

# 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

Abraham and the Promises .....	289
<b>Christ Praying to Be Glorified (1)</b>	
A Sermon by James Stewart.....	292
<b>The Fall of Man (1)</b>	
Rev Donald Macdonald.....	299
<b>Archibald Cook</b>	
<b>2. Minister in Inverness and Daviot</b>	
Rev J R Mackay .....	306
<b>“We Preach not Ourselves but Christ”</b>	
Rev G G Hutton.....	311
<b>Book Reviews</b>	
<i>Alexander Peden</i> by Maurice Grant.....	314
Children's Books by Sinclair B Ferguson .....	314
<b>Protestant View</b> .....	315
<b>Notes and Comments</b> .....	316
<b>Church Information</b> .....	319

**October 2013**

**Vol 118 • No 10**

## The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland

**Moderator of Synod:** Rev Neil M Ross BA, 10 Achany Rd, Dingwall, IV15 9JB.

**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:**

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

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

**Website of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland:** [www.fpchurch.org.uk](http://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:** Larne, North Uist, Zenka.

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

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

**May: First Sabbath:** Aberdeen, Grafton, London; **Second:** Achmore, Donsa, Kinlochbervie; **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, Munaka, Portree; **Third:** Tarbert; **Fourth:** Aberdeen, Barnoldswick, North Uist; **Fifth:** Fort William, Ingwenya.

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

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

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

# The Free Presbyterian Magazine

Volume 118

October 2013

Number 10

## Abraham and the Promises

Abraham was a true believer; indeed he is described as “the father of all them that believe” (Rom 4:11). Obviously, he was the ancestor of the Israelites, who constituted the visible Church of Old Testament times, but the Church is no longer confined largely to the Jews. So, to quote Charles Hodge’s comments, New Testament “believers are called the children of Abraham because of this identity of religious nature or character, as he stands out in Scripture as *the* believer . . . and because they are his heirs, inheriting the blessings promised to him”. Hodge also states that “the word *heir*, in Scripture, frequently means *secure possessor*” (probably because, he explains, “among the Jews possession by inheritance was much more secure and permanent than that obtained by purchase”).<sup>1</sup> In that case, every believer is the secure possessor, through Christ, of all the spiritual blessings promised to Abraham.

Believers must experience trial and, since Abraham was *the* believer, we need not be surprised that his faith was tried more than most, if not all, of his spiritual children. God directed Abraham to offer up his son Isaac. To obey this command was to cut through bonds of strong love between father and son; that was a sore trial. But there was more, far more: Isaac was the son who had been given to him by divine promise. God had told him: “In Isaac shall thy seed be called” (Gen 21:12). Isaac was the son promised to Abraham in these words: “Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him” (Gen 17:19).

The birth of Isaac had spiritual significance. No doubt Abraham could, by faith, relate these promises to the promise made in the Garden of Eden of the seed of the woman who, by bruising Satan’s head, would defeat Satan’s plan to destroy spiritually the whole human race and thus take away very seriously from the glory of God. It was through this seed that the further divine promise to Abraham would be fulfilled: “In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed” (Gen 12:3). And what greater blessing could there be than salvation

<sup>1</sup> Hodge, *A Commentary on Romans*, Banner of Truth reprint, 1983, pp 117,119.

from sin? It would be salvation, not only for sinners scattered throughout the earth, but for Abraham himself; his deliverance from the power of sin and from a lost eternity was dependent on the Seed that was to be born in the fullness of time, through the line of Isaac.

Manifestly, if Isaac was to die, these promises would be invalidated. And then how could he himself be saved? And how could anyone else, past, present or future be saved? But Abraham knew that God's promises are utterly reliable; they cannot be broken. And he obeyed; we are told: "He that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son" (Heb 11:17). He obeyed the instruction although it seemed completely to contradict the promises which had been made to him.

It was by faith he obeyed; he acted in complete trust on the One who had made these promises to him; this is clearly stated in the first part of the verse just quoted: "*By faith* Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac". He knew that God is absolutely trustworthy; He is altogether true in all that He says. So although Abraham could not see how these promises could be fulfilled, he knew that God's understanding and power are such that He can bring about whatever He has promised. The promises were sure because of the faithfulness of the Promiser. Thus Abraham felt safe in going ahead, taking Isaac to the mountain to which God told him to go. Even when he tied Isaac to the wood, his faith did not waver. Even when he took the knife in his hand to kill Isaac according to God's command, he was trusting in the great God who had assured him of His blessing.

Certainly Abraham was mistaken in how he thought God would fulfil His promise. He based his thinking on the fact "that God was able to raise [Isaac], even from the dead" (Heb 11:19). Abraham was right in recognising God's power to raise a human being from the dead, though doubtless he had never heard of that happening. But God worked even more wonderfully for him; He stopped Abraham from going further and the knife never touched his son. That he was wrong in the way he anticipated God would deliver Isaac did not matter. What *did* matter was his trust, and his trust was vindicated. God's promises held firm; Isaac would indeed have a seed, and through that seed there would be salvation for "all the families of the earth".

God's promises to His children will always hold firm. They may find themselves in seemingly-impossible situations. Their duty may be clear, but as they look around them, difficulties may be obvious. Indeed the difficulties may seem so great as to make it impossible for them to proceed. What can they do? There ought to be no question: they must do whatever is their duty, relying on the promises of God. And these promises are many; they include: "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee" (Heb 13:5), a promise previously

made to the children of Israel – and to Joshua, their leader – in connection with the dangerous mission of entering Canaan to conquer the land.

There were strong cities to be conquered; there were giants to be fought and defeated. These were among the difficulties that had so influenced the 10 unbelieving spies that they brought back to Moses a very negative report. Their fundamental weakness was that they did not trust God to lead them safely on till they took possession of Canaan. But Joshua and Caleb resisted that report; they believed God's promises and trusted that He would fulfil them. Accordingly they brought a trustful minority report.

Soon after being given God's promise, Joshua took up the responsible position of leading Israel across the Jordan to lay siege against Jericho and to face all the other difficulties that would confront him and his people. He went on, trusting in God's promises. And, according to his faith, he experienced God's help. He and his people successfully crossed the Jordan, conquered Jericho and took possession of the land.

God is still the same today. And His promises are as sure as they were in Abraham's time, and in Joshua's time. Unbelief will focus on temporal factors, including what other people will do and how they will react, but faith will focus on God and His power, His wisdom and His faithfulness. God's children today are to trust in these promises as firmly as previous generations of God's children – in biblical times and since. Let today's believers remember also that the faith they need is God's gift. In their weakness let them look to Him for strength, and for grace to trust Him to fulfil His promises – as Paul prayed that the Ephesians would “be strengthened with might by [God's] Spirit in the inner man” (Eph 3:16).

The whole of life is a difficult journey, not least for those who have never trusted in Christ. To them these words are particularly addressed: “Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness” (Mt 6:33). Then, having found Him, they will have One to guide them safely to the end of their days, and on into a better world.

Asaph experienced serious difficulties as he considered the prosperity of *wicked* people around him; they even had an easy death. How, he asked, could a holy God allow such things to happen? But God showed him, when he went to the sanctuary, that they were on a slippery slope leading to a lost eternity. Then, his difficulties removed, he could say trustingly: “Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory” (Ps 73:24).

May each of us be given grace to trust in Christ for the salvation of our souls and then go on trusting in God and His promises, whatever difficulties we may experience in this sinful world! What a mercy to be heirs of God – secure possessors of all the spiritual blessings promised to Abraham!

# Christ Praying to Be Glorified (1)<sup>1</sup>

A Sermon by James Stewart

John 17:1-5. *These words spake Jesus, and lifted up His eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee: as Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him. And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent. I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do. And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.*

With exquisite tenderness, Christ had mitigated the sorrow of His disciples, whose deepest feelings had been touched and whose brightest hopes had been destroyed by the announcement of His approaching sufferings and death. He then, in their hearing, offered up this beautiful prayer. It has generally been considered a pattern of the intercession which He now makes for His people in heaven. It consists of earnest supplications to the Father for Himself, as about to “finish the transgression and to make an end of sins”; for His immediate followers, about to be deprived of His personal fellowship and guardianship; and for as many as should believe in His name in the succeeding ages of the world.

In the first five verses, the petitions of Christ refer directly to Himself, who had now reached that part of the work of redemption when He must make “His soul an offering for sin”, when He must endure the mocking of His enemies, have the light of His Father’s countenance withdrawn from Him and taste the bitterness of death. But before quoting the prayer, the Evangelist describes the attitude in which it was presented, “*These words spake Jesus, and lifted up His eyes to heaven*”. The minutest particulars recorded about Christ deserve our attention. The devotional attitude which He here describes is beautiful and expressive. As heaven is specially the residence of God, it is the temple of the universe. And as the Jews in their religious worship turned their faces towards Jerusalem, because it was the city of the Great King, and contained the created symbol of His presence, so God’s creatures everywhere, when they address prayer and adoration to Him, naturally look to the place which is honoured by the visible manifestation of the true Shechinah.

