

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

The Relevance of Scripture	97
Infant Baptism: Its Grounds in the Bible	
A Sermon by Charles J Brown	100
When a Child Is Born	
Henry Law	109
Amyraldianism: Devaluing the Atonement	
3. The Rise and Growth of Amyraldianism	
Rev Neil M Ross	113
Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth	
Rev G G Hutton	117
Jesus Looking up to Heaven	
A Sermon Outline by John Kennedy	120
Book Reviews	
<i>Ernest Kevan</i> by Paul E Brown	121
<i>The Culdee Church</i> by T V Moore	123
Protestant View	124
Notes and Comments	125
Church Information	128

April 2013

Vol 118 • No 4

The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland

Moderator of Synod: Rev D Campbell MA, F P Manse, North Tolsta, HS2 0NH.

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, 2 Fleming Place, Stornoway, HS1 2NH; tel: 01851 702501.

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 LLP, 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 R MacLeod BA, 4 Laurel Park Close, Glasgow, G13 1RD; tel: 0141 954 3759.

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.

Australia and New Zealand: Rev G B Macdonald BSc, 60 Hamilton St, Riverstone, NSW 2765; tel: 02 9627 3408.

Zimbabwe: Rev S Khumalo, 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@gmail.com.

Residential Care Homes:

Ballfeary 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

Published by The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland (Scottish Charity Number SC003545). 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 begins in January. 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 the printer.

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

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

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

The Gaelic Supplement (quarterly): Editor: Rev A W MacColl MA PhD, F P Manse, Swainbost, Isle of Lewis, HS2 0TA. 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: First Sabbath: Broadstairs; **Second:** Dingwall; **Third:** Stornoway; **Fourth:** North Uist, Zenka.

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

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

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

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

July: First Sabbath: Beauty; **Second:** Bonar Bridge, Staffin; **Third:** Applecross, Auckland; **Fourth:** Cameron, Struan.

August: First Sabbath: Dingwall; **Second:** Leverburgh, New Canaan, Somakantana; **Third:** Laide; **Fourth:** Stornoway, Tomatin, Vatten, Zenka.

September: First Sabbath: Chesley, Larne, Sydney, Ullapool; **Second:** Halkirk, Mnaka, Portree; **Third:** Tarbert; **Fourth:** Aberdeen, Barnoldswick, North Uist; **Fifth:** Fort William, Ingwenya.

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

November: Second Sabbath: Glasgow; **Third:** Wellington; **Fourth:** Chiedza.

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

The Free Presbyterian Magazine

Vol 118

April 2013

No 4

The Relevance of Scripture

This may seem obvious to many readers, but fallen human beings have always sought to avoid the authority of the Word of God. One of their preferred strategies today is to claim that religion, and scriptural Christianity in particular, is not relevant. If people care to go further, they may say that it does not meet their felt needs. It will not make them any happier, they assume, or make it any easier to make ends meet or make them any healthier. So they turn away from it with disdain and go on in their ungodly lifestyle.

In fact, it is likely that they would be happier if they followed Christ rather than the world; they may find it easier to make ends meet because they would eliminate wasteful expenditure; they may even become healthier as a result of giving up what is damaging to their well-being. But this is to miss the main point: the absolute authority of God over His creatures, and also of the revelation He has given to mankind in the Bible – which implies their duty to submit to that authority. The idea has gained credibility that the documents of all religions are largely based on myths, but Christianity is unique in that the Bible is absolutely true from beginning to end and is therefore totally reliable. Accordingly it is entirely relevant to all people everywhere and to their deepest needs.

Yet the truths of Scripture, in spite of their relevance, may not be palatable. The truth about universal sinfulness is not welcome to the natural heart; people want to think well of themselves. This is not a new phenomenon; the Bible states, “All the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes” (Prov 16:2). People will happily deceive themselves into thinking that, in comparison with their fellow creatures, they are much more upright, much kinder and much gentler than they really are. Much more will they deceive themselves about their relationship to God. Hagar’s insight, “Thou God seest me”, is one which they do not wish to share.

But her statement is true and it is highly relevant to our lives in this world, for the One who sees us knows all that we do, all that we say and even all that we think. This is a matter of supreme relevance; it should drastically influence our behaviour. If we were to think naively about human behaviour,

we might expect everyone to obey God whenever He speaks and whatever He says. But that is to ignore the fact, also revealed in Scripture, that though man was created perfect, he has fallen into sin and his whole being is affected, including his will. He does not want to draw near to God; he does not want to obey God; he does not want to be told that he is a sinner who comes short of the glory of God continually. His corrupt heart loves sin and does not want to be parted from it.

People know that this life will not last for ever, for they must die. But the Bible tells them that “it is *appointed* unto men once to die”, and the fact that God has overruling authority over the time of our departure from this world is an unwelcome blow to the human desire to feel independent of a superior being. It is because this generation has so largely welcomed such feelings of independence that it is drifting more and more towards accepting euthanasia and assisted suicide. But God rules over everything, including death, and He has further revealed that “after death [is] the judgement”, an idea that is even more unwelcome. Yet it is true, and it has serious implications for how we spend our lives in this world if we are to have a blessed eternity.

When sinners do not face up to their sin and its consequences, they do not see Scripture teaching about the remedy for sin as relevant to their needs. They do not welcome the manifestation of the grace of God in the death of Christ or when the Holy Spirit applies redemption to needy, guilty sinners. And here we see the tremendous power of the devil, “the god of this world”, in blinding “the minds of them which believe not” (2 Cor 4:4). He blinds them so that they do not properly perceive the existence of God and His authority over them; the consequence is that they do not take to heart their personal need as sinners who have yet to confront the solemn realities of death, judgement and eternity. Satan blinds them by making them feel comfortable in their sin, encouraging them to feel that religion, especially true religion, is totally unattractive and not worthy of any attention – to look on it as something that may safely be ignored.

So most sinners today do not take time to examine God’s revelation of a full and free salvation through Jesus Christ, who died for sinners and rose again, and who now, from His throne in glory, is applying redemption to the guilty. Again this is according to Scripture: “He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from Him; He was despised, and we esteemed Him not” (Is 53:3). The Son of God became man and was rejected by most of those who came in contact with Him; the God-man is now on the throne of glory and most people treat Him as irrelevant to their lives.

When God’s prophet Micaiah warned King Ahab about the dangers he

faced in going to battle against the Syrians, the King despised the prophet and his message. He dismissed the warning and went ahead with his plans. But as he lay fatally wounded in his chariot, Ahab's mind must have wandered back to Micaiah's warning, which was now so obviously true. But it was too late to benefit from it. And how many in a lost eternity will think back to the Bible and its warnings, which they rejected because they interfered with their desire to go on in sin! But then it will be too late to heed the warnings, turn from their sin and embrace the salvation which they once could have found if they had sought it.

The unbelief of today's professing Church makes it all the easier for the man or woman in the street to reject the authority of God's Word. To a great extent, the Church does not accept the Bible's testimony about sin and its consequences and therefore does not fulfil its function in bearing witness to the continuing relevance of that testimony. Large numbers of ministers do not accept the testimony of Scripture to Jesus Christ as truly divine, as One who bore the full punishment for the sins of His people, who rose again and ascended to the right hand of God the Father. They do not point to Him as the unique Saviour; they ignore the fact that "there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). Ours is a generation that glories in inter-faith worship; it has lost sight of the unique relevance of Christ and of the salvation He has provided for guilty sinners.

Can this generation be rescued from its blindness? Let us think back to Ahab's generation, one which also lost sight of the wrongness of false religion. After the false priests of Baal had failed to call down fire on their sacrifice, God answered Elijah's earnest prayer for fire from heaven to fall on his sacrifice, "that this people may know that Thou art the Lord God" (1 Ki 18:37). Then the people cried in acknowledgment: "The Lord, He is the God", for only the power of the living God could bring fire from heaven. And only His power could remove the people's blindness and bring them to declare that the Lord is indeed God – although we may not know how many of them were convinced of their sin and brought believingly to see how suitable was the provision that the true God had made for sinners like them.

Today only divine power can remove the almost-universal blindness which prevents sinners from seeing the entire relevance of God's testimony, in Scripture, to sin and its terrible consequences and to salvation from sin. What we need is, first of all, the work of the Holy Spirit in God's people, so that they would, like Elijah, pray earnestly for an outpouring of the Spirit on those who have even the least contact with the Word of God, so that they would see its entire relevance to their spiritual condition, and that they would then be brought from the heart to acknowledge, "The Lord, He is the God".

Infant Baptism: Its Grounds in the Bible¹

A Sermon by *Charles J Brown*

Acts 2:39. *The promise is unto you, and to your children.*

If we would get a firm grasp of our subject we must try to apprehend the true relation between the scriptures of the Old Testament and of the New, and more particularly the relation between the old covenant – or the old dispensation of the covenant of grace – and the new. In either case, it is a relation of *substantial oneness, with diversity in the circumstances.*

It is not two Bibles we have, but one – one revelation of the living God in different periods. Some seem to speak as if the New Testament alone were the rule of faith and life to a Christian – as if the Old was now obsolete. Certainly Jesus Himself did not so speak, nor His apostles. The truth is that neither Testament is complete without the other; one complements the other. I have a very learned friend who was once asked by a student what he considered the best book on the Old Testament. “O,” he answered at once, “the New.” It was a beautiful reply. I have long thought that the converse holds also: the best book on the New Testament is the Old.

