

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

“But God . . .”	257
“I May Tell All My Bones” (1) A Sermon by Rev Alexander McPherson.....	260
Justification 1. From the Fathers to the Reformation	266
The Early Scottish Reformation 9. Leanings Towards Reform J H Merle d’ Aubigné.....	270
Does the Pope Believe in the Resurrection? Matthew Vogan.....	275
Book Reviews Concerning the True Care of Souls, by Martin Bucer	280
Repentance, by John Colquhoun.....	281
Children’s Books, by Alison Brown	282
Protestant View	282
Notes and Comments	284
Church Information	287
Acknowledgement of Donations	288

September 2010

Vol 115 • No 9

The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland

Moderator of Synod: Rev E A Rayner BA, PO Box 1171, Grafton 2460, Australia.

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 H M Cartwright, MA, 8 Colinton Road, Edinburgh, EH10 5DS; tel: 0131 447 1920.

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

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

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

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@mweb.co.zw.

Residential Care Homes:

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

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

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

The Free Presbyterian Magazine

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 H M Cartwright, Rev N M Ross, Rev D W B Somersett.

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

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

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

Communions

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

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

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

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

May: First Sabbath: Aberdeen, London; **Second:** Achmore, New Canaan, Donsa, Scourie; **Third:** Edinburgh; **Fifth:** Chiedza.

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

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

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

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

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

November: First Sabbath: Applecross; **Second:** Glasgow; **Third:** Wellington; **Fourth:** Aberdeen; **Fifth:** Chiedza.

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

The Free Presbyterian Magazine

Vol 115

September 2010

No 9

“But God . . . ”

It is easy to see that the world is in a terrible state – with war, civil disobedience and crime affecting, in varying degrees, people across the globe. But, more fundamentally, we must recognise the terrible spiritual state of every individual human being, for frictions between nations and problems within individual countries and communities only exist because each human being is by nature a fallen creature with a sinful heart. Paul describes the fallen human condition in stark terms: “dead in trespasses and sins”, living “according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience”, having “our conversation . . . in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind” (Eph 2:1-3). If sinners ignorant of the gospel focus on this list of terms which so emphasise the seriousness of their spiritual condition, they would be left entirely without hope – provided they really believed the accuracy of the testimony God has given in the Scriptures.

This makes the opening words of the next verse tremendously significant: “But God”. What man cannot do is altogether within God’s power. And while there can be no hope on the merely-human level, there is every reason for hope if we receive this further testimony from the Bible.

That God would rescue anyone who is “dead in trespasses and sins” depends on what Paul next refers to: “God . . . is rich in mercy”. He is willing to do good to those who, spiritually, are in a desperate condition, who have rebelled against Himself, whose enmity against Him is such that they will resist His offers of mercy, who are under the power of Satan. It is mercy beyond what we could reasonably imagine that leads God to rescue sinners whose mind “is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be” (Rom 8:7).

This speaks of human inability; no individual can, by his own power, bring himself to submit to the authority of God’s law. This is one of the consequences of spiritual death; just as a man or a woman who has died can no longer walk or talk, or even breathe, so a spiritually-dead sinner is completely unable to engage in any spiritual activity – to trust in Christ, for example, or

to love God or to desire to live a holy, God-glorifying life. It is utterly impossible for sinners to do anything that will please God; they are spiritually dead. But God, in infinite mercy, can so subdue them that they submit to His law. Those who are now God's children were unbelieving, resisting the gospel, but God the Holy Spirit has given them grace to trust in Christ. They had no love for God, for "the carnal mind is enmity against" Him, but the Holy Spirit, in regenerating the soul, implanted the grace of love. They lived in an environment of sin; they "were dead in trespasses and sins"; they did not want to be holy; but God has "quicken"ed them (Eph 2:5); He put new life in their souls and, from then on, their desire has been to live holy lives – to do what will glorify God.

Sinners are also "by nature the children of wrath". They are guilty, not least because of original sin, and therefore subject to God's anger – His righteous purpose to punish them because of their sin. It is because He is just that He cannot pass by their sin; He cannot treat their transgressions as if they had never happened; He must punish. Accordingly all unconverted sinners are under sentence of eternal destruction and nothing they can do can deliver them from that fearful situation. But God can deliver sinners, for He has given His Son to be their substitute – "for His great love wherewith He loved" them. "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (Jn 3:16).

The love of God was acting in harmony with the justice of God; only thus could sinners be saved. Apart from the revelation God has given, it must have appeared impossible for sinners justly to escape the punishment which they so much deserve. But God, in infinite wisdom, was able to exercise mercy in perfect harmony with His justice, for the salvation of sinners. So when the Father gave the Son to a lost world in love, the Son must suffer and die; He must endure the full punishment that would otherwise fall on those sinners whom He was representing.