The attitude of looking up to heaven signified the wish of Christ to withdraw from human society, in which there was nothing congenial to the perfect

<sup>1</sup>Taken, with editing, from *Remains of Rev James Stewart*. Stewart (1813-46) was first minister of Wallacetown, Ayr, and later of the Free South Church in Aberdeen.

purity of His soul, and to behold and admire the transcendent excellence of God. It intimated the earnestness of His prayer, for a greater intensity of desire is often manifested, and a stronger and more effectual appeal to sympathy made, by the wistful, beseeching look of a suppliant than by the power of language. It exhibited His full confidence in the love of His Father and a sense of His own acceptableness, for conscious demerit and guilty fear would have led to conduct similar to that of the publican, who would not so much as raise his eyes to heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, "God be merciful to me a sinner".

Christ, who is "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," was able, without confusion or shame, to lift up His eyes to heaven, saying, "Abba, Father". He had previously instructed His disciples to address God as their Father in heaven; what He had enjoined in words, He now taught by example. This indeed is the name by which He almost invariably calls upon God in prayer. "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in Thy sight." "Now is My soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour." "Father, glorify Thy name." When He was in the garden of Gethsemane, He prayed, "Father, if Thou be willing, remove this cup from Me". While experiencing the cruelty of His persecutors, He interceded for them: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do". And when He bowed His head and gave up the ghost, He said, "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit".

By using the name, "*Father*", Christ expressed the relation between Himself and Him whom He addressed; He intimated the reverence, confidence and trust which He felt, and He suggested the obligation under which God was, as His Father, to hear His prayer. The great significance of the name is enough to show Christ's purpose, not only in using it Himself, but in teaching His people to use it. When believers address God as their Father, they also express the relation into which He has, through Christ, condescended to enter; they intimate the reverence, trust and dependence which they feel; and they suggest the obligation which He has graciously taken on Himself to bless and satisfy them.

When, however, Christ uses the name, it is necessarily understood in an inconceivably higher sense than when adopted by believers. As to His divine nature, Christ is the only-begotten, eternal Son of the Father and is therefore one with Him in essence, and equal with Him in power and glory. Even in His human nature, Christ was the Son of God in a sense altogether exclusive. This is expressly intimated in the words addressed by the angel to Mary:

“The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God”. Angels are the sons of God by creation, and men by adoption, but Christ “hath, by inheritance, obtained a more excellent name than they”.

Before presenting His desires to His Father, He gives a short but emphatic statement of the circumstances in which He then was, and by which He was urged to pray: “*The hour is come*”. The hour that had now come was undoubtedly the short period of His last sufferings which He expressively called “the hour . . . of darkness”. He mentions it as an hour which He had anticipated. This hour, and the momentous transactions which took place in it, were fixed by an eternal decree of the Father. Types and symbols, predictions and promises, had pointed to it from the beginning of the world, and the faith and hope of believers had been divinely directed to it in successive ages. It was the most important hour in time. All that was past looked forward to it, and all that was to come would look back to it. Into it were gathered events which were to fill the universe with gladness and awaken it into praise, and were to be a subject of endless investigation and wonder to angels, and of eternal joy to men.

But while this hour was glorious in its consequences, it was to Christ an hour of intensest agony. While it continued He was subjected to the highest degree of bodily and mental suffering. He had to endure the reviling and mockery of the blinded and infatuated Jews. That one of His disciples should betray Him, that another should deny Him, and that they all should forsake Him, must have inflicted a wound still deeper and more painful. And the hiding of His Father’s countenance, which had eternally beamed on Him with infinite love and complacency, filled to overflowing the bitter cup which was put into His hand. It was decreed that the brightest light should spring out of the deepest darkness, the greatest enjoyment out of the heaviest affliction, the highest exaltation and honour out of the lowest abasement and shame, and hence the necessity and urgency of the prayer, “Glorify Thy Son”.

At no period did the necessity so manifestly appear for the Father to vindicate the honour and glory of His Son as in the hour which had now come. Then He was subjected to every indignity which the most inventive ingenuity could contrive and was exposed to every cruelty which the darkest revenge could inflict. He was apparently condemned by the ordinary laws by which human society is regulated and was put to death as a criminal. He had not concealed His title to the sceptre which had already departed from Judah, and to the obedience which was due to the King of the Jews. He had claimed a higher descent than from the most illustrious of Israel’s sovereigns



– a descent which constituted Him, not only David’s son, but also David’s Lord. But His countrymen treated His claims with mockery and derision and complained that the title affixed to His cross was a national insult.

There were some who believed that it was He whose reign and triumphs had been foretold by the prophets, and who waited for the time when He should “restore the kingdom to Israel”. But their faith could scarcely be sustained even by the multiplicity of miracles He performed; and their hopes, after being long deferred, were in danger of being buried in His tomb. They no doubt supposed that a contest and a triumph would precede His reign, but they did not know that the contest consisted in rendering perfect obedience to the divine law, in the midst of sufferings needful to expiate His people’s guilt, and that the Redeemer’s victory must come out of His previous humiliation and seeming defeat. Human ingenuity was unable to reconcile with royalty the meanness of His outward condition. It was difficult for the human mind to comprehend how the enemies of Israel were to be discomfited by the endurance of an ignominious death – how the external marks of defeat were compatible with a glorious and final triumph.

It was therefore indispensably necessary to the vindication both of His regal character and His moral integrity that the Father should manifestly interpose. Such an interposition was granted. Not only did the Roman judge repeatedly affirm that he could find no fault in Jesus and the Roman centurion declare that truly He was a righteous man, but the veil of the temple was miraculously rent, the sun was darkened, the dead were raised and the rocks were broken by an earthquake.

Also they who derided Him and put Him to death suffered a national punishment which emphatically declared their awful criminality. Because they denied the supremacy and rejected the claims of the Messiah, God spoke to them in His wrath and vexed them in His sore displeasure. Because of their disloyal exclamation, “We have no king but Caesar”, their city was desolated; their temple was levelled with the ground and ploughed over like a field; they fell before the sword, the famine and the pestilence; they were driven from their own land and left to the mercy of a world which everywhere hated and oppressed them; they were shattered in pieces like the wreck of a vessel in a storm, and scattered over the earth like fragments on the waters. By their sufferings they were made to bear witness to the regal dignity and glory of Christ, though in words and deeds they denied it.

But the prayer, “*Glorify Thy Son*”, was answered in a sense still higher at His resurrection, for He was then “declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness”. It received a more striking fulfilment when He “ascended on high”, leading “captivity captive”, when the proclamation

was made, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in – when "He sat down at the right hand of God the Father in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come".

Christ was glorified by the Father when He was put in possession of His mediatorial kingdom. The commandment has gone forth, "Let all the angels of God worship Him", and He shall be glorified by His people when they have been gathered from the successive generations and the scattered tribes of men, and when they join with the other inhabitants of heaven in ascribing "blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever". Notwithstanding the indignities that a rebellious and ungodly world heap upon Him, He shall be eternally acknowledged as the Son of God and the King of Israel.

But in offering up this prayer, the views and desires of Christ do not terminate on Himself. He asks the Father to glorify Him, in order that He may in turn glorify the Father. "Glorify Thy Son that Thy Son also may glorify Thee." Christ here discloses His motive in undertaking and perfecting the salvation of man. It was to glorify the Father that "He made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was found in fashion as a man". It was to accomplish this end that He submitted with meekness and patience to that accumulation of suffering which rendered Him pre-eminently "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief". And it is from the same pure and exalted motive that He now prays to have His regal dignity and prerogative vindicated before men – to be raised from the degradation and imprisonment of the grave, to be invested with His mediatorial government and authority, and to be worshipped and obeyed equally with the Father.

That Christ anxiously sought to glorify God is manifest from the whole tenor of His history. "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" was the question by which He replied to His mother when she chided Him for staying behind at Jerusalem. "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work", He told His disciples when they pressed Him saying, "Master, eat". "Father, glorify Thy name," was the prayer in which He breathed forth His filial love and holy zeal. "I honour My Father . . . and I seek not Mine own glory", was part of His reply to the Jews when they said, in contempt and blasphemy, that He was a Samaritan and had a devil. And now, in the immediate prospect of unparalleled sufferings, He showed that the same motive still predominated in His breast when He said, "Glorify Thy Son that Thy Son also may glorify Thee".