We oftener speak of the New Testament as the key to the Old. But the Old is, in many ways, just as much the key to the New. The New is scarcely intelligible without the Old, so continual are the allusions to it in the New. I venture to go even further: without the Old Testament, our code of worship and moral law are not complete. Apart from the Psalms, for example, or the Ten Commandments, with the command about the Sabbath, where would our code of worship be? Apart from the book of Leviticus, where would our code of, for instance, marriage relationships be? The scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are together our one rule of faith and life. You might consult such passages as: “Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone”; “Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.”

But now, more specifically, observe the relation between the old covenant and the new. It is not two covenants of grace, substantially different, but one, under different dispensations. Here also the relation is one of substantial identity, with diversity in the circumstances. True, Paul speaks in Ephesians of the “covenants of promise”. But these are not separate, substantially different, covenants (as the covenant of works, for example, differed essentially from the covenant of grace), but to different dispensations of the one covenant of promise, which has existed from the beginning.

¹Taken, with editing, from Brown’s little book, *Infant Baptism.*

Take, for example, *the covenant of promise which God made with Abraham*. It is clear from the scriptures that, for substance, it was the same covenant under which we live. Turn to the song of Zacharias in Luke 1, at verse 68: “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of His servant David; as He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began; that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember His holy covenant; the oath which He sware to our father Abraham, [of course, this is the covenant of grace under which we live] that He would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life.” This is declared to have been the “holy covenant, the oath which God sware to Abraham.”

I have referred to some who speak as if the New Testament is the only rule of faith and life to a Christian. They speak as if God’s covenant with Abraham was almost exclusively one of temporal blessings – about Canaan, a temporal kingdom and, at best, having spiritual blessings only by way of allusion and type. But this is a serious mistake; the very beginning of the covenant with Abraham, “I will be a God to thee”, is the soul and sum and essence of the covenant of grace (see Jer 31:33, Mt 22:31,32, Heb 11:16, Rev 21:3,7). So Paul calls circumcision the initiatory sign of the Abrahamic covenant, “a seal of *the righteousness of faith*”, at once showing what he held to be the essence of that covenant.

Or take his great words in Galatians: “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree; that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith”. Or his words in Hebrews: “When God made promise to Abraham, because He could swear by no greater, He sware by Himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us.”

Let this then be our *first* position, and let us plant our foot firmly on it, that the covenant which God made with Abraham is the same covenant in substance under which we now live. True, there are great circumstantial differences. The grace of the covenant is now in many ways expanded, but the substance is the same. Let me refer you here to the words of our *Confession of Faith*

in the chapter on God's Covenant with Man: "This covenant [of grace] was differently administered in the time of the law, and in the time of the gospel: under the law, it was administered by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the paschal lamb, and other types and ordinances delivered to the people of the Jews, all foreshadowing Christ to come; which were, for that time, sufficient and efficacious, through the operation of the Spirit, to instruct and build up the elect in faith in the promised Messiah, by whom they had full remission of sins, and eternal salvation; and is called the old testament.

"Under the gospel, when Christ, the substance, was exhibited, the ordinances in which this covenant is dispensed are the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper: which, though fewer in number, and administered with more simplicity, and less outward glory, yet, in them, it is held forth in more fullness, evidence and spiritual efficacy, to all nations, both Jews and Gentiles; and is called the new testament" (7:5,6).

My *second* position is: as the infants of the Church were embraced within the old covenant, occupying a very special place in the covenant made with Abraham, so we have abundant Scripture evidence that they still occupy substantially the same place in the covenant under the new dispensation. Note that I am not yet speaking of the *signs* of the covenant – of circumcision or baptism. As to the place of children in the old covenant, it may be enough to remind you of the promise to Abraham: "I will establish My covenant between Me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee" (Gen 17:7), and of Deuteronomy 30:6: "The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live"; and of Isaiah 44:3: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground; I will pour My Spirit upon thy seed, and My blessing upon thine offspring".

Yet the promise in Isaiah belongs more especially to gospel times; and a glance at the context will show that the words in Deuteronomy refer to a period in the future – that of the final conversion and restoration of Israel. But turn to Mark 10:13: "They brought young children to Him" – we know that, at least, there were infants among these children, for Luke uses the word *infants* – "that He should touch them: and His disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, He was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God." Christ declares that the children of His people occupy substantially the same place in His new kingdom as they did in the Church of Israel – the same place in the new covenant as in the old.

What does Peter say in our text? Exhorting an assembly of Jews to accept Christ and submit to the ordinance of baptism in His name, he enforces the exhortation by telling them, in effect, that their children should hold the same place under the gospel as they had under the law: “Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost: *for the promise is unto you, and to your children*”. A few years later, Peter was reporting the angel’s words to Cornelius: “Who shall tell thee words, whereby thou *and all thy house* shall be saved” (Acts 11:14). The answer of Paul and Silas to the jailor of Philippi was – in circumstances where one might have thought the overwhelming importance of the man’s own case would have left no room for mentioning even his nearest and dearest – “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, *and thy house*”.

But most important of all is the only other passage I refer to here: “The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: *else were your children unclean; but now are they holy*” (1 Cor 7:14). Paul declares that the children of one Christian parent, the other remaining a heathen, were holy because of their connection with that believing parent. But what does he mean by *holy*? We know he cannot mean that they were all personally holy, regenerated by the Holy Ghost. But the least he can mean is that they were within the sacred enclosure of the Church and of the covenant; that, in some sense, they were separated, dedicated to God, members of the Church. It is a very strong expression to intimate, at least, that the children of one believing parent still occupied the same place in the gospel covenant as children had done under the law.

In order to avoid the force of this passage, an attempt has been made to interpret the word “unclean” as equivalent to *illegitimate*, and “holy” as meaning *born in wedlock*. But the heathenism even of both parents never made children born in wedlock illegitimate. And the words cannot be so translated. Undoubtedly the meaning is that the children of believers occupy the same place, substantially, in the gospel covenant as under the old.

There are two further important points here. One is that Paul *assumes* all this – he does not formally assert it – as something well known in the Church in Corinth: “but now”, *as you know*, “are they holy”. The other point is that, in writing to a Gentile Church, he uses the well-known phraseology of the ancient Church of Israel, “as if thereby designing to teach the Gentile Christians of Corinth that they had come into a Church of long standing, whose fundamental principles, amidst all changes of life and form, continued unchanged”.² Paul speaks of “the mystery, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the

²He is quoting his brother, David Brown, from *The Restoration of the Jews*.

same body". It is Israel's old olive tree (as he teaches in Romans 11) onto which the Gentile Church has been grafted, the Jewish branches having been broken off. The reference cannot be to the invisible Church, for no branch can ever be broken off it, but to the Church as an organised, visible community. This second position is that, as the infants of the Church were embraced within the covenant of old and occupied a special place in the covenant with Abraham, we have abundant evidence in Scripture that they still occupy substantially the same place in the covenant.

My *third* position is simple: there is a standing initiatory *sign* of the covenant under the gospel, even as there was under the law. Our Baptist friends will not dispute this. I might put it thus: as there were two great signs of the covenant in Israel, circumcision and the passover, so two have come in their place, baptism and the Supper. Undoubtedly the latter came in place of the passover. And it is evident that baptism occupies the place of circumcision, from Paul's words: "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with Him *in baptism*" (Col 2:11-12).

Note that Paul has Judaizing teachers in his eye who sought to persuade the Colossian believers that they could not be saved unless they submitted to circumcision. Paul reminds them that they had already received a nobler circumcision, "without hands". But then the Judaizers were ready to answer that Abraham too enjoyed that nobler circumcision, and yet he had to submit to the outward one. Therefore Paul reminds the Colossians that, in so far as the Lord had seen fit still to unite the inward grace with an outward sign, they had that sign in the ordinance of baptism.

A *fourth* position will complete the argument. It follows that the initiatory sign of the covenant must now, as of old, belong to infants unless Christ has expressly forbidden administering the new sign to infants – which assuredly He has not. Or, to express it slightly differently, if no express statement on baptizing of infants can be found in the New Testament, yet, since children occupy the same place in the covenant now as they held of old, it follows unavoidably that the initiatory sign also belongs to them. Having the greater thing, they must be entitled to the lesser, especially under a dispensation of more extended privilege – unless Christ has expressly declared that baptism is not to be administered to them, or there is something in the nature of the new sign which makes it inapplicable to infants.

Here the first question is, Do we have any express statement in the New Testament about baptizing infants. Our argument does not depend on the answer, but it is of high importance. I think we have, to say the least, something very like an express statement of the baptizing of infants, in Acts 16:

14,15, "A certain woman named Lydia . . . heard us And when she was baptized, *and her household*" Our friends say here: You assume that there were infants in her household. But we might say to our friends, *You* assume that there were none; for, if there were any, Paul certainly baptized them. You must assume the same about the Jailer's household, he "was baptized, he and all his, straightway" (Acts 16:33). And Paul writes of a third household: "I baptized also the household of Stephanas" (1 Cor 1:15).

But the strength of the argument seems to me independent of that question of fact, which cannot be settled definitively. It seems to me to lie in the *form* of the statement, "She was baptized and her household." Note *the incidental way* in which the baptism of the household is stated. After the narrative of Lydia's conversion it was natural that her baptism should come in as a matter of course. But will any candid Baptist say that the conversion of a whole household is so matter-of-course, after the mother has been converted, that the historian might be supposed, on the sole footing of their separate conversions, to say, "She was baptized *and her household*"? I think not. To me there seems to be a clear reference to the old, unchanged principle of the children's place in the covenant, and so there is an unchanged right to its initiatory sign. It seems to me the counterpart of those other expressions, "He shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved"; "The promise is unto you, and to your children"; "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house".