There are some sinners whose wickedness is so great that it may seem totally impossible for them to be saved – men such as Manasseh, who committed unspeakable crimes on a vast scale. But God showed that He was able to save this brutal king of Judah, which directs our attention to the greatness of the redemption accomplished by Christ. Yet, in this context, we should focus less on the greatness of Manasseh's sin, although clearly his sins were unusually heinous, and place more emphasis on the seriousness of every sin, for every sin is committed against an infinite and pure God. We must never underestimate the seriousness of any sin, but however great the guilt of a particular sin – and the guilt of every sin is infinitely great – the redeeming work of Christ, being the work of a divine, infinite Person, is totally effective

to blot out sin of every kind, for “the blood of Jesus Christ . . . cleanseth us from all sin” (1 Jn 1:7).

There are other sinners whose beliefs seem to stand in the way of their salvation. They follow some false religion such as Islam or Buddhism, or they adhere to some perversion of Christianity such as Roman Catholicism or Mormonism, or they claim to believe that there is no God, professing to be atheists and underpinning their unbelief by placing supreme confidence in the philosophy of evolution. But God is able to save them. However tenaciously they may hold on to their beliefs, God can make them willing to receive the truth about Himself and about themselves. The Holy Spirit can bring them to submit to the whole of the revelation He has given to mankind in Scripture and lead them on to believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as the One who came into the world to save sinners. This is what took place in pagan Ephesus and Corinth during the time of the Apostles, and even in the case of a few people in Athens, where everyone seemed to show such disdain for Paul and his teachings.

We may notice a third group of people: those who accept that God exists and that the Bible is true, who listen to preaching and say their prayers, but who are still outside the kingdom of God. It might seem relatively easy for them to be converted, but the fundamental difficulty for them is the same as for every other sinner: they are “dead in trespasses and sins”. They do not believe, and they cannot believe. Their heart is in the world, and they are totally unwilling to come to Christ in order that they may be saved. It is completely impossible even for such people to be saved by their own efforts, although most others would describe them as good people – like Saul of Tarsus, for instance, who could look back on his past life and declare that, as “touching the righteousness which is in the law” he was “blameless”. But God can save them. Christ’s redemption must become their only hope, and they must see that the work of the Holy Spirit is the only power that can change their hearts and set them on the way to heaven.

The world is indeed in a terrible state. Governments and commentators of every conceivable viewpoint may put forward endless suggestions as to how the situation in various parts of the globe may be improved, or even solved. There may indeed be a degree of merit in many of these ideas. Yet we must never lose sight of the fundamental human problem: man has gone away from God and, apart from divine grace, he will go on living out his life in a fallen condition, “dead in trespasses and sins”. But God is able to save individuals and communities and nations, because of what Christ has done. For that blessing we must pray earnestly and constantly. It must be our only hope, “for there is none other name . . . whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4:12).

“I May Tell All My Bones” (1)¹

A Sermon by Rev Alexander McPherson

Psalm 22:17,18. *I may tell all My bones, they look and stare upon Me, they part My garments among them and cast lots upon My vesture.*

This is a Messianic psalm in the most complete sense – a psalm concerning the great Deliverer from sin and misery that was to come. David was employed by the Lord as a prophet to set forth a good deal about the person and work of the Messiah who was expected, and he describes in detail here the experience of the Saviour on the cross – from the cry at the ninth hour, with which the Psalm begins, until the darkness in the Saviour’s soul gave way to the light of accomplishment and the glorious prospects that we read of from verse 21 to the end of the Psalm.

The Psalm formed the basis of the Saviour’s thoughts during a brief period at the end of His ordeal and most of the first part described how men treated Him when He was made a curse for sin. He was reproached; He was despised; He was mocked; He was nailed to a cross; and while His enemies surrounded Him like strong bulls, roaring lions and fierce dogs, He became weaker and more agonised. One of the results of the treatment meted out to Him was the dehydration of His bodily frame, which led Him to think of the dust of death that He speaks of in the Psalm. Thus, with death in prospect, Christ tells of His emaciated appearance and how those watching Him reacted to it, and that is what we principally have in our text today.

So there are three matters that I would like to say a little about as enabled: (1.) Christ’s emaciated condition; He says, “I may tell all My bones”. (2.) How this affected sinners viewing Him at this time. He says, “They look and stare upon Me. They part My garments among them, and cast lots upon My vesture.” (3.) Some observations on these matters.

1. Christ’s emaciated condition. He could see and count the bones of the upper part of his body and, of course, the stretched posture that was created by crucifixion would bring the bones of the trunk more into view than is normal. But the words convey much more than that and more also than the drying up of the flesh and skin would have produced. The thing to remember is that His was a body wasted by labour, by want of rest and by fasting. That is something we may tend to overlook, but it is a fact – a fact overlooked by the artists in medieval times who thought it a great duty and privilege to make a pictorial representation of the crucifixion. Of course, they were sinning in attempting to make a picture of the dying Saviour, but most of them had not noticed that, looking at it Himself, He could say, “I may tell all My

¹Preached on the Sabbath morning of the Dingwall communion season in February 1996.

bones”. It agrees with Isaiah’s prophecy: “As many were astonished at Thee; His visage was so marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men. . . . He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see Him, there is no beauty that we should desire Him.”