But this expression also affirmed that the Father, by glorifying Christ, would thereby eventually glorify Himself. It is beyond all controversy that every part of the plan of redemption, and therefore its completion in the glorification of Christ, is fitted to magnify the Father. When the company of angels on the plain of Bethlehem ascribed “glory to God in the highest”, they undoubtedly expressed the leading purpose of the scheme of salvation about to be executed by Him whose birth they had announced. It was purposely fitted in its formation, development and consummation to reveal the distinct persons in the Godhead in their separate offices and operations, and to illustrate the infinite perfections of the divine character. That it was calculated to glorify God is here urged by Christ as a reason why His petition should be granted, for if He was not exalted to the mediatorial kingdom, it must have remained incomplete and could therefore have reflected no honour on the Father. In pressing His request, Christ only adduced an argument by which the Father was moved to bring the universe into being – the manifestation of His own transcendent glory.

The ground on which Christ rested His petition, “Glorify Thy Son”, is fully and clearly stated in the succeeding verse: “*As Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He may give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him*”. As if He had said, In asking to be glorified by Thee in having My regal dignity vindicated before men, and being put in possession of My mediatorial kingdom, I seek the joy which from eternity was set before Me – the fulfilment of an immutable promise, the execution of an everlasting decree – for I was given, by Thine own ordination, from before the foundation of the world, a sovereign power which would enable Me to bring Thine own elect to the enjoyment of salvation. “Power over all flesh” was part of the mediatorial glory for which He “endured the cross, despising the shame”. That He should eventually be invested with it was a condition of the covenant in which He was a party with the Father. He therefore here requests that it be given to Him now, and that He may be manifested to the universe as really possessing it and exercising it, in bringing His people to honour and immortality.

It is surprising that, in the face of a declaration so clear and explicit as Christ Himself here made, it should be alleged that His kingdom consists only of believers and that it is restricted to the Church. It is true that there is a sense in which Christ is exclusively the King of saints. These He received as a gift from the Father; and though they had renounced their allegiance, they have been again brought under the loved authority of His law. But while these were given Him to be saved, the whole world was given Him to be ruled and governed. “On His vesture and on His thigh is a name written, King of kings and Lord of lords.” The Father “hath put all things under His

feet, and gave Him to be head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all". "God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

From the fact that the Father is here said to have given Christ power over all flesh, it is argued by the enemies of the Saviour's divinity that He is a mere creature – exalted, through the sovereign will of God and as a reward of His own distinguished merit, to high honour and dignity and influence. But in order to refute such an argument as this, it is only necessary to state that the power, which is here said to have been given to Christ, is not that which is essential to the divine nature, which He possessed as God, but the power He received and now executes as mediator. As the second Person in the blessed Trinity, He possessed from everlasting an almightiness which could not be increased or diminished or changed. But as Mediator, by His meritorious obedience, sufferings and death, He obtained a right to exercise His power for new ends: bestowing salvation and exercising judgement upon sinners as the appointed Head of the kingdom of grace.

The purpose of the Father in conferring, and of the Son in accepting, this regal dominion and authority, was most merciful: "Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He may give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him". This power was not given to qualify Him for making an atonement, or for working out a righteousness for His people, but to enable Him to bring them to the actual possession of a salvation which He had already procured.

It was after His humiliation and suffering had ended, and when He had finished the work which was given Him to do, that He was exalted "a prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins". It was indispensably necessary that He should receive such sovereign, unlimited power so that He would be able to give eternal life to as many as the Father had given Him. Without it He could not send them the knowledge of the gospel, for to do so implies the entire government of mankind; without it He could not use the ungodly as instruments in their training, for such an agency can be employed only by one who has absolute control over them; without it He could not authoritatively judge His people and acquit them finally, for the function of judgement belongs exclusively to the kingly office. Without it He could not confer on His people the actual possession and enjoyment of eternal life; such a gift suits only the munificence and independence of a king.

Christ exercises the power He possesses as Mediator in giving eternal life

only “to as many as the Father hath given Him”. It was only for them that He acted as surety in His obedience, sufferings and death, and therefore the blessings which He purchased are communicated only to them. But as the government of Christ includes the reprobate as well as the elect, if His power is not employed in bringing them to salvation, it must necessarily be exhibited in inflicting deserved punishment on them. This is an aspect of the administration of Christ which is generally neglected. His government of His people is so pleasing that it is generally contemplated to the exclusion of His rule over the rebellious.

Even the openly disobedient find in Christ’s rule an antidote to those fears and apprehensions which are sometimes awakened by conscious guilt. They so magnify His beneficence that they effectually conceal the purity of His holiness and the rigour of His justice – they sink His character as a righteous moral governor in the relation of a Father and a friend; they throw around His whole character and administration a mildness and tenderness altogether incompatible with the least approximation to inflexible justice; they deprive His laws of the sanction of punishments and leave only the sanction of rewards. But while, in virtue of the sovereignty with which He is invested, Christ blesses His people with salvation, by His providence He breaks His enemies “with a rod of iron” and dashes them in pieces “like a potter’s vessel”, and on the day of final judgement He shall pronounce on them an irreversible sentence of condemnation.

---

## The Fall of Man (1)<sup>1</sup>

*Rev Donald Macdonald*

The Fall of our first parents, Adam and Eve, was that act of disobedience which had such fearful consequences for mankind and the world. We must begin with the book of beginnings, the Book of Genesis. Genesis 1: 26-31 gives an account of man’s creation. We find his creation as flesh and spirit in 2:7, the providence of God towards man in 2:8, the covenant and its precept in 2:15-17, the creation of the woman in 2:18,21-23, the sequence of events leading up to his fall in chapter 3.

One of our secondary sources, *The Westminster Confession of Faith*, states: “It pleased God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of

<sup>1</sup>This is the first part of a paper given at the Theological Conference in 2011. The paper has five sections: (1.) What position did man fall from? (2.) How could a perfectly-holy being sin? (3.) The Fall itself and what was involved. (4.) The consequences for the human race. (5.) Conclusion. The first two sections are printed here.

the glory of His eternal power, wisdom, and goodness, in the beginning, to create, or make of nothing, the world, and all things therein whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days; and all very good.

“After God had made all other creatures, He created man, male and female, with reasonable and immortal souls, endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, after His own image; having the law of God written in their hearts, and power to fulfil it; and yet under a possibility of transgressing, being left to the liberty of their own will, which was subject unto change. Beside this law written in their hearts, they received a command, not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, which while they kept, they were happy in their communion with God, and had dominion over the creatures” (4:1,2).

The Fall is the name given to Adam’s first transgression, and his immediate descent into a state of guilt and condemnation before God. *The Shorter Catechism* states: “Our first parents, being left to the freedom of their own will, fell from the estate wherein they were created, by sinning against God (Ans 13). And John Brown thus defines *the Fall* in his *Dictionary*: “Metaphorically taken, [it] imports, to become guilty of sin, or be subject to misery: in this way, persons, nations, or cities lose their height of glory and happiness. Man beginning to disobey his Maker, and so losing his favour and image and becoming sinful and miserable, is called his Fall.”

**1. What position did Man fall from?** We will comment on his creation, and his original state as he came forth from the hand of the Creator. Robert Shaw makes the following observations: “Man was formed after God had made all other creatures; and this strongly marks the dignity of his character, and the exuberant bounty of his Creator. Before he was brought into existence, the earth, which was designed for his temporary residence, was completely prepared, and amply furnished for his reception. . . . Man is a compound existence, made up of two great parts, a soul and a body. His body, though formed of mean materials, is a piece of exquisite workmanship; but his soul is the noblest part of his nature. By his soul he is allied to God and angels; by his body, to the beasts that perish and to the dust under his feet.”

“Man was originally created after the image of God. This could not consist in a participation in the divine essence, for that is incommunicable to any creature. Neither did it consist in his external form; for God, having no bodily parts, could not be represented by any material resemblance. The image of God consisted partly in the spirituality of the soul of man. God is a spirit – an immaterial and immortal being. The soul of man also is a spirit, though infinitely inferior to the Father of spirits. Thus, in immateriality and immortality the soul of man bears a resemblance to God. The image of God in man like-

wise consisted in the dominion assigned to him over the creatures, in respect of which he was the representative and vicegerent<sup>2</sup> of God upon earth. . . .