I would add three things here. First, supposing this to be the case, there was no need to mention specifically the baptism of the infants if there were infants in the house and they were baptized. The natural mode of expression was just what Luke uses here: "She was baptized, and her household". Only assume that the administering of the sign to infants continued as under the law, and the comparative silence of the New Testament about their baptism will appear quite natural. Second, can our Baptist friends produce a single instance in the New Testament of anyone who, at his birth, was the child of Christian parents but was baptized as an adult after making a personal profession of faith? That nothing resembling this is found, in the whole period of apostolic history, is surely very like a virtual statement that the children of the Church's members were all baptized in infancy. Third, had it been otherwise, how does it come to pass that the baptism of households is spoken of repeatedly in the New Testament, while we never hear of such a thing as the baptizing of households among our Baptist friends now?

But our argument is really quite independent of that. The position is that, supposing no statement of the baptism of infants can be found in the New Testament, yet, since infants still have the same place in the covenant as of

old, it follows that the initiatory sign must also belong to them, unless the Lord has positively excluded them from it. Our friends demand of us a New Testament statute for the baptizing of infants. But it is ours to demand of them a New Testament prohibition of their baptism – a repeal of the ancient law. No new statute was required to sanction their simply retaining what they had. Mere silence could only leave matters where they were before.

It required a new statute, of course, to change the sign from circumcision to baptism – which we have. But if the Lord intended to exclude children from the new sign, a further statute was required; and such we certainly do not have. The matter is analogous to the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. The anti-Sabbatarian demands of us where in the New Testament it is commanded to “remember” the first day of the week “to keep it holy”. We answer that, in its whole substance, the Fourth Commandment remains the law of Christ, with only the circumstantial change of the particular day; for which change we have sufficient evidence in the New Testament.

The place in the covenant, which children still have, is by far the greater thing, and the sign the lesser, to which therefore they must much more be entitled. Further, *those circumstantial differences* between the old covenant and the new are all in the direction, not of restricting the grace of the covenant, but of expanding it! Christ did not come into the world to narrow the privileges of His people, but greatly to enlarge them. If Paul had refused to baptize children, how certainly would the Judaizing teachers have pleaded this as an argument of great weight in support of the continued obligation of circumcision in the Christian Church! But we read of no such argument.

Suppose some Jewish mother, who had received baptism at Peter’s hands on the Day of Pentecost, had soon afterwards taken her infant child to him for baptism, and he had told her: As a minister of Jesus Christ I can only know your child as a heathen, until he come to years of discretion and then comes to repentance and faith. Might she not have answered, I understood that the promise was to us, and to our children; and a year ago, when I brought the same little one to the Master, He took him up in His arms and put His hands on him and blessed him and said to His servants, “Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God”. Would the reply have been easy?

We have every reason to believe that it was God in the person of the Son who said to Abraham: “I will establish My covenant with thee, to be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee”. Can anyone witness the same Son of God in our nature much displeased with His disciples for rebuking those Jewish parents, and easily believe that He intended to withdraw the initiatory

sign from those little ones to whom He there so lovingly granted a continued place, which is only confirmed by the sign?

Still, all that must give way, if it could be shown that the Lord has anywhere expressly prohibited the baptizing of infants. But neither has He done this in words or by making the new sign of baptism inapplicable to infants. What our brethren tell us about baptism being so often and expressly associated in Scripture *with believing*, and infants being incapable of faith, is no doubt quite true. But it is *its own answer*. Is everlasting life not still more frequently and expressly associated with believing? And infants are incapable of faith. But are they on that account incapable of everlasting life? Our friends will declare their confident persuasion that their infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved. How, since Scripture so expressly associates salvation with faith? They will answer, as we do, that this association presupposes a capacity of faith, which their dear departed children did not have. But they have thus met their own argument. The Scripture statements about baptism and faith apply only to those capable of faith – to adults only.

We may not close without solemnly recalling the words of Paul about circumcision in Romans 2:28,29, which may be, with a slight change, applied to baptism. We may say, He is not a Christian who is one outwardly; neither is that baptism (at least to any saving purpose), which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Christian, who is one inwardly; and baptism is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter.

Note also those words of John the Baptist, “Think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father” – we have been baptized, we enjoy various outward privileges – “for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire. I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but He that cometh after me is mightier than I . . . He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire: whose fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner, but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.”

It is possible to be saved without baptism – where there is no wilful contempt of Christ’s authority. But it is not possible to be saved without the things which baptism signifies – without the blood of Jesus applied and the regeneration of the Holy Ghost. It is possible to be saved without baptism, because the ordinance is not necessary from anything in its own nature, but only because Christ appointed it. It is not possible to be saved without forgiveness and a new heart, which are indispensable from their very nature. It is too easy,

– it happens every day – to perish *with* baptism: to be baptized, and go to the Supper too, and perish miserably after all. Have you been born again? Have you been washed in the blood of the Lamb? If not, privileges can only increase your guilt and aggravate your doom? “Flee from the wrath to come.” “Escape for thy life; look not behind thee, neither stay thou in all the plain; escape to the mountain lest thou be consumed.”

To my young friends I would say, now that you are no longer infants but able to understand me, your infant baptism can be of no use to you unless you make it your own by coming to Jesus and beginning to serve Him. I will remind you of the beautiful story in the chapter which speaks about Christ taking up the little children in His arms: “As He went out of Jericho . . . blind Bartimaeus, the son of Timaeus sat by the highway side begging. And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out and say, Jesus Thou Son of David, have mercy on me. And many charged him that he should hold his peace: but he cried the more a great deal, Thou Son of David have mercy on me. And Jesus stood still, and commanded him to be called. And they call the blind man, saying unto him, Be of good comfort, rise; He calleth thee. And he, casting away his garment, rose, and came to Jesus. And Jesus answered and said unto him, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? The blind man said unto Him, Lord, that I might receive my sight. And Jesus said unto him, Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole. And immediately he received his sight, and followed Jesus in the way.”

“Seek ye the Lord while He may be found, call ye upon Him while He is near.” He calls you also, each of you, “Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear My voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with Me”. “Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked: I counsel thee to buy of Me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see!”

Christians know but little of that they should know; they know but little of that they might know; they know but little of that others know; they know but little of that they desire to know; they know but little of that they shall know when they shall come to know even as they are known. And yet these weak and imperfect glimpses that they have of God and heaven here are infallible pledges of that perfect knowledge and full prospect that they shall have of God and heaven hereafter.

Christians, you must remember that it is one thing for God to love you, and another thing for God to tell you that He loves you. Your happiness lies in the first, your comfort in the second.

Thomas Brooks

When a Child Is Born¹

Henry Law

Leviticus 12:7. *This is the law for her that hath born a male or female.*

This chapter brings us to new fields of thought. The curtains of domestic life fall back. A mother and her new-born babe appear. Where is the mind which can turn heedlessly away? Where is the heart which will not pause and melt? In this event, being begins which can never end. Such is the fact, and it speaks solemnly.

The cradled infant is but a tiny stream. It scarcely seems to trickle. But it must flow onward until its waters form an ocean without bottom – without shore. A tender blade just sprouts, but roots must deepen and boughs spread, through the expanse of an interminable age. Each birth is a deathless increase to the world of spirits. A new eternity gains life. These magnitudes are yoked to every mother's babe. What scales can weigh the value of each child? What can correspond to its price? Pile suns on suns; bring all the treasures which all nature holds; ransack all mines of choicest ore, and their wealth, though large, is finite. But here is a new infinity. Offspring will continue far beyond all time and outlive all the glory of all worlds.

Thus solemn is the scene. Next God's voice sounds beside the Jewish cradle. Solemnity becomes more solemn. What are its tones? Is its call to gratitude and joy alone? Is its purpose to kindle praise for peril now past, and a dear addition to family delights? Not so. It writes pollution on child-bearing. It sentences the mother as unclean. It bars her from taking part in social life and pious rites. It bows her head in shame. It dooms her, as though some leprous spot was seen, to solitude (Lev 12:2-5).

Reader, reflect. What is the moral of this rule? Is it our wisdom to inquire? True, ceremonial stains have long since ceased. True, legal offerings no more can cleanse. The gospel rays scatter all twilight mists. But principles have undying root. The cause which then existed still survives. Mothers in every age are virtually addressed.

But why is shame the twin of every offspring born? Behold the infant, and receive reply. What is its nature, character and taste? Let not fond feeling shrink from weighing it in scales of truth. Is it a little innocent – conceived in purity and shaped in holy mould? Are its materials clean?

It is indeed a wondrous fabric. But what is the quarry which supplies its parts? The tender frame contains the germ of countless passions – multitudinous desires and thoughts – as many as the ocean's sands. Are these the germs of godly life? Do they give promise of ripe fruit for God? If so, the birth

¹A chapter taken, with editing, from Law's *The Gospel in Leviticus*.

is holy, and bearing mothers should not bear the brand of shame. But facts show not this smiling face. The babe is the sinful product of a sinful race. Corruption's seal is fixed upon its brow.

Reader, trace back the cause. Return in thought to Eden's terrible offence. When our first parents fell into sin's mire, what a tremendous change changed their entire being! Innocence in man for ever died. Iniquity, as conqueror, claimed the captive land. The fountain-head received deep poison. No drop could henceforth issue free from taint. The root of human life is rotten to the core. All sprouts have evil taste. Nature was spoiled of God's fair image. What nature no more has, it can no more bestow. Its properties are guilt, and guilt alone can be imparted by it. From Adam's fatal passage into Satan's realms, each child is Satan's slave. Each birth now propagates corruption. Hence she who bare is warned to bend, as bulrush in the vale. She must sit solitary as unclean.

