous into life eternal.

These are awful truths! But they are truths, and ought to be told. No wonder that the Roman governor Felix trembled when Paul the prisoner discoursed about "righteousness, temperance, and judgement to come" (Acts 24:25). Yet the believer in the Lord Jesus Christ has no cause to be afraid. For him, at any rate, there is no condemnation, and the last assize need have no terrors. The bias of his life shall witness for him; while the shortcomings of his life shall not condemn him. It is the man who rejects Christ and will not hear His call to repentance – he is the man who in the judgement day will have reason to be cast down and afraid.

Let the thought of judgement to come have a practical effect on our religion. Let us daily judge ourselves with righteous judgement so that we may not be judged and condemned of the Lord. Let us so speak and so act as men who will be judged by the law of liberty (James 2:12). Let us make conscience of all our hourly conduct and never forget that we must give account at the

last day for every idle word. In a word, let us live like those who believe in the truth of judgement, heaven and hell. So living we shall be Christians indeed and in truth and have boldness in the day of Christ's appearing.

Let the judgement day be the Christian's answer and apology when men ridicule him as too strict, too precise and too particular in his religion. Irreligion may do tolerably well for a season, so long as a man is in health and prosperous and looks at nothing but this world. But he who truly believes that he must give account to the Judge of quick and dead, at His appearing and kingdom, will never be content with an ungodly life. He may say, "There is a judgement. I can never serve God too much. Christ died for me. I can never do too much for Him."

Keep Unspotted from the World (1)¹

J B Waterbury

One part of "pure religion" is to keep "unspotted from the world". How few reflect daily on this feature of true piety, and how little danger is felt by professing Christians from constant contact with the world. But how carefully does a woman adjust and protect a clean garment when the path becomes obstructed and her dress exposed. One spot may mar its beauty and make its owner sigh; but if is spoiled by rough contact with some object, it will henceforth be laid aside as useless. Is the care which we bestow upon the soul, or even on the Christian character, to be compared with this? And would not some professing Christians sigh over a soiled garment more than at the gradual weakening of spiritual purity which they are experiencing by constant contact with the world?

But shall we therefore retire into obscurity and, like the ascetic, prohibit contact with society, while we pore in silent abstraction over our own feelings? We answer that one extreme, if dangerous, does not justify us in flying to the other, if it is forbidden. Now our Saviour, in His commands and counsels, has not advised us to go to this latter extreme but has actually indicated His disapprobation of it by declaring that His followers are "the salt of the earth" and "the light of the world". And by exhorting them to "let their light shine before men" it is clear that He requires us to live in the world and to illustrate our religion before its eyes. In His intercessory prayer also

¹The first of two slightly-edited chapters, entitled, "Constant contact with the world unfavourable to pious joy", taken from the little book, *Who Are the Happy?* Waterbury was a nineteenth-century American minister, author of *Advice to a Young Christian*, which appeared chapter by chapter in *The Young People's Magazine* some years ago.

He says, "I pray not that Thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldst keep them from the evil". This is precisely in harmony with the characteristic of pure religion to keep one "unspotted from the world". And this is all we plead for: that if a Christian would not let down his profession and part with his appropriate joy, he must walk carefully in a world so filled with objects liable to mar his high calling.

The ascetic life, and the over-tasked and jaded spirit that passes almost its entire existence in the busy and care-corroding world, are extremes. We shall not undertake to estimate the comparative guilt and danger of these extremes but simply observe that, in our times, if there be guilt in the life of an ascetic, it is not very probable that many of those who profess religion will incur it. The danger with us lies at the other extreme; and assimilation with, rather than separation from the world, is likely to involve us in guilt and to take from us our confidence and joy.

The world has almost given up its persecuting spirit, either because Christianity has become so predominant as fearlessly to ask the shield of the law to protect her, or – which it is feared is the more palpable reason – so little of her pure spirit is manifested that no opposition is excited, and hence a sort of compromise has gradually, though not avowedly, taken place. The world will tolerate piety if those who profess it will so modify their conduct that it will not disturb the fears of the worldling, but rather afford an apology for his continued idolatry. The line of separation having thus gradually faded, the professing Christian is solicited to part with his scruples and to mingle indiscriminately with men of all principles.