When the Saviour and some of the Apostles came down from the Mount of transfiguration they found a man greatly troubled over his demon-possessed son. The other disciples had been trying to cure him and had failed; the Saviour’s explanation was: “This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting”. I think we can gather from this that the many miracles Christ performed were preceded by prayer and fasting. And if we think of the past week, foretold in this Psalm, when he had gone up to Jerusalem – and especially the past 24 hours, when His expending of energy exceeded all that preceded – our Lord could say, “The zeal of Thine house hath eaten Me up”. And now He could tell His bones as He looked down upon Himself.

There have been others, of course, who could count their bones: some who have been so affected by illness that practically none of their flesh was left, some through starvation, some through ill-treatment (such as prisoners of war), some through fanatical fasting – but these were all sinful, mortal men. The One who speaks here is totally different; He is truly man but, as to His person, He is the Son of God. His body is a supernaturally-prepared and voluntarily-assumed body uncontaminated by sin and ordinarily exempt from death, for death is the wages of sin. As far as He personally was concerned, “in Him is no sin”; there was no deviation from the perfect law of righteousness and love: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself”. This the Saviour did from the time He knew His right hand from His left; He was keeping the law of God to perfection. Therefore in that respect He was not due the penalty of death – the penalty for sin.

We should remember that the body He was at this moment looking at was His own, that the Son of God possessed His human nature – body and soul – as surely as our bodies belong to us, and the souls which animate them. The human body and soul that the Son of God was united to were entirely His; He is God and man in two distinct natures and one person for ever. Therefore the one who says, “I may tell all my bones”, is God in our nature, holy harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners. And is it not extraordinary that such a being should be brought to the dust of death, that one who had never sinned – one in whom there was no inclination to sin but rather a divine aversion to it – should be crucified and be in such a state of body that He is able to count His bones? It ought to be amazing to us.

Both the life that wasted His holy body and the death that brought it to lie

in the grave were uniquely remarkable, and I just wish to enlarge slightly upon these two matters. If we single out the recorded part of His life – that is, His ministry – which began, as you remember, when He came to John the Baptist, who was baptizing at the Jordan, and presented Himself as a candidate for baptism. John, who had previously been alerted to the coming of this Person, refused to baptize Him, thinking it was more proper that this Person should baptise him. But the Saviour demanded to be baptized and said that it was a fulfilling of all righteousness.

Here, at the very beginning of His work as mediator of the covenant of grace, He was bent on fulfilling all righteousness, which means that He, as the lawful representative of God's elect people, would perform all the righteousness required of Him. Here is the One who has come to save His people from their sins, and the only way to do so was by associating Himself with them and being associated with them in the eye of the Father. He was their representative, and God looked upon this Person, His Son in our nature, as a representative of those many sinners that He came to redeem. God saw His Son as their representative and saw therefore that He as their representative must act as these people ought to have acted. While they in their multitudes had sinned grievously, in all sorts of ways, breaking both the first table of the law and the second, yet it was His duty as their Redeemer and Saviour to keep that law to perfection, to do Himself what His people had failed to do in order to work out a righteousness for them.

Of course in the 30 years that elapsed before He began His ministry, He had been fulfilling that law perfectly, as I mentioned already; in Him was no sin. There was not a particle of sin in thought or word or deed, in imagination or desire or aim or purpose – not a particle of sin anywhere in the life of this Person. And now, when He entered on His ministry, He was subjected to temptations that had been absent previously, although there must have been many temptations then. He, the holy One living among unholy creatures like you and me, was to be subjected to temptations of a different sort once He entered on His ministry and therefore the trial of His obedience would be all the greater.

But you find Him here declaring that it was His business to fulfil all righteousness; so He continued in His duty of keeping the law of God to perfection. He obeyed every command of God from a spirit of love and in that way magnified the law – that law which Satan would have sinners like us, and even believers among us, to regard as grievous. And sinners do regard it as grievous; the law is an annoyance to sinners; the law is something that we do not like, something we are habitually keeping in part. And we suppose – this is the trouble with many of us – that we are good at keeping the law

because we are keeping the law in part and are not going the full distance in breaking its commands openly. We suppose therefore that our little keeping of the law will be regarded in heaven as sufficient.

In this Person you see that there was no such disposition; in Him there was a perfect love to the divine law. In Psalm 40 He says,

To do Thy will I take delight, O Thou My God that art,
Yea, that most holy law of Thine I have within My heart”.

When part of Psalm 40 is quoted in Hebrews 10 you see that it was when He came into the world that He said this: “I come to do Thy will”. And you can ask yourself how it was that these words were spoken when He came into the world – that is, when the holy Child of Mary was born in Bethlehem.

It was the Saviour’s duty as the Mediator of the covenant of grace to obey the law of God to perfection, to do what man is obliged to do. Adam was not given a tablet of stone on which the Ten Commandments were written. He was not told to love the Lord with heart and soul and strength and mind. This was written into his very nature, his very disposition; this was something that he intuitively knew to be his duty: to love God perfectly and to love his fellow men perfectly. This was the duty from which Adam departed when he sinned by eating the forbidden fruit, and those who are descended from him come into this world sinners, ill-disposed towards that law in its fullness: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with heart and soul and strength and mind, and thy neighbour as thyself. Perfect love, continual love – nothing else but love to God and love to man – that is the law. That is a law we do not keep, a law we cannot keep, a law we have no will to keep.