“But the image of God in man principally consisted in his conformity to the moral perfections of God, or in the complete rectitude of his nature. From two passages in the New Testament, it appears that the image of God, after which man was at first created, and to which he is restored by the Holy Spirit, consists in knowledge, righteousness and holiness (Eph 4:24, Col 3:10). Man had knowledge in his understanding, righteousness in his will, and holiness in his affections. His understanding was illuminated with all necessary knowledge. He knew God and His will; he knew himself, his relations to God, his duty to Him, and his dependence upon Him. His will was in conformity to the will of God. As he knew his duty, so he was fully disposed to the performance of it. And his affections were holy and pure; they were placed upon proper objects, and exercised in a regular manner. There was then no need that the moral law should be written on tables of stone, for it was engraved on the heart of man in fair and legible characters. He had likewise sufficient ability to fulfill it; but his will was entirely free to act according to his original light and holy inclinations, or to turn aside to evil.”<sup>3</sup>

The starting point of Thomas Boston’s *Fourfold State* is: God made man upright in his creation. God created man in complete conformity to his Maker; he was a stranger to disease and death, as to his body. In his soul he was completely holy and happy in his intellect and will, in his understanding and affections, in all his faculties. The moral law was perfectly written on his heart. However, his chief happiness lay in the favour of God and the blessedness of fellowship with Him. It is to be remembered that, in this state of perfection, he was both a moral and a dependent creature. But he fell from that favour he enjoyed as having dominion over the creation and all creatures. He fell from communion with his Maker; he lost his original righteousness; his understanding became darkened; his will no longer submitted to the will of his Creator. He lost the original holiness that he had in his creation.

**2. How could a perfectly-holy being sin?** Universal experience and observation testify to the fact that man is now in a very corrupt and sinful state. That he was not originally formed in this degraded state might be inferred from the character of his Maker, and the Scriptures explicitly affirm that he was at first created in the image of God, in a state of perfect rectitude.

We know that moral evil intruded into the world of angels. The question then arises: How was it introduced into the world? To this important question, reason can give no satisfactory answer. Pagan philosophers could not fail to

<sup>2</sup>One who has delegated authority.

<sup>3</sup>Shaw, *Exposition of the Westminster Confession of Faith*, on chapter 4, section 2.

observe the degeneracy of human nature; mournful experience taught them that evil had come into the world. But to identify the source of evil was knowledge too wonderful for them. Numerous were their conjectures, but they were all remote from the truth.

Divine revelation, however, sets this matter in a clear and certain light; and the *Westminster Confession*, in accordance with the inspired record, traces the entrance of sin to the seduction and disobedience of our first parents. They “sinned in eating the forbidden fruit”. This question takes us into the area of the human will and free agency. The *Confession* states, “God hath endued the will of man with that natural liberty, that it is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of nature determined to good or evil” (9:1).

On this section, Shaw comments: “The decision of most of the points in controversy between Calvinists and Arminians, as Jonathan Edwards has observed,<sup>4</sup> depends on the determination of the question: Wherein consists that freedom of will which is requisite to moral agency? According to Arminians three things belong to the freedom of the will: (1.) That the will has a self-determining power, or a certain sovereignty over itself and its own acts, whereby it determines its own volitions. (2.) A state of indifference, or that equilibrium whereby the will is without all antecedent bias and left entirely free from any prepossessing inclination to one side or the other. (3.) That the volitions, or acts of the will, are contingent<sup>5</sup>, not only as opposed to all constraint, but to all necessity, or any fixed and certain connection with some previous ground or reason of their existence.

“Calvinists, on the other hand, contend that a power in the will to determine its own determinations, is either unmeaning, or supposes, contrary to the first principles of philosophy, something to arise without a cause; that the idea of the soul exerting an act of choice or preference, while, at the same time, the will is in a perfect equilibrium, or state of indifference, is full of absurdity and self-contradiction; and that, as nothing can ever come to pass without a cause, the acts of the will are never contingent or without necessity – understanding by necessity . . . an infallible connection with something foregoing. According to Calvinists, the liberty of a moral agent consists in the power of acting according to a choice; and those actions are free which are performed without any external compulsion or restraint, in consequence of the determinations of his own mind. ‘The necessity of man’s willing and acting in conformity to his apprehensions and disposition’ is ‘fully consistent with all the liberty which can belong to a rational nature.’”<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup>See Edwards on *Freedom of Will*.

<sup>5</sup>Dependent on an uncertain event, rather than on the purpose of God.

<sup>6</sup>In the last sentence, Shaw is quoting from Adam Gib, “A Discourse on Liberty and



The *Confession* continues: “Man, in his state of innocency, had freedom and power to will and to do that which was good and well pleasing to God; but yet mutably, so that he might fall from it” (9:2).

And Shaw here comments: “The human will is not a distinct agent, but only a power of the rational soul. It is essential to a soul to have a moral disposition, good or bad, or a mixture of both; and, according to what is the prevailing moral disposition of the soul, [so] must be the moral actings of the will. Hence there is a great difference in regard to the freedom of the will in the different states of man. In the state of innocence, the natural inclination of man’s will was only to good; but it was liable to change through the power of temptation, and therefore free to choose evil.”

However the question about man in a state of innocence remains: How can a man’s will which is only towards the good choose what was forbidden? John Murray brings out several points on the subject, involving both action and will. The section is too long to quote in its entirety, but I will touch on some of what he says on what the *Confession* calls natural liberty:

“1. *The reality of human action.* The thought hereby expressed is that man is endowed to perform certain actions within the realm of his created and dependent existence. . . .

“2. *The responsibility of human action.* Man’s actions are worthy of blame or approval. Moral law, law of obligation, applies to him. His acts are within the sphere of ought and ought not. This obtains because he is made in the image of God . . . . The law that prescribes action or forbids it is the transcript of God’s perfection, the perfection of God coming to expression for the regulation of conduct consonant with it.

“3. *Freedom of human action.* This is volition. The responsibility referred to above rests upon the fact that the action is the result of volition. Man wills or chooses to act. . . .

“4. *The determinant of volition.* . . . Two men have power to earn a livelihood. One does it by honourable labour, the other resorts to theft. What explains the difference?” It is not the power of will because both have it. This has to do with character. There is a radical difference of character; the character is the habit of the person. The whole complex of desires, of motives and principles.”<sup>7</sup>

Professor Murray also discusses here the inclusiveness of freedom. He says, “This freedom is not restricted to the sphere of volition and action. It applies to the heart, the dispositional complex. The heart of man is his own. Man is depraved, but this depravity is his and he is responsible for it.”

Necessity”, in *Sacred Contemplations*, Edinburgh, 1786, p 484.

<sup>7</sup>Murray, *Collected Writings*, vol 2, Banner of Truth, 1977, pp 60-61.

What I particularly want to look at is what he says about the power of contrary choice. It is not the essence of free agency. "In dealing with this proposition it is necessary to distinguish between *contrary* choice and *alternative* choice. *Contrary* choice is the ability to choose between alternatives that are morally antithetical, between good and bad regarded, not relatively but absolutely, in terms of God's judgement. *Alternative* choice, on the other hand, is a choice between alternatives that are ethically of the same character, that are both good or both bad. The proposition applies only to contrary choice."<sup>8</sup>

Satan was the occasion of the temptation which resulted in man's Fall, through the woman, but no external power or influence can cause a rational being to sin. Adam's sin was a movement of defection and apostasy and transgression in his heart and mind and will, says Professor Murray. While allowing for Satan's involvement and guilt, Adam alone was responsible.

"God gave to man the power of contrary choice. Man of his own will, by no external compulsion or determination, used that power in the commission of sin. There was no necessity arising from his physical condition, nor from his moral nature, nor from the nature of his environment, why he should sin. It was a free movement within man's own spirit. . . .

"The outward act of transgression, like all overt acts, was determined by inclination, propension<sup>9</sup>, character. Since the character that produced the act cannot be different as to its moral character from the act itself, we must conclude that the inclination, disposition or character of Adam changed from holiness to unholiness. It was that change of moral character that alone can explain the overt act of sin. The inward change was signalled or manifested by the overt act of disobedience."<sup>10</sup> I think that, in this analysis, Murray goes some way to answering the question: How could a perfectly-holy man sin?

The Biblical account is to be found in Genesis 2:15-17: "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Andrew Symington says in his *Elements of Divine Truth*: "Man by special revelation was brought under a positive precept to prove his subjection to the moral authority of God". He was first created; then God placed him in the Garden of Eden to keep it. Although created a perfect man, he was created

<sup>8</sup>*Collected Writings*, vol 2, pp 63,64.

<sup>9</sup>Propensity.

<sup>10</sup>*Collected Writings*, vol 2, p 69.

mutable, liable to fall, Only God is immutable. It was within the power of man's created will to obey or disobey, to choose good or evil.

The positive precept given by special revelation in these verses points to the Covenant of Works. In the Garden of Eden which the Lord had planted, everything was provided for his happiness. He had access to everything except one tree: the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. He would receive good if he obeyed, evil if he disobeyed. This was to be the time of Adam's probation, when his continued relationship to the Creator would be tested. He had dominion over all God's creatures and power to fulfill God's will, he was left to the freedom of his own will to perform the creation mandate.