Now what is the effect of this? In the first place, the pious man is thrown off his guard by these circumstances, and goes into the world with almost as little fear of evil consequences as if he were associating only with the good. The next effect of such free and constant intercourse is to diminish the glow of pious feeling and to weaken the power of conscience. At length the professing Christian can scarcely live out of the world. Its business, its politics, its stirring events – even its pleasures – are gradually becoming topics of deep interest. His joy is now derived from other sources than it was wont to be. The place of retirement used to have attractions, and the throne of grace used to be visited as the soul's happy home. How many hours of tranquil delight have been passed in secret, the world shut out; but now these joys are gone.

Serious obstructions have occurred. The world has put in its claim. It has gone to the Christian and fastened on him anew its chain. It has required of him what all tyrants do, that he should acknowledge no other master. It says to him: "You may exercise your religion on the Sabbath, when my service

cannot be performed, and I will allow you a few moments of hurried and heartless prayer in the morning and in the evening, but the rest of your time and attention I claim for the purpose of business, society and pleasure”.

We will not undertake to say how many of those who profess piety are thus drawn away by the world and live wholly amidst its exciting scenes. But many are exposed to this course of life from the particular state of society in our day and country. Their business and their engagements render them the easy victims of the world’s temptations. It is this constant contact with the world which we disapprove of and which, more than any one cause, we dread as undermining the vital principles of piety.

Is such a Christian happy? Is his joy “the joy of the Lord”? If he has ever tasted pious joy, he must feel the sad contrast in the meagre and unsatisfying pleasures which are offered to him. Look at Demas. See his care-worn brow, which used to wear the smile of heaven, and his sorrow-shaded face, which seems to say, “My religious joys are gone”. Yet he has too much conscience left to indulge the pleasures of the world without fearful misgivings. If he would speak out, he would exclaim, “I was once a happy man; I lived on the promises of God and gathered my joys along the green pastures of His grace. I loved to go alone and commune with my Maker, and felt as if the world was but a vanity. Alas, what am I now? Day after day I am busied and anxious about many things, while the one thing needful is neglected. The business I have chosen, and the engagements I have made, drive me on against the remonstrating voice of conscience, while my soul is oppressed with the fearful idea of final apostasy and ruin.”

Protestant View

The Pope as the Man of Sin

The section of the *Westminster Confession* which is most frequently attacked is that which asserts that the Pope is “that antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition” (25:6). Many who criticise this part of the *Confession* do so because they reject its teaching, yet there are others who accept the doctrine that the Pope is the “man of sin” of 2 Thessalonians 2:3 but nevertheless believe that it is an inappropriate subject for the *Confession*.

This shyness is a comparatively recent attitude. The great sixteenth- and seventeenth-century divines not only held the doctrine but readily included it in several Confessions. It is found in the *Second Helvetic Confession* of 1566, drawn up by Henry Bullinger, and endorsed by various national churches including that of Scotland. In 1603 it was added to the *French*

Confession by the National Synod of the French Reformed Church as its thirty-first Article, at the Synod of Gap. Henry IV of France strongly objected to this step but the decision was confirmed by the Synod of Rochelle in 1607. In 1615 the doctrine was included in the *Irish Articles* (paragraph 80), usually attributed to James Ussher.

In 1647 the doctrine, which had been the belief of both Presbyterians and Episcopalians in Scotland, was formally adopted by the Church of Scotland as part of the *Westminster Confession*. The two English revisions of the *Confession*, the *Savoy Declaration* of the Independents in 1658 and the *Baptist Confession* of 1689, both retained the doctrine. So too, until the twentieth century, did the various revisions to which American Presbyterians subjected the *Westminster Confession*. The doctrine is found in the marginal notes of the Geneva Bible and in the annotations of the Dutch States Bible of 1637. By virtue of its inclusion in the *Westminster Confession*, it was incorporated into the Scottish Revolution Settlement of 1690 and into the Act of Union between Scotland and England of 1707.

We believe that the doctrine is rightly included in the *Westminster Confession*, for the following reasons, among others. Firstly, it is true. The proof of this is found in the numerous Protestant expositions of 2 Thessalonians 2. Christopher Wordsworth's *Is the Papacy predicted by St Paul?* (1880, reprinted by Harrison Trust in 1985) is particularly clear, simple and convincing.