But when this Person came to begin His official ministry, He declared it was His duty to keep that law, to fulfil all righteousness; He must obey that law, in thought and speech and behaviour, on behalf of the people He loved and had come to save. That was the first part of the Saviour’s duty in connection with salvation; the other part of His duty was to suffer what justice demanded from the sinful people He came into the world to save. “Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins.” They were a people under condemnation, under sentence of eternal death, and that is the way that we are by nature. You who are here in a state of nature, you are under the sentence of eternal death; wisdom would suggest to you that there is no time to be lost in seeking salvation. It ill becomes the soul under sentence of eternal death to procrastinate.

Now when we come to the matter of His suffering, He is to be thought of as the substitute of His people, their representative, the Person who must die instead of them, the Person who must take their law-place and give satisfaction to divine justice as it demanded of Him what was proper. Here you have one

Person; on the other hand you have the ones He represented, the ones He substituted for – a multitude that no man can number. Many of them had a hideous record, Manasseh among them. Adam too was among them; his was a fearful transgression; it brought his whole posterity into this dreadful plight of spiritual death.

This multitude that no man can number, guilty of all the sins, almost, that you can imagine, these are the people for whom He is the substitute, and it was proper that His substitution should be accepted on their behalf. It is proper that this one Man's endurance of the penalty of His people's sins should be effective. He laid down His life for His sheep, as He said, giving His life a ransom for many. It was proper that the life He laid down, the death that He died, which was a death under the curse, should be accepted as a sufficient atonement. It effectively brought about redemption for the whole number of those for whom He substituted. And the reason why the sufferings unto death of this one Man, on Calvary's accursed tree, was a proper substitution for those He loved is just due to the Person who suffered. It was no ordinary man who was suffering; it was the Son of God in our nature who suffered unto death.

That is the reason why there is such merit in His death. And divine wisdom and divine justice appointed that these sufferings on that accursed tree should be a perfect substitute for the sufferings that the people He loved would otherwise have had to endure. These things are, of course, mysterious; we are dealing with divine matters. "Great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh." And we come up again and again against matters that are beyond our power to understand. Yet we can satisfy ourselves with the truth that this one Man, the God-man, died on Calvary's accursed tree following the nine hours on the cross, and God accounted this a perfect atonement. Thus there is every reason why the multitude of His people should be redeemed and should come at last to glory. This was the completion of the fulfilment of righteousness, the doing of all that was required to vindicate and glorify the righteousness which marks God's nature.

This is what is overlooked or even rejected by many who speak of their ideas about the gospel. What they leave out of account altogether, what they do not want to consider, is that in this there was a fulfilling of God's righteousness, that this was all due to the fact that God is righteous. "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" said Abraham. And he was only saying what is absolute truth and what is said elsewhere in a multitude of places regarding the high and the lofty One who inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy – that He is righteous, that in Him there is no iniquity, that He does not tolerate sin, that He does not set aside what is right in favour of something incomplete.

This is the God who is absolutely right and who will not be moved from his divine rectitude on any account.

You see preachers of the Word with false gospels who are now coming out into the open and declaring that they do not believe that there is a hell; they cannot accept that there is a lost eternity. And what lies behind that but their ignorance of the fact that God is righteous and of what will therefore happen if sinners will not receive the one Saviour that is set before them, if sinners will despise and reject the Son of God in our nature, if sinners will pay no due attention to the fact that “God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life”? If sinners will have none of these things, they will perish in a lost eternity, because God is righteous.

And the righteousness of God is such that, when His eternal purpose of saving some of this sinful race must be fulfilled, it fell to His Son to bear His wrath and curse. No escape for Him although He is the Son of God, although He is God in our nature, although – in addition to His perfection as the Son of God – His behaviour as the Son of man was infinitely perfect. No exception was made for Him. If it was proper for sinners to be saved through a divine substitute, that substitute must suffer the wrath and curse of God. Righteousness demanded it, and that is what happened when the Saviour came to the state we read of in this portion of the Word of God. This was required to vindicate and glorify the righteousness which marks God’s nature and government, and this was what produced the descent to death in Christ’s sufferings.

These sufferings and shame had no parallel; so it is divine, redeeming love that we see in the words before us: “I may tell all My bones”. We read of Christ coming to the upper chamber on the night before He died; we read that, “having loved His own that were in the world, He loved them unto the end” – although He knew what lay before Him, although something of the shadow of Calvary was passing over His heart and mind. Yet He loved His own unto the end, notwithstanding the fearful physical sufferings, notwithstanding this reduction of His holy frame to something that was now wasted, whose bones He could count. It was due to the fearful wrath that fell upon Him as the Father visited upon Him the iniquities of all His people. We see divine redeeming love in these words before us: “I may tell all My bones” – love that many waters could not quench nor floods drown.