There is a strong need to show the case without deception's mask. Nature is prone to partial love. She sees her own with an admiring eye. She pictures infants as fair purity's abode. But it is never gain – it rather is great loss – to trample upon truth. No flowers of profit can be plucked from error's barren branch. The wise man finds his happy seat at Scripture's feet. His only guidance is: "Thus saith the Lord".

Let then no mother, while she clasps her babe, deck it in robes of visionary innocence. Her love makes it no lovely object in God's sight. Affection's estimate is not the estimate of heaven. A soul is indeed born to immortality. But let its birth state be distinctly seen. It brings no soul life with it. Nature gives various senses – but no sense of God. The heart has neither eye to see, nor ear to hear, nor foot to seek the upward path of life. Each feeling has a bias to transgression's ways.

Leave but the child to its inbred desire, and evil, only evil, will be sought. When choice can choose, it will take Satan's yoke. When hands can handle, they will grasp his tools. When lip can speak, his language will be learned. When feet can run, they will rush headlong towards hell. So wisdom teaches. So experience finds.

Will then the mother say, Alas that such a life has birth from me? Faith speaks not thus. It knows that there is a remedy for all this ill. It looks to Christ, and fears recede before hope's dawn. Apart from Christ, the babe must enter on a voyage of woe and pass through troublous billows to the whirlpool of despair. Apart from Christ, its course must be one flow of misery, its end one gulf of ruin. But if Christ looks on it with love – if He receives it to His arms of grace – then neither can thought think or words proclaim, how blessed is a birth on earth!

Think what Christ grants. There is a merit in His precious blood which wipes out all sin's stains. There is a refuge in His wounded side which screens from wrath and curse. There is a beauty in His glorious righteousness which is a fit mantle for the courts of heaven.

He can send forth the Spirit's power to breathe new life into the dead-born soul. He can remove the blindness from the eye; the deafness from the ear; the listlessness from the heart. He can convert the stone into the tender soil in which all fruits of godliness shall spring. He can burst Satan's iron yoke. He can keep the soul pure from all temptation's snares. He can make earth an upward flight to heaven. He can present the spirit blameless before God. Through His transforming might, that child of wrath may brightly shine a jewel in redemption's crown. Through His all-saving work, it may sing sweetly in the realms of light.

There is such hope in Christ. He is the treasury of full, rich, blessed, glorious grace. The second Adam more than repairs the damage of the first. He snatches from the lowest depths. He raises to the highest heights. He can exalt to all that heaven contains.

Prayer is the Christian mother's stronghold. It is a golden key to unlock God's treasury. Faith's importunities prevail. Mighty desires, which cannot sit down mute, spring from above and will not fail. The Spirit pleads within such a wrestling heart, and all His pleadings reflect the mind of God. The offspring of much prayer is loved in heaven ere it is loved on earth. Scripture writes not in vain, how interceding parents ever gained their suit. They cry. Christ hears and smiles and answers – and His answers are these: Satan despoiled and saving grace bestowed. When nursing is accompanied with strong petition, the child is nestled in salvation's arms.

Faith next draws comfort from baptism. Christ gives a special ordinance to which the new-born may come. It is a token of His early care. It is a seal of His adopting grace. Herein we read a tender Saviour's tender heart. Is it His will that infant offspring should be as outcasts in vile nature's waste? Provision of the sacrament slays such doubt.

We see His arms outstretched; we hear His urgent call, "Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not". This rite abounds in hope. It is no mocking form. It is ordained as means of grace. Cast out the thought that infancy excludes the Spirit's breath. If wilful sin be no impervious bar, much less the fault of an inherited disease. Jeremiah's young heart began to beat with sanctified pulse. The Baptist's second birth was scarcely later than the first. The God who blessed them is always the same. Mercy has trodden this early path and may tread it again.

Christian mother, proceed to educate your child for Christ. So soon as

thoughts begin to flow, they must have a channel. Why should that course be nature and not grace? What though the tender mind be weak to argue out a proof? The truths of Jesus are not arguments but facts. The precious truths of life's high tree may fall down into childhood's lap.

The tender Shepherd, seeking a lost lamb and dying on the cross to buy it, though held in a robber's hand – washing it in streams flowing from His own side and feeding it in green pastures and bearing it in His strong arms and loving it with constant love and raising it to a bright home – are thoughts which weakest minds can grasp. These, when once grasped in saving power, can never be completely lost.

Let the first lesson be the love of God, the grace of Christ, the Spirit's present help. Let the young eye be early turned to Calvary's dying scene. Let memory's page take its first lines from Jesus' life. Let thought's soft tendrils be entwined around truth's stem. Then, through rich mercy, there is solid hope that the child born on earth is born an heir of heaven. Corruption's seed will not prevail. Satan's chains will fall. The unclean will be cleansed. The birth of children thus adds citizens to heaven.

The infant in the Jewish lap reminds of other truth. If it is a son, the days of the maternal shame are less. If it is a daughter, the unclean period is double (Lev 12:2,4,5). We may not pass this difference unmarked. The cause seems hidden from a casual glance. But thought, which dives into the ocean of God's mind, is here soon carried back to Eden's guilt and the first act of sin. It was the woman who first listened to the serpent's wile. Her mind first went astray. Her will first lusted. Her hand first touched. Rebellion in the man was inexcusable offence, but the woman's transgression beckoned to the snare.

There is no difference in the sin. The guilt of each is infinite dye. But there is a difference in the order of events, and a recording rite keeps this in memory's view. The stamp of lengthened degradation was fixed on each female birth. Sin's entrance was thus marked. Hence the foul misery is more abhorred. Hence the one remedy is more loved.

When the appointed days of shame are past, the excluding barrier is solemnly removed. Especial rites are ordered. Two victims are now slain. The one, as a burnt sacrifice, blazes on the altar. The other is an offering for sin (Lev 12:6). The gospel here speaks loudly. Defilement cannot cease without blood shed. A dying Saviour must atone before sin vanishes and the sinner is brought back to God.

Reader, you are unclean. There is no act, no word, no thought of any day, which is not dark before God's eye. But Jesus is near, and able to make pure. Wash and be clean. Wash and be reconciled. Wash and be welcomed to

receiving arms. Wash and look upward to a Father's smile. Wash and look onward to a Saviour's throne.

Amyraldianism: Devaluing the Atonement

2. The Rise and Growth of Amyraldianism¹

Rev Neil M Ross

Summary of Amyraldianism. Before considering the beginnings and development of Amyraldianism it will be useful to have in mind a summary of Amyraut's teaching on the atonement. In *The New Dictionary of Theology*, Roger Nicole defines his teaching thus: (1.) "God, moved by His love for mankind, had appointed all human beings to salvation provided they repent and believe." (2.) "He sent His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, to die for the sins of all mankind in order to implement this purpose." (3.) "However, since human beings would not on their own initiative repent and believe, God then chose to bestow a special measure of His Spirit to some only, who are the elect." So we see that Amyraut held, contrary to Scripture, that Christ died for *all* human beings, not only the elect. The elect are defined just as those chosen by God to be given grace to repent and believe.

Moise Amyraut – the man. We shall now look at a few facts about Amyraut himself. Moise Amyraut (or Moses Amyraldus in Latin), after whom the system of Amyraldianism is named, was a seventeenth-century French Protestant minister and theologian. Like Calvin, he studied to be a lawyer but switched to theology, under John Cameron, Professor of Theology at the Huguenot Academy of Saumur, which was founded by the French Reformed Churches. Cameron regarded Amyraut as his most notable scholar, and it was from Cameron, "a learned but restless Scotchman", as George Smeaton describes him,² that Amyraut imbibed certain erroneous teachings.

In his *Scottish Theology*, John Macleod states that Cameron had "a dash of ambition in his nature, and more or less, too, of the brilliant about him; he became a man of significance from the fact that he led a school of thought; he tried to steer a middle course between the Calvinism of the Synod of Dort and the Arminianism which it condemned"³. Macleod adds, "The issues of his mongrel compromising teaching were far-reaching".

It is to be kept in mind that Amyraut had in fact tremendous admiration

¹The second part of a paper given at the 2011 Theological Conference. The first part dealt with the atonement and its extent.

²*The Apostle's Doctrine of the Atonement*, p 540.

³*Scottish Theology*, pp 60,62.

for Calvin, and under Cameron's influence he took up the idea that the Calvinism of his day had deviated from Calvin's own teaching. Therefore he propounded a system of universal atonement which he stated to be the logical development of concepts he claimed to have found in Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*.

In 1633, when he was 37, Amyraut was appointed Professor of Theology at Saumur and taught there for 31 years. During that time he had a decided but detrimental influence on the Reformed Church in France and beyond. He took a very active part in all the great controversies on predestination and Arminianism which disturbed the Reformed church in Europe in those days. **Amyraut's Treatise on Predestination.** In 1634 he published his most controversial work, *Treatise on Predestination*, in which, among other things he rejected a limited atonement, propounding instead his idea of a universal atonement. Amyraut's aim, in positing his theory of universalism over against the particularism of the Canons of Dort was to mitigate what he believed were the harsh features of predestination. His intention, Nicole says, was "to soften the edges of the traditional orthodox Reformed view and thus to relieve difficulties in the controversy with Roman Catholics and facilitate a reunion of Protestants in which Reformed and Lutheran could join ranks".⁴ Amyraut's friend, Paul Testard,⁵ also produced a work in which he argued for the idea of universal atonement, but less ably than Amyraut.