Secondly, the doctrine is important. There are innumerable truths in Scripture, far too many to be included in the *Confession*, but this doctrine is of such importance that it should be included. Its discovery, or rediscovery, was one of the fundamental impulses to the Reformation. It was when Luther, Calvin and Knox realised that the Church of Rome was beyond reformation, and was never going to be purified, and was spoken of in Scripture as destined to destruction, that they felt free and indeed duty-bound to leave her and to denounce her errors and to call on others to flee from her. Knox's very first sermon, in the parish church in St Andrews in 1547, was on Daniel 7:24-25, "the fourth beast".

In the words of his biographer, Thomas M'Crie: "He proceeded to show that this was applicable to no power but the papal. He compared the parallel passages in the New Testament, and showed that the king mentioned in his text was the same elsewhere called the man of sin, the Antichrist, the Babylonian harlot; and that, in prophetic style, these expressions did not describe a single person, but a body or multitude of people under a wicked head, including a succession of persons occupying the same place. In support of his assertion that the papal power was antichristian, he described it under

the three heads of life, doctrine, and laws. He depicted the scandalous lives of the popes from records published by Roman Catholic writers, and contrasted their doctrine and laws with those of the New Testament, particularly on the heads of justification, holy days, and abstinence from meats and from marriage. He quoted from the canon law the blasphemous titles and prerogatives ascribed to the pope, as an additional proof that he was described in his text. . . .

“This sermon, delivered with a considerable portion of that popular eloquence for which Knox was afterwards so celebrated, made a great noise, and excited much speculation among all classes. The preachers who had preceded him, not even excepting Wishart, had contented themselves with refuting some of the grosser errors of the established religion. Knox struck at the root of popery, by boldly pronouncing the pope to be Antichrist, and the whole system erroneous and antisciptural.”

Thirdly, the doctrine is *practical*. One reason for the uncertainty of recent years regarding the doctrine has been the comparative political weakness of the Church of Rome. The French Revolution and the rise of atheism have taken away much of her power in Europe, and increasingly it is Islam and atheism which are seen as the principal threats to the true Church of Christ. Roman Catholics often appear as allies in the struggle against abortion, blasphemy, sodomy, euthanasia, and islamisation. In these circumstances the doctrine provides an important reminder that the fundamental teaching of the Church of Rome is unaltered, and is as deadly and as blasphemous as ever. The Pope’s pretensions are no less astounding and Christ-dishonouring than they were in the sixteenth century. Those who remember this will be less readily duped by an appearance of evangelicalism in their local Roman priest, and will not waste their time issuing joint statements such as “Evangelicals and Catholics Together”.

The final reason is that the doctrine is *mysterious*. There is a “mystery of iniquity” (2 Thess 2:7) in the Papacy, and this mystery is one of the themes of Scripture. In the Old Testament, the line can be traced down through Cain, Ishmael, Esau, Saul, Doeg the Edomite (Ps 52), Ahithophel, Absalom, Jezebel, the fourth beast of Daniel 7, and passages from the Psalms such as 41:9, 55:12-15, 109. In the New Testament one finds Judas, Ananias and Sapphira, Demas, Alexander the coppersmith, Diotrophes, the man of sin, the Antichrist (1 Jn 4:3), the sin against the Holy Ghost, and the beast and the harlot of Revelation. Behind them all lies Satan, the fallen angel. The “mystery” of this deceitful, malicious, inveterate opposition to Christ and His people on the part of those closely associated with Him is a thread running through Scripture and Church history, and clearly this mystery is at work

today. The *Westminster Confession* identifies where, principally though not exclusively, it is at work.

In his sermons on 2 Thessalonians 2, Thomas Manton refers to those who could not see the Papacy in the chapter and compares them with the Jews who could not recognise Christ: “They expected a temporal Messiah, and therefore could not see what they saw. What was apparent to children was a riddle to the rabbis. So they expect some open enemy of the Church to attack it by power and force, little dreaming of a bishop” (*Works*, vol 3, p 93). Richard Baxter puts it even more memorably. In answer to the question, whether the Pope is the person “particularly described in the Apocalypse and Thessalonians”, he says that “if the pope be not he”, he had the severe misfortune “to be so like him” (*Christian Directory*, p 631). DWBS

Islam and Rome Moving Closer

One can envisage that Roman Catholicism and Islam, in their ambitions for world dominion, might believe it to be mutually beneficial to draw closer together. In fact, all the signs suggest that they are indeed moving nearer to each other.