So the Apostle says, “Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich”; “Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour”. And so He said, “I may tell all My bones”.

Justification¹

1. From the Fathers to the Reformation

We are familiar with the concise, scriptural definition of *The Shorter Catechism*: “Justification is an act of God’s free grace, wherein He pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in His sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone” (Ans 33). James Buchanan explains the term as meaning “man’s acceptance with God, or his being regarded and treated as righteous in His sight – as the object of His favour and not of His wrath, of His blessing and not of His curse”.²

Accordingly this is not man’s inward righteousness, his sanctification; it is his legal standing before God. The question is: Does God now accept the sinner, or does he still stand condemned before his holy Judge? Louis Berkhof brings out this point clearly with his definition: “Justification is a judicial act of God, in which He declares, on the basis of the righteousness of Jesus Christ, that all the claims of the law are satisfied with respect to the sinner”.³ Justification is *not* the infusing of righteousness into a sinner; it is appropriate to use these words in describing regeneration and sanctification but not justification. In the same category as justification is *condemnation*; they are opposites, but they are both legal concepts. So John Owen points out that “condemnation . . . but the passing a sentence upon a man with respect unto his wickedness”. Then he comes to his main point: “No more is justification the change of a person from inherent unrighteousness unto righteousness by the infusion of a principle of grace”, but the passing of a sentence declaring “him to be righteous”.⁴

It is vitally important, as we will see, to keep this distinction between justification and sanctification very clearly in view; in God’s revelation of religious truth in Scripture these are distinct ideas. The *Westminster Confession* stresses that sinners are justified, “not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous: not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ’s sake alone” (11:1). Much of the doctrinal confusion that has plagued the Christian era has arisen through a failure to keep distinct the two ideas of justification and sanctification.

One other general point at this stage: Buchanan notes what is “charac-

¹The first part of a paper given by the Editor at the 2009 Theological Conference.

²Buchanan, *Justification*, Banner of Truth Trust reprint, 1961, p 31.

³Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, Banner of Truth, 1974, p 513.

⁴*The Works of John Owen*, Goold edition, 1851, vol 5, p 135.

teristic of all human systems as distinguished from the divine method of justification”; it is “self-righteousness or self-sufficiency in one or other of its manifold forms, which are all, more or less, opposed to dependence on the grace of God”. This error, he says, is universal, and manifests itself in human beings in three distinct ways: (1) “in reliance on the general goodness of their character and moral conduct”, (2) “in their observance of religious forms and ceremonies, as a compensation for any shortcoming in moral obedience”, (3) “in their possession of peculiar privileges, viewed as special tokens of God’s favour”.⁵

With these points in mind, let us now proceed to consider how the doctrine of justification has fared at the hands of the Church – and, in particular, its theologians – in the period since the Apostles. The Fathers, the Church leaders during the centuries immediately following the Apostles, do not provide an elaborate exposition of the doctrine of justification. But in their writings we find indications of what they believed on the subject. For instance, in the Epistle to Diognetus, we read: “In whom was it possible that we, transgressors and ungodly as we were, could be justified, save in the Son of God alone? O sweet interchange, O unsearchable operation, O unexpected benefit, that the transgression of many should be hidden in one righteous Person and that the righteousness of One should justify many transgressors!”⁶

However, after Constantine established Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire, persecution became a thing of the past and professing Christians began to lose their sense of sin. Accordingly they no longer felt their need of an effective remedy; they lost sight of the significance of the blood of Christ and turned their backs on the doctrine of justification by faith.

There can be no doubt that the unscriptural teachings of Romanism on this subject can in part be traced back to the writings of Augustine of Hippo (354-430); he was the greatest of the Fathers and did much to oppose the teachings of Pelagius – the British monk who denied original sin and maintained that man has power to save himself. However, Buchanan argues that, while Augustine’s use of the term *justification* included the idea of sanctification, he did not confound the two ideas. Augustine’s “was not a mind”, Buchanan insists, “that could confound things so different as the guilt of sin and its defilement, the remission of sin and the renewal of the sinner, a man’s external relation to God and his inherent spiritual character. And . . . there is no evidence to show that he made a sinner’s forgiveness and acceptance with God to rest on his own inherent righteousness as its procuring cause.”⁷

⁵*Justification*, p 79.

⁶Quoted in Buchanan, *Justification*, p 99 (the writer of the Epistle is unknown).

⁷*Justification*, pp 105-6.

Buchanan describes the views of Anselm on this subject (died 1109) as “thoroughly Protestant” and quotes Bernard of Clairvaux (died 1115) saying, “The Apostle says, ‘If one died for all, then were all dead,’ meaning thereby to intimate that the satisfaction made by One should be imputed to all, even as One conversely bore the sins of all”.⁸ The most prominent of mediaeval theologians was Thomas Aquinas (died 1274), whose massive writings have been fundamental for later Roman Catholic thinking. His idea of justification included three components: the forgiveness of sin, the *infusion* of grace, and the turning of the will to God. And in the theology of the Middle Ages the justification of a sinner became dependent on the grace that is infused into him; further, the good works which result from the infused grace have merit before God. It is that merit which leads to pardon and acceptance with God. There was even a kind of merit in doing one’s best; what it amounted to was that people could have some claim on God for spiritual blessings on the basis of their good works.