Francis Turretin (1623-87), Professor of Theology at Geneva, observes that Amyraut and Testard had "a certain pious design (as it seems) of promoting ecclesiastical peace and . . . a desire of disputing more strongly with the Remonstrants"⁶ (the followers of Arminius), but peace did not ensue. In fact, their works, especially Amyraut's treatise, gave rise to tremendous controversy within the Reformed Church and met with determined and vigorous opposition. Amyraut himself believed he was adhering to Calvin's theology, and insisted that his own doctrine could be found, not only in Calvin's writings, but also in Augustine's teaching and, of course, in the Scriptures. He also asserted that what he taught was in agreement with the Canons of Dort, to which he had subscribed.

Among the theologians who ably contended against him, and for the true doctrine, were Pierre du Moulin (1568-1658) who taught in the Protestant Academy of Sedan, Andre Rivet, a professor of theology at the University of Leiden, and Friedrich Spanheim, also a professor of theology at Leiden.

⁴*New Theological Dictionary*, p 17.

⁵Testard (1599-1650) was pastor in Blois. His work, entitled *Eirenikon seu Synopsis Doctrinae de Natura et Gratia*, was produced a year earlier than Amyraut's treatise.

⁶*Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, vol 1 p 395.

Amyraut tried by the French Reformed Church. The controversy came to a new height in 1637, when Amyraut and Testard were summoned by the French Reformed Church to answer charges of heresy before its Synod, which met at Alençon that year. They were acquitted of the charge of heresy, but were given a mild rebuke for using unguarded language that could be misinterpreted.

Charges were brought against them again at the Synods of 1644 and 1659. Those Synods had clear evidence not only of erroneous writings by both Amyraut and Testard but also able refutations of their views which were presented in writing to the French Church by Moulin, Rivet and Spanheim. The Synods also received from the Reformed Churches in Holland and Switzerland expressions of their deep concern about the spreading errors.

It would seem that both the accused men, in their statements to the Synods, were disingenuous and used ambiguous language. “Naturally enough, in the explanations they gave,” says Nicole, “Amyraut and Testard sought to conform their presentation and language as closely as they could to the traditional Reformed views without making an outright disavowal of their previously printed sentiments. It would be difficult to maintain that they were wholly free of dissimulation in this matter. For instance, it seems fairly obvious that their printed utterances were ill in keeping with the Canons of the Synod of Dort, to which they pledged allegiance. In view of what they wrote later, the conclusion is inevitable either that they were not very forthright or that they did not yet grasp well the implications of their own position.”⁷ One wonders if Nicole is being rather charitable to them.

Amyraut and Testard were acquitted yet again. The final decision of the Synod in the case of Amyraut reads thus: “This Assembly being very well satisfied with his explications and sense given of his doctrine agreeable to that of the Synod of Alençon; and judging it best to bury in the grave of oblivion all those reciprocal complaints brought in from all parties, hath, as formerly, dismissed the said Sieur Amyraud, with honour to the exercise of his professorship, wherein he is exhorted to employ himself with courage and cheerfulness”.⁸

Unfaithfulness of the French Reformed Church. Sadly, the French Church had culpably failed to grasp the nettle. William Cunningham observed, in a speech in the General Assembly of the Free Church of 1859 (on the Tercentenary of the first national Synod of the French Reformed Churches which met in Paris in 1559): “The Synod of 1637 manifested a considerable amount of unfaithfulness to God in connection with the doctrines, and that unfaithful-

⁷*Standing Forth – Collected Writings of Roger Nicole*, p 315.

⁸Quick’s *Synodicon*, vol 2, 455, quoted in *The Free Presbyterian Magazine*, vol 42, p 447.

ness did not fail to appear in the Synod of 1644 – the one only 17 and the other 25 years after the solemn adoption by the National Synod of the Canons of the Synod of Dort. The National Synods and purity of doctrine seem very much to have gone down together.”⁹

As was inevitable, the result in France for both the Protestant faith and the Reformed Church was disastrous. The teachings of Amyraut and his party so predominated that the national Church slid into Arminianism, and its Protestantism became weak. Nicole gives this analysis of the damage: “The doctrine of hypothetical universalism acted as a corrosive factor in the French Reformed Church. Tolerated at first because it was felt that an outright condemnation would lead to schism, it slowly undermined respect for the confessional standards and disrupted internal unity and cohesion. As far as can be seen, it did not in fact help to promote any basic union with the Lutherans, nor did it materially assist in preventing abjurations to [Roman Catholicism]. On the other hand, it did provide a bridge toward Arminianism and perhaps toward the Semi-Pelagian tendencies of the Church of Rome. The advantages that Amyraut had envisioned failed to materialize, and the dangers against which his opponents had warned did in fact eventuate.”¹⁰

Defenders of the faith. However, although the Reformed Church in France proved unfaithful in dealing with Amyraut, there were those both within and outwith that Church who ably refuted his teachings, for example, Moulin, Rivet and Spanheim, mentioned above. Spanheim’s treatise against universal atonement, entitled *Universal Grace*, is the “great work . . . on the subject,” says Smeaton. “Here every point is calmly and lucidly reviewed, with little of the acrimony of controversy.”¹¹

Owen’s *Death of Death in the Death of Christ* (1643) although refuting Arminianism, also counters the theory of Cameron, Amyraut and Testard. Owen summarises their error in this way: “Christ died for all, but only *conditionally* for some, if they do believe, or will so do (which He knows they cannot do of themselves); and He died *absolutely* for His own, even them on whom He purposeth to bestow faith and grace, so as actually to be made possessors of the good things by Him purchased”.¹²

The teachings of Cameron and Amyraut were also robustly repelled in the *Formula Helvetica Consensus* (1675). It was the last of the major Reformed confessions of faith during those formative stages of Reformed theology, and was formulated by the Swiss Reformed Churches, which also required their

⁹Quoted by Smeaton in *Our Lord’s Doctrine of The Atonement*, 2nd ed, p 469.

¹⁰*Standing Forth – Collected Writings of Roger Nicole*, p 326.

¹¹*Our Lord’s Doctrine of the Atonement*, p 471.

¹²John Owen, *Works*, Edinburgh, 1862, vol 10, p 222.

ministers to subscribe it. One of its framers was Francis Turretin, not only a strong opponent of the theology of Saumur, but also a zealous defender of the Canons of Dort.

His able refutation of Amyraut's errors can be seen in two sections of his masterful *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*.¹³ These indicate a certain lack of logic and consistency in Amyraut's theory, of which we have given just a summary, but we hope to expand upon it later.

Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth

Rev G G Hutton

Paul exhorts Timothy – who was his son in the faith as well as a preacher of the gospel – with the words: “Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth” (2 Tim 2:15). The expression *rightly dividing* is, in the original, a compound word meaning to cut straight, to bring out the correct meaning. In other words, Paul is telling Timothy to apply himself to the diligent and thorough study of God's Word, so that he may know how to expound it correctly, to explain its true meaning – to state precisely what God is saying in any particular passage of His Word.

Paul is impressing on Timothy that, in order to this, the ruling principle of his life and ministry must be the pursuit of divine approval. Timothy needed to understand that there were ways of handling the Scriptures which God would not approve and he must therefore avoid them at all cost. It was essential for him to be aware that he was under divine scrutiny every time he expounded the word of truth. Paul later charges Timothy: “Preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine” (2 Tim 4:2). Inevitably such preaching would produce different reactions among his hearers, but Timothy was not to concern himself with preaching so that there would be a favourable reaction to him, but rather to deliver his soul before God. Whatever the consequences, he must always endeavour to divide the Word of truth in such a way as to receive approval from the Word's author: God Himself.

Every time a man stands up to declare God's Word, his work, like Timothy's, comes immediately under the eye of God. Every time he leaves his pulpit, he does so under the approval, or else the disapproval, of the One in whose name he has spoken. Few, if any, places can be more dreadful or sobering than the pulpit. There is no room here for flippancy or vulgarity.

¹³Vol 1, pp 395-6, 422-8.

The pulpit belongs to God, and from here He addresses His creatures on their way to eternity, through the tongues of mortal men.

Paul asks the Romans: "How shall they preach, except they be sent?" (Rom 10:15). The inference from this question should be clear: no man can truly preach unless the divine Head of the Church has commissioned him to do so. The first preacher we meet in the New Testament is John the Baptist, of whom it is written: "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John" (Jn 1:6). Although it is little recognised today, every pulpit is Christ's rightful property, and thus any man who occupies a pulpit unsent is a usurper. However, when a preacher enters the pulpit with a commission from Christ Jesus, he possesses an authority which neither man nor devil can deprive him of.

While Nehemiah was engaged in rebuilding Jerusalem, a work which God in providence had committed to him, he received an invitation to meet men who intended to do him harm. Whether the Lord's servant was fully aware of their intentions or not, his reply is worth noting: "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down" (Neh 6:3). It is thus quite obvious that he had very definite priorities from which he would not be diverted. His heart was in his work. Nothing was of greater importance to him. He felt the work was so great and it was such an honour to do it that it required his undivided attention. This spirit is essential in all those called by God to be workmen handling His Word. If they understand what this work of rightly dividing the Word of truth is, they will forego many interests and refuse to be involved in many activities in order to concentrate on the onerous work which they must have a heart for. By its very nature, it demands their concentrated attention.