An open letter from 138 Muslim scholars, from around the world, urged Christians and Muslims to develop their common ground of belief in one God. It exhorted: “Let this common ground be the basis of all future inter-faith dialogue between us”. In response, the Pope has decided to hold a conference of Roman Catholic and Muslim leaders in Rome in the spring of this year.

The utterly false idea that the God of Scripture and Allah are the same God is increasingly being promoted. In January the Roman Catholic Bishop of Breda in Holland told Dutch television that churches in the Netherlands should use the name *Allah* for God to ease tensions between Muslims and Christians. The fact that the Pope sent a message of greeting to Muslims worldwide at the end of their festival of Ramadan, last September, is also an indication of reaching out. In it he said, “This is the ardent hope I share with you: that Christians and Muslims continue to develop increasingly friendly and constructive relationships in order to share their specific riches, and that they will pay particular attention to the quality of the witness of their believers”.

These and similar moves do not auger well for Reformed Christianity. When one considers the centuries-old opposition to true Christianity by both the Papacy and Islam, the signs of the times seem to indicate increased opposition and persecution. But blessed be the name of God that the divine Head of the Church, Jesus Christ, has stated, “Upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it” (Matt 16:18). NMR

Notes and Comments

The Death of a False Prophet

Gordon B Hinckley, President and one of the so-called Twelve Apostles of the Mormon sect, or self-styled Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, has died. During his life the US Government and various universities awarded him honours, and in death he was lauded by Mormon leaders as “our prophet, seer and revelator” and “a lighthouse to the lost mariner”.

Like Joseph Smith, founder of Mormonism, Hinckley was far otherwise. A false prophet and a blind leader of the blind, he assiduously peddled the gross errors of Mormonism, such as: “That God the Father has a body of flesh and bones and was once a sinful man on another planet. That God lives with many goddess wives on a planet near the great star Kolob. . . . That Jesus Christ is the brother of Lucifer, the Devil. That Jesus had to work out his own salvation. That the doctrines of their inspired leaders are superior to the Bible. That ‘there are more gods than there are particles on a million earths’. That men can become gods themselves by joining the Mormon church and will be able to create and populate their own earths” (www.whatismormonism.com website).

This pernicious sect rejects biblical teaching about the Saviour, although it claims to be the “Church of Jesus Christ” and many think of it as Christian. A Mormon publication states: “In bearing testimony of Jesus Christ, President Hinckley spoke of those outside the Church who say Latter-day Saints do not believe in the traditional Christ: ‘No, I don’t. The traditional Christ of whom they speak is not the Christ of whom I speak. For the Christ of whom I speak has been revealed in this the Dispensation of the Fullness of Times. He, together with His Father, appeared to the boy Joseph Smith in the year 1820, and when Joseph left the grove that day, he knew more of the nature of God than all the learned ministers of the gospel of the ages.’”

The Christ of whom Hinckley spoke is indeed the Christ of Mormonism – a Christ whose atoning work must have our works of righteousness added to it for our salvation, a Christ who in creating the world needed the help of others: “Michael or Adam was one of these. Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Peter, James and John, Joseph Smith, and many other noble and great ones played a part in the great creative enterprise” (*Mormon Doctrine*, p 169, quoted on whatismormonism.com). He is a Christ who was overshadowed by Mormon founder Joseph Smith, who said, “I have more to boast of than ever any man had. I am the only man that has ever been able to keep a whole church together since the days of Adam. A large majority of the whole have stood by me. Neither Paul, John, Peter nor Jesus ever did it” (*History of the Church*, vol 6, pp 408-9, quoted on whatismormonism.com).

When Hinckley was interviewed by *Time* magazine for its cover story of

4 August 1997, he was asked if God the Father was once a man, as Mormonism teaches. He evasively responded, “I don’t know that we teach it”. Little wonder that the story was entitled *Dodging and Dissembling Prophet?* His staff later claimed that he was quoted out of context. One commentator, having seen a transcript of the interview, said, “The statement in the letter from the Office of the First Presidency that President Hinckley’s words were quoted out of context . . . is clearly false. . . . What Joseph Smith declared proudly and unambiguously – that God the Father was once a man – President Hinckley apparently now wishes to conceal from the public.”