And in baptism, it was said, God first renews the soul and then forgives, completely removing all the effects of original sin – though, if the Baptism is to be thus effective in adults, they must be properly prepared by exercising the seven virtues of faith, fear, hope, love, penitence, with a purpose to receive the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, and a purpose to lead a new and obedient life – a whole series of good works. We may note the form in which the Roman teaching on Baptism is put in the present-day *Catechism of the Catholic Church*: “By Baptism all sins are forgiven, original sin and all personal sins, as well as all punishment for sin”; and, further: “Baptism not only purifies from all sins, but also makes the neophyte [that is, the one who has just been baptized] ‘a new creature’, an adopted son of God, who has become a ‘partaker of the divine nature’, member of Christ and co-heir with Him, and a temple of the Holy Spirit”.⁹ This is what is claimed to take place merely as a result of the priest taking some water, sprinkling it on the person and repeating the requisite words.

It was in such a climate that the sale of indulgences flourished in the early sixteenth century – people were given the impression that a monetary contribution would lead to the forgiveness of their sins; it was even possible for them to deliver themselves from the agonies of purgatory on account of sins they had not yet committed. And it was when these indulgences began to be sold among his own people that Martin Luther prepared the 95 theses that he nailed to the door of the Wittenberg church, which was effectively the beginning of the Reformation.

⁸*Justification*, pp 110-11.

⁹*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Geoffrey Chapman, 1994, paras 1263,1265.

Luther had previously come to realise, through painful personal experience, that the way of salvation which God has provided for sinners, is by faith in Jesus Christ, not through the ceremonies of the Church. He had suffered terribly at the thought of the righteousness of God, which he had understood as God dealing righteously with the sinner – which for him could imply nothing else but God’s inflexible severity in punishing sin.

But Luther relates his deliverance: “At last I came to apprehend it thus: through the gospel is revealed the righteousness which avails with God, a righteousness by which God, in His mercy and compassion, justifies us, as it is written: ‘The just shall live by faith’. Straightway I felt as if I were born anew; it was as if I had found the door of paradise thrown wide open. The expression, ‘the righteousness of God’, which I so much hated before became now dear and precious. . . . I see the Father – inflexible in justice, yet delighting in mercy – ‘just’ beyond all my terrified conscience could picture Him; He ‘justifies’ me a sinner.”¹⁰ God had showed the future Reformer – with whom the idea of justification by faith is so closely associated – that sinners are saved by faith alone, not by their good works.

So during the winter of 1515-16 Luther, lecturing on Romans 3:28, was declaring to his students: “We hold, recognise and affirm, we conclude from what is said that a man is justified, reckoned righteous before God, whether Greek or Jew, by faith, apart from the works of the law, without the help and necessity of the works of the law”.¹¹ The Lord had led him to a thorough understanding of the doctrine of justification, which William Cunningham describes as “the great fundamental distinguishing doctrine of the Reformation . . . regarded by all the Reformers as of primary and paramount importance. The leading charge which they adduced against the Church of Rome was that she had corrupted and perverted the doctrine of Scripture upon this subject in a way that was dangerous to the souls of men; and it was mainly by the exposition, enforcement and application of the true doctrine of God’s Word in regard to it that they assailed and overturned the leading doctrines and practices of the papal system.”¹²

Thomas M’Crie was impressed by two particular points in the writings of the Reformers: “The first is the exact conformity between the doctrine maintained by them respecting the justification of sinners and that of the Apostles. The second is the surprising harmony which subsisted among them on this important doctrine. On some questions respecting the sacraments and the external government and discipline of the church, they differed; but on

¹⁰Quoted in Buchanan, *Justification*, p 428.

¹¹Quoted in J V Fesko, *Justification*, P & R Publishing, 2008, p 20.

¹²*Historical Theology*, Banner of Truth reprint, 1969, vol 2, p 1.

the article of free justification, Luther and Zwingli, Melancthon and Calvin, Cranmer and Knox spoke the very same language. This was not owing to their having read each other's writings, but because they copied from the same divine original . . . Some of their successors, by giving way to speculation, gradually lost sight of this distinguishing badge of the Reformation and landed at last in Arminianism, which is nothing else but the popish doctrine in a Protestant dress."¹³

The Early Scottish Reformation¹

9. Leanings Towards Reform

J H Merle d'Aubigné

In spite of the executions, the Romish party was not yet satisfied. "These cruel beasts," says Knox, "did intend nothing but murder in all quarters of the realm." Many of King James V's courtiers, his associates in dissipation and in the pay of the priests, instigated him to persecute.

Archbishop James Beaton died in the autumn of 1539. By his last will he left his archbishopric of St Andrews to his nephew David, who became primate of Scotland when confirmed by the King. Henry VIII was induced by these changes to take fresh steps at the beginning of 1540 to gain over his nephew, the Scottish King. Henry sent him presents and friendly messages, which James received in the warmest manner. Henry, however, meant to get to the main point, and Thomas Eure, one of his envoys, strove to discover the King of Scotland's purposes about the Bishop of Rome and the Reformation. One of the councillors, Ballenden, replied with great politeness: "The King of Scots himself . . . was greatly given to the reformation of the misdemeanours of bishops, religious persons and priests within the realm".