Symington says further on this covenant relationship: "(1.) There is a moral relationship between God and man, implying the necessary moral, legislative superiority of God, and man's necessary moral subjection. (2.) The rule of the moral subjection of man to God is the moral law promulgated in him. (3.) This moral subjection implies a capacity of obedience and disobedience, in respect of physical, intellectual and moral faculties. (4.) It implies moral freedom, or a liberty of choice and a freedom of action to do what is willed. This moral freedom does not consist of indifference, nor is it necessary – like the operation of fire and water – but a freedom of choice, under the influence of view and motive, and the removal of all external hindrance. (5.) This moral subjection implies responsibility to God and is liable to the natural, moral, and legal, or penal, effects of disobedience."<sup>11</sup>

Man chose death rather than life; hence the sad reality that the first man fell from a state of perfect holiness to a state of sin. And all his posterity fell with him, as he was the root of the whole human race – all were in his loins. There is no valid reason for enquiring: What kind of tree was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil? But it was a clear sign to man, setting before Adam good and evil – good in obedience, and evil in disobedience. It was a sign addressed to the eye, setting before man the blessing and the curse, life and death, the necessity of obeying the whole law, the good of that obedience, and the evil of the contrary.<sup>12</sup>

That first covenant with man is still in force while he is in a state of nature. This is irrespective of his inability to recover himself; the authoritative precept has not been removed. As Scripture says, "The law is not of faith: but the man that doeth them shall live in them" (Gal 3:12). *The Shorter Catechism* states: When God had created man, He entered into a covenant of life with him, upon condition of perfect obedience; forbidding him to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, upon the pain of death" (Ans 12).

<sup>11</sup>Symington, *Elements of Divine Truth*, Edinburgh, 1854, p 121.

<sup>12</sup>See Symington, *Elements of Divine Truth*, p 130.

# Archibald Cook<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Minister in Inverness and Daviot

*Rev J R Mackay*

During his Caithness ministry, Cook began those much-needed services for Gaelic-speaking fishermen in Wick, which the well-known Alexander Gair did so much to perpetuate and which, in course of time, became quite a feature of the religious life of the place. Duncan MacIver states that he himself had met with two worthy men – one a catechist and another a farmer in America – who, according to their own testimony, first realised the preciousness of an immortal soul while hearing Cook at some of those services for Gaelic-speaking fishermen.

At a meeting for catechising in Daviot, about the year 1850, Cook said, “I can say for myself, that I never put my hand to anything of the world but I was afraid I would lose my soul by it.” He added, “I will make free to tell you another thing. When I was in Caithness I had a small piece of land, and I knew nothing as to how anything about it should be managed. Yet the Lord was pleased to reveal to me in secret how everything respecting it should be done.”

There are ample proofs that Cook’s Caithness ministry was much owned of the Lord. We have given some concrete cases of blessing; we believe they may be taken as samples of many similar cases. Only the Great Day will fully reveal what were the fruits of a ministry characterised with such genuine humility, such an arresting tenderness of walk and conversation, such unflinching opposition to iniquity, and also such extraordinary prayerfulness. Not long after Cook was settled in Bruan, he married Catherine MacKay from Wick; their family consisted of two sons and six daughters.

In 1829 Finlay Cook accepted a call to Ness, Lewis. After a ministry of little more than four years in Lewis – but one that was manifestly owned by God – he accepted a call to the East Church, Inverness. Finlay Cook’s ministry in Inverness was also brief, lasting only for about three years, at the end of which he became minister of Reay, in Caithness, where he continued to minister with acceptance for the remaining 23 years of his life. When he came to Inverness, the congregation was a mere skeleton, and the church

<sup>1</sup>This is the biographical introduction to a volume entitled, *Sermons (Gaelic and English)* “by the late Rev Archibald Cook, Daviot”; it was published in 1907. Mr Mackay was then the Free Presbyterian minister in Inverness. This introduction is included in the forthcoming volume of sermons by Cook being produced by Free Presbyterian Publications; as reprinted here, the introduction has been edited. The first article, last month, told of Cook’s early years, until he was inducted as missionary-minister of Berriedale and Bruan, in Caithness.

itself £900 in debt. Before he left the town, the church was overcrowded, and the whole of that debt was cleared off. He proved the means of associating with the church a group of men who, before his arrival, were standing aloof from the ordinary ministrations of the Church of Scotland. Among these were some of the excellent of the earth.

When Finlay Cook left Inverness for Reay, the Inverness congregation turned their thoughts to his brother as a desirable successor. Archibald Cook was therefore heard on probation there. One of his sermons, it seems, was from the words: "Keep me, O God," but, although it was considered by some of the most discerning in the congregation as the finest of the wheat, it gave offence to some others. The consequence was a prolonged and bitter division in what was now a large congregation, ending in the party which was opposed to Archibald Cook carrying their point, although only by a very small majority.

The large minority who had set their heart on him would not give in. They were disjoined from the East Church and built, as a separate congregation, the old North Church of Inverness. When they had, with the General Assembly's sanction, done this, they sent a unanimous call to Archibald Cook, which he, "much to the regret of his attached friends throughout Caithness", thought it his duty to accept. His induction to the pastorate of the North Church took place on the 31 August 1837. In his new sphere of labour, Cook had quite a large number of eminently pious men and women in thorough sympathy with his method of preaching and his views of truth. The North Church congregation, always large, grew apace during his seven-year pastorate.

It was during this period that the Disruption of the Church of Scotland occurred. Cook appears to have had no hesitation as to the path of duty and immediately joined the Free Church. As his entire congregation followed him, his people were not greatly disturbed by the upheaval. So far as we know, they were not once threatened with dispossession of the church buildings on account of becoming Free Churchmen.

In his personal life, Cook continued to maintain the high level of spiritual-mindedness which, we have seen, characterised him from the outset. Poor he often was in his own feelings, yet at the same time he was making many rich. "I was three nights with him," writes his brother Finlay, in a letter of March 1842, "on my way home from Edinburgh. He is really an excellent man; there are few in this generation like him. I never saw a man that keeps so near to the Lord as he does. He is constantly praying or reading or meditating when he is not engaged in public. Though you would be a year with him you would not hear a vain word out of his mouth." Very different, how-

ever, was his own estimate: "My own barrenness and distance from God," he writes in a letter from this period, "the want of spiritual-mindedness, and the fear of becoming a barren tree in the Church, these often make my life a burden, and I often wish that I never appeared in public, or that I had been born dumb".

Through God's blessing on a life of such humility as well as of devotedness to service, Cook became a power for good in the town of Inverness. Not only were the North Church people devotedly attached to him, he was, to an extent he would himself scarcely have looked for, a means of elevating the moral tone of the community around him. For instance, he became in a great measure the means of bringing to an end in this neighbourhood those disreputable functions, not uncommon in those days, known as penny weddings. These were weddings held in public houses, to which all who paid the fiddler and his drink were made welcome. Cook, whose mind, ever since his experience of the dancing school in Arran, was averse to all such frivolities, set himself to denounce this way of celebrating marriages with all his might. On one occasion at least, his denunciations were owned of the Spirit of God for the conversion of one of the party to whom the rebuke was administered. Cook had before long the happiness of seeing this form of iniquity hide its face, as ashamed.

For four years after the death, in the summer of 1839, of James Macphail (son of the well-known Hector Macphail of Resolis) the parish of Daviot was without a pastor. The patron – such was then the way – sought, after Macphail's death, to set over the congregation a man utterly unacceptable to the people. The people firmly stood out against this arrangement, but it was only the Disruption that brought them relief. In this struggle, Cook sympathised deeply with the people of Daviot. The Daviot case, as it was called, may have helped to make his path of duty plainer to him when the Disruption arrived. At any rate, it would seem to have affected him favourably towards that people when, in the summer of 1843, the Free Church congregation of Daviot asked him to become their pastor.

When the North Church congregation came to hear of this movement, countenanced though it was by Cook himself, they set themselves to use all the means within their power to thwart it. By a statement signed by more than 900 people they appealed to the Presbytery of Inverness not to sanction Cook's removal from the town. The statement bore eloquent testimony to the very strong attachment which the North Church congregation, to a man, felt for their pastor, to their conviction that God's blessing had in a conspicuous manner rested upon his labours among them, and it asserted that his removal to another sphere of labour meant irreparable loss for the North Church

congregation. It was only then that Cook fully realised his people's strong attachment to him, and in the circumstances he threw himself upon the Presbytery to decide the matter for him. The consequence was that Daviot was disappointed for the time being.

In the following year, however, the Daviot congregation approached Mr Cook a second time. Meanwhile the conviction had been growing on him that town life was damaging his health. In the circumstances, The North Church congregation intimated that they would not again offer such opposition to his leaving them, if he himself thought it his duty to go elsewhere. Cook did think it his duty to accept the call from Daviot, and his induction took place on 1 August 1844.