The sect has other “damnable heresies” and “doctrines of devils” which it does not wish to discuss openly but which it holds tenaciously – thus underlining the fact that its so-called apostles and prophets love darkness rather than light. “Such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ” (2 Cor 11:13). NMR

The Christian Roots of the Nation

There has been something of a furore over the reported remarks of the Anglican Bishop of Rochester regarding his perception of the effect of multiculturalism on the Christian character of the nation. Consequently, he alleges, “it is now less possible for Christianity to be the public faith in Britain”. He notes that the arrival of large numbers of people of other religions has coincided with the British loss of confidence in “the Christian vision which underlay most of the achievements and values of the culture”. It has also coincided with the endeavour “to accommodate the newer arrivals on the basis of the novel philosophy of multiculturalism”.

Dr Nazir-Ali, the Pakistan-born son of a convert from Islam to Roman Catholicism, who came to this country when his life was endangered while a bishop in Pakistan, describes himself as “evangelical and catholic”. He has strongly opposed the ordination of homosexual clergy and the blessing of same-sex partnerships. However, the article which has brought him before the public at this time appeared in a newspaper published on the Lord’s Day. He has ordained women to the ministry. He is said to be “a prominent spokesman for engagement between Christianity and Islam”. We do not know the nature of the gospel which he preaches. We would no doubt find ourselves at odds with him on significant matters of doctrine, principle and practice. But he is one of the few prepared not to be intimidated and has certainly put his finger on the fundamental problem of modern British society: we are rapidly losing contact with the Christian roots of our nation.

Politicians rant about British values and British identity while refusing to affirm the Christian faith which is historically basic to the social cohesion and values and, we may say, strength of the nation. Repeatedly one hears of poli-

ticians describing the state as secular and regarding all “faiths” as equally valid or invalid. Certainly the spirit and practice of many of our leaders are secular but this ignores the fact that the nation is legally committed to Protestant Christianity. Much of the response to the Bishop’s views has demonstrated just how intolerant of truth multiculturalism is. Even though Christianity is professedly the religion of the nation and of the vast majority of the population, alleged minorities within the minorities avail themselves of the civil and religious freedoms which that religion affords to them and to others, in an attempt to censor those who call for Christian values to be upheld. Some even aspire to live in a parallel society with its own territories and laws.

A strongly Christian Britain would be able to integrate strangers within the gate, but the abandonment of Christian commitment can only lead to the increasing manifestation of the displeasure of God and to further segregation and disintegration. The Archbishop of Canterbury has claimed that one cannot just say that there is one law for everybody. He has suggested that “adopting parts of Sharia law could help social cohesion”. We are glad that the Prime Minister is reported to have dissociated himself from this view and to believe that “British laws should be based on British values”, and that other political leaders seem to concur in this. But what are these values, and how long will they survive, without their basis in the Christianity of the Word of God? Laws have been formulated which are directly contrary to the law of God and which, to say the least, put those who practise the Christianity of the Bible and of the nation at a distinct disadvantage. To quote the Bishop again: “Unless we diagnose the malaise from which we all suffer, we shall not be able to discover the remedy”.

HMC

Church Information

Synod Agenda and Committee Reports

Clerks of Presbyteries, conveners and clerks of committees, and all interested parties should note that all items of business intended to be placed on the Synod agenda must be in the hands of the Clerk of Synod by April 8.

Conveners and clerks of all standing committees of Synod should note that all committee reports must also be in the hands of the Clerk of Synod by April 8, for printing. These reports should contain information about the work of the committees during the year. Recommendations and proposals should be sent as separate items for the Synod agenda.

(Rev) John MacLeod, Clerk of Synod

Jewish and Foreign Missions Fund

By appointment of Synod, the first of the year’s two special collections on behalf of the Jewish and Foreign Missions Fund is due to be taken in congregations during March.

W Campbell, General Treasurer

FREE PRESBYTERIAN PLACES OF WORSHIP

Scotland

Aberdeen: 2 Alford Place, AB10 1YD. Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Tuesday, 7.15 pm. Rev D W B Somerset BSc DPhil, 18 Carlton Place, Aberdeen, AB15 4BQ. Tel: 01224 645250.