James gave even then some proofs of this disposition. On 6 January 1540 a grand feast and dramatic performance was given in the palace of Linlithgow, to exhibit the presumption of the bishops, the iniquities of the spiritual courts and the evil ways of the priests. The King, the Queen, and all the councillors spiritual and temporal were present. James then had the Archbishop of Glasgow called to him, as well as the other bishops. "I exhort you," the King

¹³Quoted in Buchanan, *Justification*, p 471. Buchanan pays tribute to Henry Balnaves' *Treatise on Justification* as "still one of the best in our language". It can be found in David Laing, ed, *The Works of John Knox*, vol 3, pp 431-542. Balnaves was, along with Knox, taken prisoner at the castle of St Andrews by the French.

¹Abridged from *The History of the Reformation in the Time of Calvin*, vol 6. Last month's chapter gave an account of the trial and martyrdom of, among others, Dean Thomas Forrest and an 18-year-old lad from Ayr.

told them, “to reform your fashions and manners of living. If you do not, I will send six of the proudest of you unto my uncle of England, and after he has put them in order, I will do the same with the rest if they will not amend.” The Archbishop answered in consternation, “One word of your grace’s mouth shall suffice them to be at commandment”. Ballenden, in confirmation of these new intentions of James, said to Thomas Eure, “The King is fully minded to expel all spiritual men from having any authority by office under his grace”.

James’ convictions were not very deep, and his own life did not give him the right to criticise the bishops’ lives. The Cardinal was sure of persuading him to change his mind. Other men have been called great or just; Beaton deserved to be called a persecutor. History inflicts this term on him as a disgrace, but he seems to have aspired to it as a glory. Beaton assembled at St Andrews the prelates and nobles who enjoyed his confidence. An elevated seat was provided for him in the cathedral. Proud to see beneath him that illustrious and brilliant assembly, David Beaton began to speak. He set forth with warm feeling the dangers to which the multiplication of heretics was exposing the Roman faith; the audacity with which they avowed their opinions, even at court, where they found too much support – alluding to the drama with which James had been so struck.

Then, to show the significance of his words, he announced that he had cited before the assembly Sir John Borthwick, brother of the provost of Linlithgow, who probably had a hand in the drama. “This heretic gives out”, he said, “that the Pope has no more authority than other bishops, that his indulgences have no effect other than to deceive the people, that the religious orders ought to be abolished, that all ecclesiastics are at liberty to marry, and in short, that the Scots, blinded by their clergy, do not profess the true faith. He reads and circulates the New Testament in English and divers treatises of Melanchthon, Oecolampadius and Erasmus, and refuses to submit to the see of Rome.”

Instead of going to St Andrews, Borthwick set out in all haste for England, where he was well received by Henry VIII. But although Beaton could not send the lamb to the slaughter, he could at least take possession of the fleece. On May 28 confiscation of Sir John’s property was pronounced and his effigy burnt at St Andrews. The fire did him no great harm, but it served to give a certain point to the Cardinal’s speech.

Under the Cardinal’s influence, the King had again returned to the side of Rome. This prince, so thoughtless, violent and unprincipled, changed his opinion at a word from those about him. Money he wanted, and he would have received it from one party as readily as from another, but the priests were more persevering and more skilful in finding it. Sir James Hamilton, the royal

treasurer, had at that time received large sums from the Cardinal; and the King, won by that argument, pronounced himself against the friends of the Reformation with the passion he had before shown towards the prelates.

The King then invested Hamilton with functions resembling those of an inquisitor, charging him “to seize all persons suspected of heresy and to inflict on them, after judgement, such penalties as they have deserved”. In his zeal he exclaimed, “Not a man of that sort shall find any mercy at my hands, not even my own son, if it were proved that he was in the number of the guilty”. This declaration alarmed many. It was plain that an inquisitorial court was to be set up, and Hamilton was already preparing everything for that end. But he was suddenly thrown into the prison in which he meant to confine the friends of the Reformation. Accused, either justly or unjustly, of conspiring against the King’s life, he was arrested, and James had him put to death in August 1540.

James spoke of his son. He had indeed a son, born on 22 May 1540, and so not old enough to excite any fears about what he called heresy. The boy’s baptism took place on May 28, and on the next day the King left “to visit the isles”. The Cardinal and other prelates resolved to take advantage of his absence. The King, they saw, was in ill humour with the nobles, and all those who were suspected in the matter of doctrine must be got rid of. But one discreet man, James Kirkcaldy of Grange, the Lord Treasurer, had been told about this project and made it known to the King. James was enraged at this intrigue hatched in his absence and turned about once more.