In March 1844 the Free Church congregation of Moy had become vacant through the translation of Thomas MacLachlan to Stratherrick. The people of Moy then sought to secure Mr Cook as their pastor, before the Daviot congregation had approached him the second time. His preference was for Daviot, but in the circumstances he expressed to the Presbytery a willingness to preach on every third Sabbath at Moy, until such a time as the Moy congregation was provided with a pastor of their own. This arrangement concerning Moy was heartily agreed to by all concerned. It was not to last long; as a matter of fact it came to an end only three years before Cook died, when John Baillie was inducted to Moy.

At Daviot, while Cook's health lasted, his labours were, as in his earlier charges, most abundant. From November to May each year, his time was largely occupied in catechising his people, an exercise in which he greatly delighted. Those who admired him most thought that, as he excelled most other ministers in preaching, so in catechising he excelled himself. Referring in one of his letters to this part of his ministry, he remarks: "Though I find it heavy, it is the happiest part of my time in the whole year. I feel myself free of worldly cares when so engaged and often feel my own soul refreshed in speaking to sinners of a Saviour, though myself the greatest sinner among them." In thus catechising the people of two parishes, he was wont to hold about 90 meetings each winter, and most of them would occupy between two and three hours. Generally they were held in barns, for it was not an uncommon thing to see congregations of several hundred. Many thirsting for the water of life attended these services from neighbouring parishes, some from very considerable distances.

"Mr Cook's catechising," says Duncan MacIver "cannot be described. It was just flashes of light for the occasion. In dealing with a person who had the least concern about eternity, he was all tenderness, as if the fears and difficulties – yes, and even the thoughts then passing through the person's

mind were open before his eyes; yes, more than if the person tried to tell his troubles, and he used them all to draw the soul to the Love that came to seek and to save that which was lost. On the other hand, his faithfulness and severity were just as remarkable. When a person stood before him, although a perfect stranger to him, that person's manner of living seemed to be as clear to him as if he were an eye-witness, and he dealt with him according to the person's ways, so that some had a great dread of the catechising, yet would not shirk it lest people would think them worse than they were." For wit, let it be added, for sympathy with the distressed, for reprobation of wickedness, for profound intuitions into theological questions, experimental and doctrinal, this catechist, according to all that one has heard of him from many sources, was unique.

During the summer months Cook frequently gave assistance to neighbouring ministers during communion seasons, and occasionally travelled great distances for such purposes. While his brother, Finlay Cook, lived, he was as a rule once a year in Reay. Only once did he visit that parish after his brother's death. An intelligent and appreciative hearer on that occasion writes: "Mr Archibald Cook came to Reay shortly after his brother's death in 1858 to dispense the Communion. He conducted the Gaelic service on the hillside on Sabbath and the English in church on Monday. His text on Monday was John 3:30, 'He must increase, but I must decrease.'

"At the conclusion, and before pronouncing the benediction, he said in very solemn tones, 'I have a message to deliver to the people of Reay, and it is this: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine on the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord"' (Amos 8:11). My friends, this is a terrible threatening and although, by the forbearance of the Lord, His spiritual judgements usually come on gradually, yet I believe there are some in this church today who will see this realised. What a judgement it was upon Israel when the ark – the symbol of God's presence – was taken from their midst! I was thinking this morning what the feelings of a godly Israelite would be as he stood in the door of his tent and watched the ark carried over the brow of the hill, unto the land of the Philistines. I bless the Lord that I got a glimpse of the ark before it has been quite taken away out of this land, for if I had not, the religion which is now coming into fashion would make wreck of anything I have.'"

The same correspondent adds: "On the following day, Mr Cook came to Thurso to take the mail coach for the south. Going along the street with the Rev Mr Taylor, they met an aged, pious woman (Kitty Cormack) who was sadly deformed and bent almost twofold. Mr Taylor stopped and asked Mr



Cook, who did not know Kitty Cormack, to shake hands with her. He did, so, saying, ‘You are very infirm and seem to be near the end of your journey; where do you think will your landing be?’ Looking up at him and with a smile overspreading her countenance, she replied, ‘At the place I am desiring, sir’. Not expecting such an answer, Mr Cook looked tenderly at her and said, ‘What a wonderful Lover is the Saviour when He would fall in love with the like of you!’”

---

## “We Preach not Ourselves but Christ”

*Rev G G Hutton*

Reading through the Epistles of Paul, it is clear for all to see that, throughout his ministry, he consistently emphasised grace – the grace of God towards ruined, undone sinners. Paul’s sense of the privilege, coupled with his sense of responsibility, to preach such a glorious gospel of grace, enabled him to testify: “Though I preach the gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!” (1 Cor 9:16). He felt himself under a divine compulsion to preach the one-and-only gospel of free and sovereign grace. So he declared, “We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord” (2 Cor 4:5).

There was thus both a negative and a positive emphasis in the Apostle’s preaching. He stated what he did not preach, as well as what he did preach. He knew he could not successfully preach Christ and, at the same time, promote himself – it had to be one or the other. Paul’s testimony about his ministry ought to incite some degree of soul-searching in every gospel minister as to the real focus of his ministry. Does he use the pulpit to promote his own name and reputation, or to display his gifts, or even to advertise his perceived graces?

The Lord Jesus, whose teaching every minister of the gospel ought to follow, stated the requirements for discipleship: “If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me” (Mt 16:24). These words make it obvious that the ego, self, is an obstacle to following Christ or engaging in His service. Unless the Holy Spirit will convince us of our obnoxiousness before a holy God, we will foolishly retain unwarrantedly-exalted opinions of ourselves. When, however, a sinner receives saving grace, he will adopt a low opinion of himself and an exalted opinion of the Saviour. Self will be put in the dust, while Christ will be put on the throne. Therefore, without this personal experience, no man is qualified to preach the gospel which Paul preached – the gospel of grace for even the chief of

sinner. Humbling grace needs to be experienced before saving grace can truly be preached.

Paul, the great exponent of grace, personally knew that he was nothing without it. Writing to the Corinthians he stated, "By the grace of God I am what I am" (1 Cor 15:10). He possessed many personal gifts and qualities, yet he wrote, "If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more . . . . But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord" (Phil 3:4-8).

In the same Epistle, Paul summed up his life in the simple affirmation: "For to me to live is Christ" (Phil 1:21). The Apostle's life was a sermon in itself. His preaching and his life both testified to how he valued the person and grace of Christ. As far as gifts and graces were concerned, he could claim, "In nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles"; yet he could acknowledge that, in and of himself, he was "nothing" (2 Cor 12:11). Paul was nothing; his Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, was everything. So with every minister today: his personal relationship with, and his personal knowledge of, Christ will determine what and how he preaches.

In order to a full-orbed ministry, he needs to be personally acquainted with Christ Jesus in both His deity and His humanity. The minister must know Him in His offices of Prophet, Priest and King. His daily acquaintance with the Redeemer must inevitably produce in his life and conduct an ever-increasing conformity to the likeness of Christ. Nothing so contradicts or discredits the gospel as when those who preach it with their lips deny it with their lives. Christ is so often wounded in the house of His professed friends.

An awareness of this fact undoubtedly influenced the Lord's servants in the New Testament Church. Paul could write to the Thessalonian believers, "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and justly and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you" (1 Th 2:10). This living godliness was a matter of conscience with the Apostle, who testified before Felix: "Herein do I exercise myself, to have always a conscience void of offence toward God, and toward men" (Acts 24:16). When therefore Paul declared, "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord," he was not inferring that the preacher himself is of no consequence, and that his life and character are basically irrelevant so long as what he says about Christ is orthodox. Paul believed that godliness in conduct is essential in every minister of the gospel. The minister is not to be a holy man so that he can draw attention to himself, but rather to confirm, by his life, the power of the grace of the gospel, which he preaches to others.

When Paul wrote, "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord",

he was emphasising that he was not in the ministry to lord it over the flock (1 Pet 5:3). His hearers were not required to submit to him, but rather to Jesus Christ, who is Lord of all. Paul was the messenger; Christ Jesus the Lord was his message. Thus Paul, in his preaching, called on sinners to repent. Repentance was the evidence that they were submitting to the rule of the glorified Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords.

This gospel is rarely preached from pulpits today. Jesus is presented in all kinds of relationships but seldom as “Christ Jesus the Lord”. Being Lord of all by divine appointment, however, Christ Jesus applies His authority in every area of the justified sinner’s life. Thus “the Word of God, which is contained in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him” (*Shorter Catechism*). All the laws of Christ’s kingdom are set before us in the Bible, and therefore the gospel minister is under an obligation to expound all its teaching, making practical application to the everyday life of his hearers.