Bracadale & Strath: Broadford: no services at present. **Struan:** Sabbath 12 noon; Wednesday 7 pm (fortnightly). Contact Rev J R Tallach, Raasay; tel: 01478 660216.

Breascleite: Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm; Thursday 7 pm.

Dingwall & Beaully: Dingwall: Church, Hill Street: Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. **Beaully** (Balblair): Sabbath 6.30 pm, Thursday 7.30 pm. Rev Neil M Ross BA, Dingwall, 10 Achary Rd, IV15 9JB. Tel/Fax: 01349 864351, e-mail: nmross@ferintosh.co.uk.

Dornoch: Sabbath 11.30 am. **Bonar:** Sabbath 6 pm. Wednesday 7.30 pm (alternately in Dornoch and Bonar). Rev D J MacDonald MA, F P Manse, Evelix, Dornoch, Sutherland, IV25 3RD. Tel: 01862 811138. **Lairg:** Church and Manse; **Rogart:** Church; no F P services.

Dundee: Manse. No F P Church services.

Edinburgh: 63 Gilmore Place, Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Thursday 7.30 pm. Rev Hugh M Cartwright MA, Napier House, 8 Colinton Road, Edinburgh, EH10 5DS. Tel: 0131 447 1920.

Farr, by Daviot: Sabbath 12 noon and 5.15 pm; Thursday 7.30 pm (fortnightly). **Stratherrick:** Sabbath 7 pm (fortnightly); Thursday 7.30 pm (fortnightly). **Tomatin:** Sabbath 7 pm (fortnightly); Wednesday 7.30 pm (fortnightly). Rev Allan J Macdonald MA, F P Manse, Farr, Inverness, IV2 6XF. Tel: 01808 521357; e-mail: ajm@snmail.co.uk.

Fort William: Monzie Square, Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm. Manse: 15 Perth Place, PH33 6UL. Tel: 01397 708553. Contact Mr Forbes Fraser. Tel: 01397 772862.

Gairloch (Ross-shire): Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm. Prayer meeting in **Strath**, Thursday 7.30 pm. Rev A E W MacDonald MA, F P Manse, Gairloch, Ross-shire, IV21 2BS. Tel: 01445 712247.

Glasgow: St Jude's Church, 137 Woodlands Road, G3 6LE. Sabbath 11 am and 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Rev Roderick MacLeod BA, 4 Laurel Park Close, Glasgow, G13 1RD. Tel 0141 954 3759.

Glendale: Sabbath 12 noon (fortnightly). **Vatten:** Sabbath 6 pm; Wednesday 7 pm (fortnightly). **Waternish:** As intimated.

Greenock: 40 East Hamilton Street, Sabbath 11 am.

Halkirk: Sabbath 11.30 am, 5 pm; Thursday 7 pm. Manse tel: 01847 831758. **Wick:** Church; **Thurso:** Church; **Strathly:** Church; no F P Church services.

Harris (North): Tarbert: Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm; Thursday 7.30 pm. **Stockinish:** Tuesday 7 pm. Rev J B Jardine BD, F P Manse, Tarbert, Isle of Harris, HS3 3DF. Tel: 01859 502253, e-mail: northharris.fpc@btopenworld.com.

Harris (South): Leverburgh: Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm. **Sheilebost:** Sabbath 12 noon (except first Sabbath of month). Prayer meetings in **Leverburgh, Northton, Sheilebost, Strond** and **Geocrab** as intimated. Rev K D Macleod BSc, F P Manse, Leverburgh, HS5 3UA. Telfax: 01859 520271.

Inverness: Chapel Street, IV1 1PF, Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Rev G G Hutton BA, 11 Auldcastle Road, IV2 3PZ. Tel: 01463 712872.

Kinlochbervie: Sabbath 11.30 am; Tuesday 7.30 pm. Manse: Tel. 01971 521268. **Scourie:** Sabbath 6 pm.

Kyle of Lochalsh: Sabbath 6 pm. Manse tel: 01599 534933. **Plocton:** No F P services. Contact Rev D A Ross; tel: 01445 731340.