The Psalmist testified, "My heart standeth in awe of Thy Word" (Ps 119:161). This is what God calls men to divide rightly, for the spiritual benefit of others. Until a man experiences what it is to stand in awe of that Word, he will never be in a position to handle it correctly. It ought to be a challenge to every potential teacher of God's Word: Do I stand in awe of it? If a man lacks such a disposition towards the Word of God, under no circumstances should the ministry be committed to him. If he is not awed by God's Word of truth, he is unfit for the ministry of that Word, whatever other gifts or qualities he may possess. Such a man neither understands the nature of the Word, nor the implications of preaching it.

The description, *the Word of truth*, means God's true Word; thus there is no error in it. It is entirely reliable and it is to be received by faith. If anyone tampers with it, it is no longer the Word of truth. But, awed by its immutable majesty, those who rightly divide the Word of truth will tremble at the very thought of contaminating it with their own thoughts. Whether in the prepara-

tory work prior to preaching or in the actual delivery of their message, there ought to be some sense of what Moses must have felt standing before the burning bush in the desert, when God said, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground" (Ex 3:5). What place on earth can be more awesome for the preacher of the Word than standing before the sacred, majestic, eternally-settled Word? He finds himself standing before the voice of the eternal God. He must wonder at times if he dare handle this Word. He must cry out, like the Psalmist, "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it" (Ps 139:6).

This work of rightly dividing the Word of truth requires studious application of the mind if one is to understand it properly. Paul is encouraging Timothy to be a workman. Timothy needed to appreciate the fact that rightly dividing the Word of truth is hard work. It is not for the slothful or the careless. Earlier in this chapter, Paul advises Timothy to "be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus", and also to "endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ" (2 Tim 2:1,3). Everything the Apostle said to Timothy suggests that the gospel preacher must be prepared to persevere in the face of difficulties in order rightly to divide the Word of truth with a view to preaching.

Neither Timothy or any other preacher of the Word has, in himself, what will enable him to expound aright God's infallible Word. He must be honest in his approach to the Word, recognising that what God says is contrary to the inclinations of the human heart. He needs to acknowledge the potential in his own heart to impose carnal notions upon the Word of God. Likewise he must understand that those who listen to him are naturally inclined to reject what God says, so that he must look for supernatural power to make his hearers willing to receive the message.

In summary, if the faithful preacher is to divide the Word of truth aright, he must be so taught by the Spirit of God that he approaches it with a sense of awe. He must study his text diligently, to the very best of his God-given ability, saturating his mind with it, seeking a spiritual understanding of it. He must penetrate his text and the text must penetrate him. This will only be possible as he fervently petitions the author of the Word, as the Psalmist does five times throughout Psalm 119, "Give me understanding". Having laboured in secret, he can proceed to the pulpit with his God-given message, with the confidence that God will not desert his ambassador. The promise is still sure: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgement thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of Me, saith the Lord" (Is 54:17). While the preacher has solemn duties, the results of his labours remain with God alone.

How necessary it is that the glorious Head of the Church would give strength and courage to His preaching servants in this dark and cloudy day, when there are so many temptations to weariness and discouragement in the work of the ministry! May it please Him also to grant His people the grace of prayer and supplication, so that they may hold up the hands of the Lord's ministers in these trying times!

Jesus Looking up to Heaven¹

A Sermon Outline by *John Kennedy*

John 17:1. Jesus lifted up His eyes to heaven.

These words furnish matter for wonder and instruction, part of which I desire to set before you in the following remarks.

What a wonderful attitude for Jesus.

As God, His throne is from everlasting to everlasting.

He was in the flesh on earth among men.

He was distinguished as the Man of sorrows.

At the same time He was looking down from the throne of God.

He was seeing an infinite distance between Himself and the highest creatures.

At the same time He was looking up from the lowest depth of humiliation.

What a distance He looked across.

He was then in the position of one under the curse.

He was looking to His place in heaven as He was God.

He knew what lay between Him and death.

He knew what He had to suffer at the hands of the high priest and rulers.

He knew what He would suffer through the weakness of His disciples.

He knew what He would suffer from divine wrath and the assaults of hell.

Sin caused all His Humiliation.

Believer, only through Him could you have been brought nigh to God.

Think of Him as kinsman and surety for your redemption.

Think of Him as God opening the way at such a cost.

How certain was an answer to His appeal to His Father.

It was on the ground of His finished work.

Think of His divine glory before the Father's face.

Think of His Example.

Believer, you should imitate Him in looking to heaven.

Do not try to be independent, when *He* was a supplicant.

¹Preached in Dingwall, on 3 September 1882, and edited.

You can adopt His plea.

You can intercede in His name, as well as according to His example.

Do not fear repulse when you plead in the name of Jesus.

Application.

What a rebuke to those who do not follow His example!

This is a tribute to the desirableness of heaven.

Do not be so foolish as to say, I can do without prayer.

Book Reviews¹

Ernest Kevan, Leader in Twentieth Century British Evangelicalism, by Paul E Brown, published by the Banner of Truth Trust, paperback, 312 pages, £8.00.

Over the past 20 years there has developed a growing literature on the recovery in England during the latter half of the twentieth century of Evangelicalism in general, and the Reformed Faith in particular. To many of the current readers of the *Free Presbyterian Magazine* the name of Ernest Frederick Kevan will be unfamiliar. He was, however, as the title of Paul Brown's book suggests, one of the leaders in this movement.

Kevan was a Strict Baptist minister (not Gospel Standard) who, after two decades in the pastoral ministry in the London area, became the first Principal of the inter-denominational London Bible College. Until his death in 1965, it was regarded as the most conservative Bible College in England.

Born on 11 January 1903, he came from a Strict Baptist family. When his father had to give up work due to a damaged heart at the age of 45, Ernest Kevan had to leave school, aged 17, and commenced work in the tea-tasting department of the Home and Colonial Stores in Mincing Lane, London.

Following a period of spiritual concern he had been converted at the age of 14 and seven years later, in 1924, though he had no formal ministerial training, he was called to be Pastor of Church Hill Baptist Church in Walthamstow. Formed in 1633, this was the oldest Baptist Church in London. Kevan served the congregation for ten years and on the three-hundredth anniversary of the congregation he wrote his first book, *London's Oldest Baptist Church* (The Kingsgate Press, 1933).

He then went on for a further decade to pastor another London congregation south of the Thames, at New Cross, before commencing a two-year pastorate in a Calvinistic Baptist Chapel in Tooting. The chapters of the biography detailing these pastorates provide a fascinating insight into the life of the non-Gospel Standard Strict Baptist Churches in London in the inter-war years

¹Both publications reviewed here are obtainable from the Free Presbyterian Bookroom.

and then during the Second World War when the capital was being attacked by German bombers.

Kevan's third pastorate was cut short due to his appointment in 1944 to the faculty of the newly-formed London Bible College. He became Principal two years later and continued in this strategic position until his death in 1965 at the age of 62. Based in central London, the College originally offered only correspondence courses and evening classes. By 1944, over 300 students were enrolled, and two years later the number had increased to 1400. The first 23 full-time students started their studies in 1946.

As Principal of London Bible College he took a leading role in Reformed organisations in the capital and was an active participant in the Puritan Conference. Kevan also promoted Evangelical biblical scholarship by his contributions to theological journals and by co-editing the landmark volume, published by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship in 1953, *The New Bible Commentary*. To this book Kevan contributed the exposition of Genesis and a Note on the Resurrection Appearances of our Lord.

From a Free Presbyterian perspective there are aspects of Dr Kevan's life and witness of which we would wholeheartedly approve and other matters at which we would demur. On the positive side he was committed to church extension and believed that not only ministers but also all Christians should be noted for a commitment to work hard and not waste time. During his second pastorate he renounced the commonly-held Strict Baptist view that, because a sinner is dead in sin and morally and spiritually unable to believe, it is not his duty to do so. Kevan heartily approved of distinct ministerial dress and would have been horrified at the way many professed Evangelical ministers in England dress at the present time.

Matters in his witness at which we would demur were his commitment to pacifism, his attendance and speaking at the Keswick Convention (even though in his Bible Reading series in 1953 on Romans 7 and 8 he expounded the Reformed view of those chapters and contradicted the view of Keswick teachers like Graham Scroggie) and his support of Billy Graham's Harringay Crusade. It came as a surprise to the reviewer to learn that Kevan's book, *What the Scriptures Teach* (Evangelical Press, 1966), was originally a series of eight booklets for training counsellors at Harringay and his book *Going On*, (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1964) was a correspondence course he had been commissioned to write for those professing conversion at Harringay. The books give no indication of their origin.

At the end of the biography there is a nine-page appendix reviewing and giving excerpts from Kevan's magnum opus, *The Grace of Law* (Carey Kingsgate Press, 1964 and recently reprinted by Reformation Heritage Books).

This was his doctoral thesis on the Puritan view of the Law and is a most useful and important book.

Paul Brown, who was a student at London Bible College when Kevan was Principal, has produced a well-researched biography that is essential for understanding the resurgence in Evangelical scholarship in England after World War II. The biography began as a lecture, at the 2008 Westminster Conference, which Mr Brown was encouraged to expand into a book. The volume is a huge step forward from Gilbert W Kirby's slender life, *Ernest Kevan – Pastor and Principal* (Victory Press, 1968). The quality of book meets the usual high standards of the Banner of Truth Trust. *Roy Middleton*

The Culdee Church, Scotland's First Presbyterians, by T V Moore, published by the James Begg Society (Issue 66 of *The Presbyterian Standard*), booklet, 44 pages, £2.50, obtainable from the F P Bookroom.