The Christ of Scripture is the glorious Redeemer, the true priest who offered Himself as the atoning sacrifice for all the sins of all His people, and is now making intercession for them in heaven. He is also the unique prophet of the Church. God’s redemptive purpose is made known by His eternal Son – the Word incarnate. The Lord Jesus Himself taught, “All things are delivered unto Me of My Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him” (Mt 11:27). For “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son” (Heb 1:1,2).

Christ Jesus has revealed Himself as a complete and willing Saviour for sinners. He exhibited His love for them through His perfect obedience to the law and in His atoning death for them, thereby removing the condemnation and curse of the law, while paying the debt they owe to God’s law and justice.

The offices of Christ as mediator of the covenant of grace, while separate, are nevertheless eternally intertwined, so that we cannot enjoy the benefits of one office without experiencing the blessings dispensed through another. If Christ is our priest, He is also our prophet and king. The sinner needs Christ in all His offices; he needs Christ as his King as much as his priest and prophet. When the Lord Jesus Christ justifies a sinner on the basis of His atoning work, He indwells that sinner to exercise all His prerogatives as a king. While it is certain that the “old man” will resist the rule of Christ, the believer will nevertheless experience progress in sanctification, which is “the work of God’s free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin, and live unto right-

ousness” (*Shorter Catechism*). As a complete Redeemer, Christ Jesus the Lord rules over His people, both collectively and individually.

When Paul wrote, “We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord,” he meant that he preached a whole living Christ who spoke for Himself. Through the whole of Scripture, Christ addresses us. When the preacher addresses his fellow-sinners, he is like John the Baptist – just a “voice” (Jn 1:23). As the voice articulates what originates in the mind, so the gospel minister is a voice, articulating what originated in the mind of the eternal Word – Christ. Many under the preaching of the Word make a dangerous mistake; they mean merely to be informed about Christ, rather than to obey Him. But, from Genesis to Revelation, the eternal Word speaks to us.

---

## Book Reviews<sup>1</sup>

*Alexander Peden*, by Maurice Grant, published by the Scottish Reformation Society in their Scots Worthies series, paperback, 54 pages, £4.00.

Mr Grant should be well known as the author of substantial biographies of the prominent Covenanters: Donald Cargill, Richard Cameron and James Renwick. This new book is on a different scale – much smaller. It is to be warmly welcome.

Peden was inducted to the Galloway parish of New Luce probably in early 1660, but within three years he had been ejected – because, like many other Scottish ministers, he could not submit to the unbiblical conditions imposed by the new regime under Charles II. He became a field preacher and had to spend time as a prisoner on the Bass Rock. He was set free in a remarkable way and was never again captured. Though he had to live mostly in caves, he died in his brother’s bed.

These and other facts about Peden’s life are interestingly retold and accompanied with appropriate comment. “To those privileged to know him,” the author writes, “he was at once a figure of awe, admiration and affection.”

*Ignatius of Antioch, The Man Who Faced Lions;*  
*Polycarp of Smyrna, The Man Whose Faith Lasted;*  
*Irenaeus of Lyons, The Man Who Wrote Books;*

all by Sinclair B Ferguson, published by the Banner of Truth Trust, hardback, illustrated, 40 pages, £8.00 each.

These are the first three in a series of books for young children, on leading preachers throughout the ages. Most people may know very little about the

<sup>1</sup>The books reviewed here may be obtained from the Free Presbyterian Bookroom.

---

men whose lives are briefly described in these books, but they were faithful to their Master, seeking to advance His kingdom in the early centuries of the Christian era. Two of them were martyred. Their stories are told simply and effectively. We would wish, however, that, even for children, modern versions of the Scriptures were not used.

---

## Protestant View

### Lack of Church Discipline in the Church of Rome

The *Scots Confession of Faith* of 1560 maintains that the marks of the true Church are the preaching of the Word of God, the due administration of the sacraments, and the exercise of Church discipline. None of these things were found in the Church of Rome at the Reformation, and none of them are found in her today. Her absence of discipline has especially been exposed by the ongoing child-abuse scandals; and while the world pays little regard to her false doctrines and corrupt practices, it has been taking notice of her lack of discipline. Even the world can see that there must be a problem in the admission of priests, when a disproportionate number of them turn out to be child-abusers. And there is an even worse problem when the conduct of child-abusing priests comes to the attention of those responsible for their discipline; the main effort then seems to be to cover up what they have done.

One case which emerged recently was that of a Scottish priest in Prestwick, Father Moore, who informed his Bishop, Maurice Taylor, that he had been guilty of serious child-abuse some years previously. The priest was privately removed from the “pastoral ministry” and sent to a sex-offenders clinic in Canada. On his return he was ordered to join the Benedictine monks at Fort Augustus Abbey; and when the Abbey closed in 1998, the Bishop tried, unsuccessfully, to get him a position saying mass for nuns at a nursing home. Father Moore should clearly have been deposed from his office, but instead he was shuffled from one place to another until he could be hidden no longer. As far as we know he is still not deposed.

Church discipline is far from easy, and it requires great wisdom to balance the various duties involved. One duty is to preserve the purity of the Church (1 Cor 5:7); another is to seek the spiritual restoration of the guilty party (2 Cor 2:6-7); a third is to ensure that the case is fairly conducted, and is seen to be so by those who know about it; a fourth is to avoid doing Satan’s work by publicising scandal unnecessary. The office-bearers of the Church must look to Christ for wisdom when faced with these difficulties.

The Church of Rome, having forsaken the doctrines of Christ, has neither part nor lot with Him, and cannot therefore look to Him for help in cases of discipline. Instead those in authority in her ranks have to follow their own wisdom. Their general policy is to place the reputation of the Church of Rome ahead of other considerations and to hide the scandals if possible. At the same time, some of them turn out to be watching their own backs, in that they are guilty of the same or related scandalous behaviour. Cardinal O'Brien seems to have been a case in point. At the Reformation many priests had concubines, and it was impossible to discipline them because the Bishops were as guilty as they were. A similar situation might well prevail now. The Church of Rome is beyond reformation, according to Scripture, but there is a lesson for Protestant Churches: to maintain discipline, painful though it may be in some cases. Discipline is a mark and a duty of the Church, and the world takes notice whether the Church's discipline is consistent with her professed standards. DWBS

---

## Notes and Comments

### Religious Worship in Schools

A generation ago in Scotland it was customary to have a period of Bible or Catechism instruction at the beginning of every school day, just as it was considered customary in the Highlands to have a school holiday on the Thursday of the local communion season to enable children to go to church with their parents. This was part of the cultural heritage and respected by most people in such communities. At school, pupils had to recite answers to *The Shorter Catechism* and Bible verses. Even then, parents had the option of withdrawing their offspring from such instruction, but this was rarely done. Sadly, over the years, this vital feature of school life has gradually diminished and now God is scarcely mentioned in many schools. Religious instruction in schools is, however, still enshrined in our law. There is a right and a duty to provide religious observances, a right which humanists and secularists are currently challenging.

In England and Wales, the Education Reform Act of 1988 requires a daily act of collective worship in all maintained schools – those funded through local authorities. One Government report states: “It is a matter of deep concern that in many schools these activities do not take place with the frequency required or the standard which pupils deserve”. A Department of Education circular in the mid-1990s insisted that “all maintained schools must provide religious education and daily collective worship for all registered pupils and

promote their spiritual, moral and cultural development”. It adds, “The syllabuses must in future reflect the fact that religious traditions in the country are in the main Christian whilst taking account . . . of other principal religions”. The legislation is designed, it claims, “to ensure that pupils gain a thorough knowledge of their Christian heritage, as our country has a long tradition of religious freedom, which should be preserved”.

Scottish local authorities also have a duty under the Education (Scotland) Act 1980, “to provide religious observance and religious education in Scottish schools”. This act goes back to 1872, when the state introduced compulsory education; previously education had been provided by the churches. Guidelines recently published by the Scottish Government state that such observances are an important part of a pupil’s education at all stages of primary and secondary school. They go on to insist that these observances should be held at least six times a year in addition to any traditional celebrations. Teachers are encouraged to draw on Scotland’s Christian heritage and to liaise closely with chaplains when planning these observances. We may have cause for concern about the quality of such collective worship, but the fact remains that, across the nation, our schools still have a legal duty to hold some form of religious worship with a focus on Christianity.