Laide (Ross-shire): Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. Rev D A Ross. F P Manse, Laide, IV22 2NB. Tel: 01445 731340.

Lochcarron: Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. Manse.

Lochinver: Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm. Manse tel: 01571 844484.

Ness: Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. Manse tel: 01851 810228.

North Tolsta: Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm; Thursday 7 pm; 1st Monday of month 7 pm. Rev D Campbell MA, F P Manse, North Tolsta, HS2 0NH. Tel: 01851 890286.

North Uist: Bayhead: Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm (fortnightly). **Sollas:** Wednesday 7.30 pm (fortnightly). Rev D Macdonald BA, F P Manse, Bayhead, North Uist, HS6 5DS. Tel: 01876 510233.

Oban: Church and Manse. No F P services at present.

Perth: Pomarium, off Leonard Street. Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Manse tel: 01738 442992. Contact Mr J N MacKinnon; tel: 01786 451386.

Portree: Sabbath 12 noon, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7 pm (Church Hall). Contact Rev W A Weale; tel: 01470 562243.

Raasay: Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. Rev James R Tallach MB ChB, F P Manse, Raasay, Kyle, IV40 8PB. Tel: 01478 660216, fax: 01478 660358.

Shieldaig: Sabbath 11 am; **Applecross:** Sabbath 6pm. Tuesday 7 pm (alternately in Shieldaig and Applecross). Shieldaig manse tel: 01520 755259, Applecross manse tel: 01520 744207. Contact Rev D A Ross; tel: 01445 731340.

Staffin: Sabbath 12 noon, 5 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. Rev W A Weale, F P Manse, Staffin, IV51 9UX. Tel: 01470 562243.

Stornoway: Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Thursday 7.30 pm. **Sandwick:** Last Tuesday of month 7.15 pm. **Achmore:** Sabbath 12 noon; Tuesday 7 pm. Manse tel: 01851 702755.

Tain: Church and Manse. **Fearn:** Church. No F P services. See Dornoch and Bonar.

Uig (Lewis) Miavaig: Sabbath 12 noon Gaelic, 6 pm English; Wednesday 7 pm. Manse tel: 01851 672251.

Ullapool: Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Manse: Quay Street, IV26 2UE. Tel: 01854 612449.

England

Barnoldswick: Kelbrook Road, Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Friday 7.30 pm; Wednesday 8 pm, alternately in Haslington and Gatley. **South Manchester:** Sabbath 6.00 pm, in Trinity Church, Massie Street, Cheadle (entry at rear of building). Contact Mr R Middleton, 4 Rhodes Close, Haslington, Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 5ZF. Tel: 01270 255024. Manse tel: 01282 851782.

London: Zoar Chapel, Varden St, E1. Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. **Broadstairs:** Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm at Portland Centre, Hopeville Ave, St Peter's; Tuesday 7 pm at Friends' Meeting House, St Peters Park Rd. Rev J MacLeod MA, 6 Church Ave, Sidcup, Kent, DA14 6BU. Tel: 0208 309 1623.

Northern Ireland

Larne: Station Road. Sabbath 11.30 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 8 pm. Manse, 23 Upper Cairncastle Road, Larne BT40 2EF. Tel: 02828 274865. Contact: 02828 273294.

Canada

Chesley, Ontario: Manse and Church, 40 Fourth Street SW. Sabbath 10.30 am, 7 pm; Wednesday 8 pm. Contact Mr David Kuiper, Tel: 519 363 0367. Manse tel: 519 363 2502.

Toronto, Ontario: Church and Manse. No F P Church services at present.

Vancouver, British Columbia: Fifteenth Avenue and Fraser Street. For F P Church services contact Mr John MacLeod, 202-815 4th Avenue, New Westminster, V3M 1S8. Tel: 604-516-8648.

USA

Santa Fe, Texas: Suite B, 12221 Highway 6. Sabbath 10.30 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Contact: Mr Joseph Smith, 13732 West Sixth Street, Santa Fe, Texas 77517. Tel 409 927 1564.

Australia

Grafton, NSW: 172 Fitzroy Street. Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Rev E A Rayner BA, 23 Nairn Terrace, Junction Hill 2460 (mail to: PO Box 1171 Grafton, 2460). Tel: 02 6644 6044.