This historical article by the American Bible commentator and Presbyterian minister, T V Moore (1818-1871) was originally published in 1868 in *Central Presbyterian* magazine. It has the explanatory sub-heading: "The historical connection of modern Presbyterian churches with those of Apostolic times, through the Church of Scotland". It was originally aimed at young people amid fears that "there is a growing tendency amongst our people, and especially our young people, to give in to the exclusive claims of other Churches to Apostolical authority, and to concede some species of inferiority to the Presbyterian Church in this matter" (p 40).

The booklet sets out to show that Christianity came to Scotland through the Greek Church and not the Roman or Western Church. It develops this foundation by seeking to demonstrate that the Celtic Church in Scotland (identified with those known as Culdee missionaries) had a more Presbyterian structure than the hierarchical system of Episcopacy imposed by Rome.

Evidence is brought out which shows that there were very significant differences and conflicts between the early Culdee Church and the Romish missionaries, and that persecution of the Culdees led to the Romanising of Scotland in the twelfth century, prior to the Reformation. Much of the material will be familiar to students of Scottish Church history, but this booklet is a useful reminder for young people that the claims of Rome to an unbroken succession through the early and middle ages of the Christian era are unfounded as far as Scotland in particular is concerned.

This book is not an academic study; it is easy to read and convincing in its arguments. It does not set out to prove an exact parallel between the Culdee Church and the Presbyterian Church in Scotland after the Reformation,

but it is successful in correcting several myths regarding the history of Christianity in Scotland. If it stirs up interest and engagement with the past works of the Lord in our land it will serve a very useful purpose.

(Rev) D Campbell

Protestant View

Reactions to Resignation of Cardinal O'Brien¹

Cardinal Keith O'Brien is no longer Archbishop of St Andrews and Edinburgh; he suddenly resigned because of complaints made against him by three priests and a former priest. The complainants contacted the Vatican's ambassador to Britain, alleging serious inappropriate conduct towards each of them by the Cardinal some 30 years ago.

In his statement of February 25, O'Brien, who was due to retire in March, said that the Pope "has now decided that my resignation will take effect today" – making it clear, as has been said, that "he was pushed more than he jumped". He did not deny but just "contests" the allegations.

He was the only British cleric due to participate in the imminent conclave in Rome for the election of a new pope, but he will not now do so. While some other cardinals are facing calls not to attend the conclave because of allegations of covering up abuse by priests, Cardinal O'Brien's case is regarded as more serious because it is alleged that he was personally and directly involved in grave misconduct with others.

Even doughty defenders of Roman Catholicism see his resignation as a disaster for their church. Clifford Longley, columnist for the Roman Catholic newspaper *The Tablet*, says that it is "the worst thing that could possibly have happened to the Church at this moment". Damian Thompson of *The Daily Telegraph* says it will "remind the cardinals . . . that allegations against its clergy have now permeated the entire institution". He adds that if the charges have any substance, "then the public credibility of the Scottish Catholic Church will collapse". Professor Tom Devine, a Roman Catholic academic, said he is concerned by the lack of a denial in the cardinal's resignation statement, and that this resignation "is probably the gravest single public crisis to hit the Catholic Church in Scotland since the Reformation".

Even Cardinal Murphy-O'Connor says, in response to the resignation, "As

¹Since this piece was written, the Cardinal has confessed, "There have been times that my sexual conduct has fallen below the standards expected of me as a priest, archbishop and cardinal". In the light of this, Archbishop Tartaglia of Glasgow has admitted, "The credibility and moral authority of the Catholic Church has been dealt a serious blow". *Ed.*

you know, there have been troubles in recent years and scandals, and these have to be addressed. . . . The pope's own house has to be put in order. . . . There is no doubt in my mind that there has to be reform."

Can there be meaningful reform of an organisation which deplores the great and glorious, liberating Reformation of the sixteenth century and continues to oppose it? For a start, Rome would have to repudiate its grossly false doctrine of papal infallibility. But that is impossible, because the Vatican Council of 1870, having stated that the pope is "possessed of infallibility" when "he defines . . . a doctrine concerning faith and morals", also decided that his definitions "are irreformable of themselves".

The papacy, having thus locked itself into its numerous errors, is beyond reform in the sense of removing the errors and adhering solely to the truth of Scripture. So it is not only hastening its own destruction but also tragically deluding multitudes. May the time speedily come, as it surely will, when the call shall be obeyed on a large scale: "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you" (2 Cor 6:17). *NMR*

Notes and Comments

Importance of the Authorised Version for the Church in Britain

The Authorised Version (AV) is often promoted and defended on the grounds of its accuracy and of the Greek text (the Received Text) underlying its New Testament translation. The Received Text is the "Church text" of the Reformation, adopted by the Reformers and the Churches, whereas most or all modern versions use Greek texts which, it is not unfair to say, have been cobbled together by unbelieving scholars and are heavily dependent on a few grossly erroneous early manuscripts which these scholars insist on referring to as "the best". This in itself should make English-speaking Christians wary of abandoning the AV in favour of modern versions (was Satan inactive in the preparation of these new Greek texts?), but there are a host of other reasons as well.

One of these is the distinct patterns of behaviour that accompany the use of the AV and of modern versions. It is a general rule, for instance, that in churches that use the AV, the men will be wearing suits and ties, and the women hats and skirts; whereas in churches that abandon the AV these things tend to disappear. It can hardly be the case that all the women in these churches have re-examined 1 Corinthians 11 and concluded that head-coverings are not in fact obligatory: what has obviously happened is that the nature

of the worship has changed. It is no longer as solemn as it used to be and people feel comfortable coming to church in more casual clothing. But if the nature of the worship has changed, then the view of God must have changed. He has lost (in the minds of these people) something of the awe and respect that is due to Him. A further indication that this is so is that the doctrine of hell tends to be less explicitly preached in churches which use modern versions. The experience of the last 50 years has shown that modern versions are a slippery slope in matters of worship, conduct and doctrine.

Another reason is that no modern version is able to command the field, so the adoption of a modern version inevitably opens the door to multiple versions. The NIV, the NKJV and the ESV are all popular at the moment in different circles in Britain. This multiplicity throws away the great advantage of having a single version, because when there is one accepted version we can all recognise quotations from the Bible and in the course of a lifetime we can memorise large parts of it. The effect of having multiple versions has been to make church-goers relatively ignorant of the Bible. Users of modern versions often do not recognise passages familiar to AV users, because what was striking and memorable in the AV may be bland and unmemorable in their current version (which may soon be superseded anyway). The resulting ignorance of the Bible makes the Church vulnerable to error and to false teachers.

A third reason is that the use of the AV marks a different view of the Church and of divine providence. The AV was the culmination of the various English Reformation translations (Tyndale, the Great Bible, the Geneva Bible, etc), and for three centuries it was *the* English-speaking version. The AV is a principal part of the Protestant heritage of Britain and it provides an entrance to the writings of the Reformers and Puritans, to the English Protestant confessions (the Scots Confession, the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Westminster Confession, etc), to the history of God's dealings with the Church in Britain, and to the example and experience of English-speaking forefathers in the Church. All this is very precious, and it is something that we should wish to profit from and to transmit to future generations.

The unhappy tendency of modern versions is to distance people from all these things. The very decision to use a modern version carries with it an implicit rejection of this heritage: the person has decided to make a fresh start and not to walk in the old paths of the English-speaking Church. Such a mindset is in itself unwise, and the decision has the further consequence that the writings of the past soon become "difficult" because people are less familiar with their language. In a little while, the whole heritage may be lost, not excluding Bunyan and M'Cheyne, and people approach church issues as if they were the first generation of Christians and it was their place to lay the found-

ations. The resulting ignorance, weakness and chaos can be seen throughout the Evangelical church in Britain.

Experience suggests that the choice of a Bible version is as much a spiritual matter as a rational one, and that some people are wedded to modern versions because they are deliberately escaping from the Protestant heritage of Britain: they do not wish to be part of it. Others may adopt modern versions because they think, misguidedly in our view, that modern versions are more effective for evangelistic purposes. But whatever the reason, such people cannot be allowed to drag the rest of the Church with them. We regard the step that they have taken as dangerous (for the reasons given above) and divisive, and we cannot imperil the well-being of the Church just for the sake of unity with them.

DWBS

Reform of the Public Order Act

A recent high-profile campaign has resulted in the Westminster Government removing the word “insulting” from Section 5 of the Public Order Act 1986. In December, the House of Lords voted by a substantial majority to amend the Act, and the Government has agreed not to challenge their lordships. As this Act has been used against professing Christians over the years it is heartening to find a positive decision being made in the Houses of Parliament when much that has happened there recently has grieved the people of God.

This section of the Public Order Act has been used to arrest and prosecute Christians who spoke the truth in public; many have seen it as a means of restricting Christian expression, especially when the evil of homosexuality is being exposed. The Act came into being as a response to disorder around the time of the Brixton riots of 1981. Undoubtedly such disturbances required action, but here the criminal law moved beyond normal breach of the peace and violence to cover areas of “annoyance, disturbance and inconvenience”. It became an offence to use “threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour, or disorderly behaviour” in the hearing or sight of a person who was “likely to be caused harassment, alarm or distress thereby”. Police did not even need to identify the alleged victim of the insult. The fear was that this was a “catch all” offence to be used by over-zealous policemen to arrest people without real grounds. Those who preached the gospel and spoke out against sin in public were left in a vulnerable position.

For example, in 2002 some members of the public reacted angrily to a street preacher in Bournemouth who carried signs saying, “Stop Immorality”, “Stop Homosexuality” and “Stop Lesbianism”. They called the police, who charged the man. He was later convicted and fined several hundred pounds under the Act. He died before an appeal was heard, when the High Court

upheld the conviction on the grounds that his conduct was deemed to have been insulting to homosexuals.