The Scottish Secular Society is, however, determined to overthrow this right, saying that automatic religious observance amounts to “an abuse of human rights”. This autumn they will send a petition to the Scottish Government asking for parents to have to opt *in* for their children to attend religious observances rather than to opt *out*, as is the current situation. Caroline Lynch, chairwoman of Secular Scotland, says that parents are not being informed about their opt-out rights and that children who do opt out are made to feel that they are being punished and are missing out on something. A Church of Scotland spokesman countered her argument by stating that spiritual education was intrinsic to the upbringing of children. He added, “It is utterly implausible to imagine a parent having to opt in to other cross-curricular or whole-school learning activities”. Tellingly, Mark Gordon, author of the Secular Society’s petition, let slip their true intentions: “We do want religious observance removed completely, but we don’t feel that is a winnable case”; so evidently they view this petition as a first step.

Gary McLelland, chair of the Edinburgh Secular Society, states quite openly: “For us religious observance has no place in the education system in 2013”. An Edinburgh mother, Veronica Wikman, was apparently so incensed to find her son learning “creationist hymns” and being taught that God created the world in six days that, backed by the Edinburgh Secular Society,

she lodged a petition with Edinburgh Council calling for all religious observance to be discontinued in its non-denominational schools.

The Humanist Society of Scotland supports this atheistic intolerance. Their education officer, a former headteacher, stated that the petition to Holyrood “is a useful first step, but our view is that religious observance should have no part in the state curriculum”. This aim of eliminating all forms of religious worship in schools has led some commentators to feel that this will be the next battle facing the Christian Church, after the same-sex “marriage” issue. Satan is never short of agents and weapons seeking to destroy Christianity, and where could he find a more strategic place than where the seed of God’s Word may be sown in young impressionable hearts? Some pupils will never hear about God at home and have never been to church, but they may just hear something in school that could cause them by God’s grace to “remember now (their) Creator in the days of [their] youth” (Ecc 1:1) and come to hear Him, who is Wisdom personified, saying, “I love them that love Me; and those that seek Me early shall find me” (Prov 8:17). *KHM*

### **Protection of Children from Homosexual Propaganda**

*The Herald* reports that Free Church minister Rev David Robertson – while “opposed to gay marriage and accepting ‘biblical teaching’ about homosexuality” – is “the first Scottish church leader to publicly condemn the homophobic Vladimir Putin regime over its treatment of minority groups in Russia”. The newspaper refers to Mr Robertson’s explanation on the Solas website about why he agrees “with Stephen Fry’s condemnation of President Putin”.

Stephen Fry wrote to the Prime Minister recalling that the 1936 Berlin Olympics proceeded under Hitler, although he had passed a law in 1934 which resulted in persecution of Jews. “Putin is eerily repeating this insane crime, only this time against LGBT Russians,” wrote Fry, in condemning what he calls “the barbaric, fascist law that Putin has pushed through the Duma. . . . He is making scapegoats of gay people, just as Hitler did Jews.”

The legislation which has triggered Fry’s hysterical outcry is Law 135-FZ, which Russia enacted on June 29 to protect children from having a homosexual lifestyle promoted to them. To agree with Stephen Fry’s condemnation of this law is in effect to disagree with what is, in principle, a good law.

The prestigious international body, the Alliance Defending Freedom comments that the new legislation “is incredibly popular in the Russian Federation as a means of protecting family values. The law was passed by a vote in the Duma with 100% approval”. The Alliance adds, “To be clear, media reflections regarding the law have been grossly exaggerated and have



---

provided a distorted view of [its] aims and scope". It also gives examples in the international media of the law being misrepresented as persecuting homosexuals for following their lifestyle, whereas its actual purpose is to prevent them promoting their lifestyle among children.

Furthermore, 103 pro-family bodies worldwide have signed a statement supporting Law 135-FZ because it protects the "innocence and moral formation of children by prohibiting propaganda of 'non-traditional sexual relationships' among them".

Whatever legitimate criticism may be made of the Putin regime, this new Russian law is necessary. Other governments should likewise take steps to prevent homosexual activists entering schools to promote their lifestyle. It is a heartless person indeed who would deliberately lead children into sinful and self-destructive practices. Jesus said, "It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend [that is, cause to stumble, to fall into sin] one of these little ones" (Lk 17:2).

*NMR*

---

## Church Information

### Induction of Rev David Campbell to Edinburgh

On Friday, 19 July 2013, the Southern Presbytery of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland met in Edinburgh at 6.45 pm for the Induction of Rev David Campbell to the pastoral charge of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland congregation in Edinburgh. The Court was depleted in its ministerial ranks and members felt sorry that Rev J MacLeod and Rev J L Goldby were not able to be present. A congregation of about 250 people gathered from many parts of the Church.

The Moderator, Rev K M Watkins, preached from Ezekiel 47:10, "And it shall come to pass, that the fishers shall stand upon it from Engedi even unto Eneglaim; they shall be a place to spread forth nets; their fish shall be according to their kinds, as the fish of the great sea, exceeding many". The address was most appropriate for the induction of a minister to a pastoral charge.

In the presence of the congregation, Mr Campbell took solemn vows and made promises, in respect of the sacred obligations of the Christian ministry, subscribing his name to them. It is significant that Mr Campbell's great uncle, Rev Donald Campbell was inducted in the same building, to the same pastoral charge, in 1951.

The newly-inducted minister was addressed by the Moderator from

Matthew 4:19: "And He saith unto them, Follow Me, and I will make you fishers of men". Rev R Macleod addressed the Congregation from Ephesians 6:18-20: "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints; and for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds: that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak".

Ministers from other Presbyteries spoke for their respective Presbyteries: on behalf of the Outer Isles Presbytery, Rev J R Tallach; and on behalf of the Northern Presbytery, Rev N M Ross. They and Rev D W B Somerset were associated with the Southern Presbytery.

Having been interim Moderator of the Edinburgh Congregation since the passing away of Rev Hugh Cartwright, the writer formed a close bond with the congregation there. As they mourned the loss of a pastor and friend he mourned with them in the loss of a brother minister and friend. Now, as they are relieved and joyful on the occasion of Mr Campbell's induction, he rejoices with them in the tender bond of Christian sympathy and love and he feels sure that that joy is shared among those who seek the good of Christ's Church in Scotland. (Rev) R Macleod, Clerk of the Southern Presbytery

### **Theological Conference**

This year's Theological Conference will be held, God willing, in St Jude's Free Presbyterian Church, Glasgow, on Tuesday and Wednesday, October 29-30. It is expected that the following papers will be read, all of which will be in public:

#### **Theological Writings of Hugh Martin**

*Rev D W B Somerset* Tuesday 2.30 pm

#### **The Intercession of Christ**

*Rev David Campbell* Tuesday 7.00 pm

#### **Martin Luther's Theology**

*Dr R J Dickie* Wednesday 10.00 am

#### **The Response of the Churches to Evolution**

*Dr A H Ross* Wednesday 2.30 pm

#### **The Covenant of Grace**

*Rev Roderick MacLeod* Wednesday 7.00 pm

Rev K D Macleod is to act as chairman.

(Rev) J R Tallach, Convener, Training of the Ministry Committee

### **Removed by Death**

We note with sadness the death of Mr Angus MacRitchie, an elder in the Ness congregation, on August 30.

# 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.

**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, 10 Achary Rd, Dingwall, IV15 9JB; tel/fax: 01349 864351, e-mail: nmross2001@yahoo.co.uk.

**Dornoch:** Sabbath 11.30 am. Manse tel: 01862 810615. **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. Rev D Campbell, 35B Barnton Avenue West, Edinburgh EH4 6DF; tel: 0131 312 8227.

**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; **Strathly:** 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.

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

**Kyle of Lochalsh:** Sabbath 6 pm. Manse tel: 01599 534933. 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. Manse tel: 01851 890286. Contact Rev J R Tallach; tel: 01851 702501.

**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. Contact Rev J R Tallach; tel: 01851 702501.

**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 Rev G B Macdonald; tel: 02 9627 3408.

**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:sydneypchurch@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 Zadorozhniyy, P O Box 100, Odessa-91, 65091; e-mail: antipa@eurocom.od.ua; or Mr D Levytskyy; tel:00 38 048 785 19 24; e-mail: dlevytskyy@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.

**Ingwenya**: Church and Secondary School. Rev A B MacLean. Postal Address: Ingwenya 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
<b>Contentment, Prosperity, and God's Glory</b> , by Jeremiah Burroughs Reformation Heritage Publications, 2013, pbk, 144 pp	£8.99	£6.99
<b>Manna</b> , Sermons by J C Philpot Gospel Standard Publications, 2012, hbk, 305 pp	£15.90	£13.00
<b>Brownlow North – The Scottish Evangelist</b> by K Moody-Stewart John Ritchie Ltd, 2013, pbk, 320 pp	£9.99	£7.99
<b>Silent Witnesses</b> , by G J Williams Banner of Truth, 2013, hbk, 264 pp	£14.50	£12.00
<b>Chequebook of the Bank of Faith</b> , by C H Spurgeon Christian Focus Publications, 2005, pbk, 389 pp	£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