Sydney, NSW: Corner of Oxford and Regent Streets, Riverstone. Sabbath 10.30 am, 6.30 pm; Tuesday 7.30 pm. Information contact: Mr C MacKenzie, P O Box 5, Riverstone, NSW 2765. Tel: 02 4730 2797. E-mail: cal.01@optusnet.com.au.

New Zealand

Auckland: 45 Church Street, Otahuhu, Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. For further information contact Mr C van Kralingen, 3 Earls Court, Manurewa. Tel: 09 266 7618.

Gisborne: 463a Childers Road. Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Wednesday and Saturday 7.30 pm. Rev J A T van Dorp, 14 Thomson Street, Gisborne. Tel: 06 868 5809.

Tauranga: Girl Guide Hall, 17th Avenue, Sabbath 11 am, 7 pm. For information contact: Mr Dick Vermeulen, Tel: 075443677.

Wellington: 4 Rewa Terrace, Tawa. Sabbath 11 am, 4 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. For further information contact Mr N Hicklin, 117 Woodman Drive, Tawa, Wellington. Tel: 04 232 7308.

Israel

Jerusalem: Lord's Day: 12 noon, 7 pm. YMCA Chapel, 26 King David Street, Jerusalem. Rev J L Goldby, P O Box 68001, Arnona, Jerusalem 91680. Tel: 00972 2 6739058. For details of weekday meetings please contact Mr Goldby.

Singapore

Singapore: Sabbath: 9.30am and 5.30pm; Wednesday: 7.45pm. Room: "Tanglin III" (Level 2), 60 Stevens Road, Singapore 257854. Contact: Mr Bernard Yong, 4 Chuan Place, Singapore 554822. Tel: (65) 6383 4466, fax: 6383 4477, e-mail: byong1@singnet.com.sg.

Ukraine

Odessa: Contact Mr I Zadorozhnyi, P O Box 100, Odessa-91, 65091; e-mail: antipa@eurocom.od.ua; or Mr D Levitskiyy; tel: 00380 482326685; e-mail: dmlev@eurocom.od.ua.

Zimbabwe

Bulawayo: Lobengula Township, PO Magwegwe, Bulawayo. Rev S Khumalo, F P Manse, Stand No 56004, Mazwi Road, Lobengula, PO Magwegwe, Bulawayo. Tel: 00263 9407131.

Ingwenya: Church and Secondary School. Rev A B MacLean; e-mail: amaclea@mweb.co.zw. Postal Address: Ingwenya Mission, Private Bag T5445, Bulawayo. John Tallach School tel: 00263 85343.

Mbumba: Church and Hospital: Postal Address: Mbumba Mission Hospital, Private Bag T5406, Bulawayo. Hospital tel: 00263 898291.

New Canaan: Church: Rev Z Mazvabo. Postal Address: Private Bag 615, Zvishavane. Tel 00263 512196.

Zenka: Church. Rev M Mloyi. Postal Address: Private Bag T5398, Bulawayo. Cell phone: 0026311 765032.

Kenya

Sengera: Rev K M Watkins, PO Box 3403, Kisii; e-mail: watkinskenya@access350.co.ke. Tel: 00254 733 731002.

Free Presbyterian Church Bookroom

133 Woodlands Road, Glasgow, G3 6LE Tel: 0141 332 1760

E-mail: sales@fpbookroom.org Website: www.fpbookroom.org

Book Selection

	RRP	Offer
Dr John Kennedy of Dingwall: Sermon Notes 1859-1865		
The James Begg Society, 2007, hbk, 390 pp	£18.00	£15.00
An Introduction to Systematic Theology by Cornelius Van Til		
P&R Publishing, 2007, pbk, 409 pp	£11.95	£10.00
I Can Plod: William Carey & the First Baptist Mission by John Appleby		
Grace Publications, 2007, hbk, 309 pp	£14.95	£12.95
Communion with The Triune God by John Owen		
Crossway Books, 2007, pbk, 445 pp	£14.99	£12.99
Sermons on the Lord's Supper by Jonathan Edwards		
The Northampton Press, 2007, hbk, 271 pp	£18.95	£15.95

(Postage is extra)

Subscription rates, including postage:

FP Magazine £19.50 (£1.50 per copy) • YP Magazine £11 (70p per copy)

Combined £28.50