There were several other cases of unjust arrests. A street preacher, who is autistic, read out passages of the Bible against homosexuality; a complaint was made and police took him away in handcuffs. He was later released and compensated for the trauma, as the events had “made him anxious, shocked and very humiliated”. Another street preacher, Michael Overd from Somerset, preaching the love of God for sinners stated, “Even these dear men caught in homosexuality, if they ask God for forgiveness of sin, can be forgiven”. Two men listening made an official complaint over these words, resulting in his being charged. He was later able to prove that his behaviour was not insulting but was meant to show hope for such people in Christ. However, the danger of arrest for preachers, under this Act, was always very real. In 2010 one was arrested and charged though he did not even mention homosexuality in his preaching. A police officer questioning him afterwards asked if he believed homosexual acts were sinful. The preacher was imprisoned for his honest response, though later cleared and compensated for wrongful arrest.

Again a hotel owner was arrested who had a seemingly-innocent religious discussion with a Muslim guest, as was a cafe owner who displayed Bible verses on his premises, and a teenager demonstrating outside the London headquarters of the “Church” of Scientology with the words, “Scientology is a dangerous cult”.

Such arrests can no longer be made under Section 5. The Home Secretary has stated: “Using insulting language will no longer be illegal in cases in which a specific victim cannot be identified”. This allows a little more freedom to proclaim the Word of God faithfully in public places. We know that Satan desires with all his malevolent heart to close the mouths of those who declare God’s name and he will use any means to achieve that goal. However, we are to take encouragement when the Lord says concerning the Word that goes forth out of His mouth: “It shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it” (Is 55:11). *KHM*

Church Information

General Building Fund

By appointment of Synod, this year’s special collection on behalf of the General Building Fund is due to be taken in congregations during April.

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:** **Struan:** Sabbath 12 noon; Wednesday 7 pm (fortnightly). Contact Rev J B Jardine; tel: 01859 502253.
- Breascleite:** no services meantime.
- Dingwall:** Church, Hill Street: Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. **Beauly** (Balblair): Sabbath 6.30 pm, Thursday 7.30 pm. Rev Neil M Ross BA, Dingwall, 10 Achany Rd, IV15 9JB; tel/fax: 01349 864351, e-mail: nmross2001@yahoo.co.uk.
- Dornoch:** Sabbath 11.30 am. **Bonar:** Sabbath 6 pm. Wednesday 7.30 pm (alternately in Dornoch and Bonar). **Lairg:** Church and Manse; **Rogart:** Church; no F P services. Contact Rev G G Hutton; tel: 01463 712872.
- Dundee:** Manse. No F P Church services.
- Edinburgh:** 63 Gilmore Place, Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Thursday 7.30 pm. Manse tel: 0131 447 1920. Contact Mr I R MacLeod; tel: 0131 334 4057.
- Farr** (by Daviot); Sabbath 12 noon. **Tomatin:** Sabbath 12 noon. **Stratherrick:** Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm. (Each of these services is held once in three weeks as intimated). **Farr:** Thursday 7.30 pm (weekly). Contact Rev G G Hutton; tel: 01463 712872.
- Fort William:** Monzie Square, Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm as intimated. Manse: 15 Perth Place, PH33 6UL; tel: 01397 708553. Contact Mr D A McKinnon. Tel: 01397 702597.
- 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.
- Greenock:** 40 East Hamilton Street, Sabbath 2.30 pm.
- Halkirk:** Sabbath 11.30 am, 5 pm; Thursday 7 pm. Manse tel: 01847 831758. **Wick:** Church; **Thurso:** Church; **Strathy:** Church; no F P Church services.
- Harris (North):** **Tarbert:** Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm; Thursday 7 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, Sheilebost, Strond** and **Geocrab** as intimated. Rev K D Macleod BSc, F P Manse, Leverburgh, HS5 3UA; tel: 01859 520271.
- Inverness:** Chapel Street, Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Rev G G Hutton BA, 11 Auldcastle Road, Inverness, IV2 3PZ; tel: 01463 712872.
- Kinlochervie:** 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. 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. Manse tel: 01571 844484.
- Ness:** Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. Rev A W MacColl MA PhD, F P Manse, Swainbost, HS2 0TA; 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. Contact Mr A MacPherson; tel: 01569 760370.
- Portree:** Sabbath 12 noon, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. Contact Rev W A Weale; tel: 01470 562243.
- Raasay:** Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm; Saturday 7 pm. Contact Rev W A Weale; tel: 01470 562243.
- Shieldaig:** Sabbath 11 am; **Applecross:** Sabbath 6pm. Tuesday 7 pm (alternately in Shieldaig and Applecross). Shieldaig manse tel: 01520 755259, Applecross manse tel: 01520 744411. 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 9HY; tel: 01470 562243.
- Stornoway:** Matheson Road, Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Thursday 7.30 pm. **Achmore:** Sabbath 12 noon; Tuesday 7 pm. Rev J R Tallach MB ChB, 2 Fleming Place, Stornoway, HS1 2NH; tel: 01851 702501.
- 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.
- Vatten:** Sabbath 6 pm; Wednesday 7 pm (fortnightly). **Glendale, Waternish:** As intimated. Contact Rev J B Jardine; tel: 01859 502253.

England

- Barnoldswick:** Kelbrook Road, Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Friday 7.30 pm; Wednesday 8 pm, alternately in Sandbach and Gatley. **South Manchester:** Sabbath 6.00 pm, in Trinity Church, Massie Street, Cheadle (entry at rear of building). Rev K M Watkins, 1 North Street, Barnoldswick, BB18 5PE; tel: 01282 850296.
- Broadstairs:** Sabbath 11 am, 5 pm at Portland Centre, Hopeville Ave, St Peter's; Tuesday 7 pm at Friends' Meeting House, St Peter's Park Rd. Contact Dr T Martin; tel: 01843 866369.
- London:** Zoar Chapel, Varden St. E1. Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. 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 7.30 pm. Rev J L Goldby MA, 23 Upper Cairncastle Road, Larne, BT40 2EF; tel: 02828 274865.

Canada

Chesley, Ontario: Church and Manse, 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: Contact: Mr John MacLeod, 202-815 4th Avenue, New Westminster, V3M 1S8; tel: 604-516-8648.

USA

Santa Fe, Texas: Church and Manse, 4031 Jackson St 77517. Sabbath 10.30 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Contact Mr Joseph Smith, 1055 FM 646 West, #1021, Dickinson, Texas 77539; tel: 409 927 1564.

Australia

Grafton, NSW: 172 Fitzroy Street. Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. Contact Mr Geoff Kidd, PO Box 1585, Grafton, NSW, 2460; tel. 0417 429 728.

Sydney, NSW: Corner of Oxford and Regent Streets, Riverstone. Sabbath 10.30 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Rev G B Macdonald BSc, 60 Hamilton St, Riverstone, NSW 2765; tel. 02 9627 3408; e-mail:sydneyfpchurch@aapt.net.au.

New Zealand

Auckland: 45 Church Street, Otahuhu, Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Rev J D Smith, 9 Pedlar Place, Conifer Grove, Auckland; tel: 09 282 4195.

Gisborne: 463a Childers Road. Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Contact: Dr G Cramp; tel: 02 7454 2722.

Tauranga: Girl Guide Hall, 17th Avenue, Sabbath 11 am, 7 pm; Thursday 7 pm. Contact: Mr Dick Vermeulen; tel: 075443677.

Wellington: 4 Rewa Terrace, Tawa. Sabbath 11 am, 4 pm; 3rd Wednesday of the month (not secondary school holidays) 7.30 pm. Contact: Mr Hank Optland, P O Box 150, Carterton, 5743; tel: 02 7432 5625.

Singapore

Singapore: Sabbath: 9.30am and 5.30 pm; Beacons International College campus, 1A Short Street, Level 2, Room L2--A, Singapore 188210; Wednesday: 7.45 pm, #03-04A, SCN Industrial Building, 11 Sims Drive, Singapore 387385. Contact: Mr Bernard Yong, 4 Chuan Place, Singapore 554822; tel: (65) 6383 4466, fax: 6383 4477, e-mail: byong1@singnet.com.sg.

Ukraine

Odessa: F P Mission Station, 3 Pestelya Street, 65031. Contact Mr I Zadorozhnyi, P O Box 100, Odessa-91, 65091; e-mail: antipa@eurocom.od.ua; or Mr D Levysky; tel:00 38 048 785 19 24; e-mail: dlevysky@gmail.com.

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, e-mail: skhumalo.by@gmail.com.

Ingenya: Church and Secondary School. Rev A B MacLean. Postal Address: Ingenya Mission, Private Bag T5445, Bulawayo.

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

New Canaan: Church.

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

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
John Newton – Bitesize Biography by J Crotts Evangelical Press, 2013, pbk, 128pp	£6.99	£4.99
The Story of the Scottish Reformation by A M Renwick Christian Focus Publications, 2010, hbk, 219pp	£7.99	£5.50
The Path of True Godliness by W Teellink Reformation Heritage Books, 2006, pbk, 303pp	£10.95	£8.95
Truth Unchanged, Unchanging by D M Lloyd-Jones Christian Focus Publications, 2013, pbk, 112pp	£5.95	£4.50
A Spiritual Appeal to Christ's Bride by J van Lodenstein Reformation Heritage Books, 2010, pbk, 173pp	£11.99	£9.50

(Postage is extra)

Subscription rates, including postage:

F P Magazine £26.00 (£2.00 per copy) • Y P Magazine £15.00 (£1.00 per copy)

Combined £39.00