The Cardinal, attended by many bishops, came to Holyrood Palace to greet the King and presented to him a paper with the names of nobles suspected of heresy. He dwelt even on the gain which would flow to the crown from getting rid of them. James replied sharply: “Get to your charges and reform your own lives; be no instruments of discord between my nobility and me, or else I vow to God I shall reform you by sharp whingers² if ever I hear such motion of you again”. The prelates, astounded at this rebuke, withdrew in confusion and gave up their scheme for a time.

A second son was born to James in April 1541, and this event both heightened his joy and increased his pride. His happiness, however, was frequently disturbed. Certain men were incessantly endeavouring to deceive him. Informers denounced to him one or other of his earls, his barons and other subjects, as bent on taking his life, and this threw him into a state of great alarm. James had yet other causes of uneasiness. His nights were disturbed, gloomy and sleepless. Hamilton’s death, which he had hastily ordered on mere suspicion, frequently gave him bitter pain. That unfortunate lord had done for the prince

²A *whinger* was a short sword.

all that he had wished; and the latter now asked himself whether he had done well to deprive himself of so devoted a secretary. Perhaps he was innocent. It was in this state of mind that a message reached him from Stirling that his son Arthur had just died: Shortly after, another message came from St Andrews to tell him that his son James was dead. His heart was broken; his mind was disordered. He shut himself up, and the only person he would see was his mother.

Meanwhile the doctrine of the Reformation made progress and, if only liberty were granted it, its triumph in Scotland appeared to be at hand. Many of the common people, both in the country districts and in the towns, held meetings more or less secretly at which they heard the Word read and even explained. By 1540 many eminent men had received the evangelical doctrine. The Earls of Errol and of Glencairn, Lords Ruthven and Kilmaurs and their children, Sir David Lyndsay, and a large number of other influential persons appeared to be attached to the gospel by genuine conviction.

Henry VIII tried to take advantage of this situation and induce the King of Scotland to make his country independent of Rome. All the endeavours of the English envoy proved futile. At bottom, the end which Beaton was pursuing was the ruin of Henry VIII. In order to attain it, he was ambitious to be appointed legate *a latere*, which would give him extraordinary powers in Scotland, powers which he actually obtained. He did everything to promote the alliance against England previously projected by the Pope. Henry, alarmed at this news, had his ambassadors promise James that, if he would go to York to confer with his uncle, the meeting would have highly-favourable consequences for him. The nobles of Scotland, the priests' natural enemies, urged the King to agree to the interview. Arrangements were made for James to meet the King of England on 15 January 1542 in York. Never was Scotland nearer a reform after the fashion of Henry VIII.

No one understood this better than Beaton. What he feared most was that the power of the Romish hierarchy would be abolished and the gospel put in its place. For the first time in his life, the Cardinal had been surpassed in cleverness and influence. He did not, however, lose courage, but applied himself energetically, with all the adherents of his party, to the task. They sowed hatred between the King and the nobles. They employed all imaginable means to dissuade him from the fatal meeting. At first they sought to alarm him. James replied that he had given his word, and that to absent himself from the meeting would lead to war with England, which he did not have the means to carry on. The Cardinal was amazed at this independence of the King, for he was not accustomed to it.

Discerning more and more clearly the greatness of their peril, his bishops

and he agreed that there was but one way of inducing James to renounce his purpose. As this prince was always in need of money, they sought to gain him by gifts of large sums. They told him: "If war should break out, the clergy will give you 30 000 crowns per annum, and you will be able to get 100 000 more by confiscating the property of heretics . . . Will you spare these wicked people? Do they not read the Old and New Testaments? Are they not in rebellion against the authority of the Pope and against the King's majesty? Have they not, by new and detestable errors, troubled the churches, destroyed piety, and overthrown institutions established for many centuries? They refuse all obedience and respect to the priests whom God has consecrated. But there must be no delay." James yielded. He sent Sir James Learmont, one of the officers of his court, to offer his excuses to his uncle. Of all James' proceedings this was the most perilous.

Henry was beside himself with anger; he immediately authorised invasions of the Scottish Borders. But after English troops fled during a small skirmish, James tried to make peace. Persecution ceased in Scotland, and liberty of conscience was more liberally granted.

In November, discouraged by the unwillingness of the Scottish nobles to advance into England, James convoked a council at Holyrood Palace. But in his rage against the nobles, he summoned only the bishops, the priests and their partisans. They persuaded themselves that the moment had come for them to make an end of their enemies in Scotland. The only trouble they took was to deprive the innocent of all means of clearing themselves. They thought that it would for the moment suffice to accuse some noble of heresy, and to call as witnesses certain men of infamous character in their own pay.

With one accord, therefore, they all strove to inflame the King against the Reformation and its friends. They drew up a list containing the names of about 100 nobles whom they wished to remove; among them were men who were well disposed towards the Word of God. This fact shows what progress the Reformation had made in Scotland. To be sure, the majority of these suspects were not decided evangelical Christians, but they had leanings that way. Once already James had refused to accept such a list, but now he accepted it at once, and expressed regret to the prelates that he had so long set their counsels aside. The outcome was an attempted invasion of England which ended in the total rout of James' army at the Battle of Solway Moss.

On 8 December 1542, James V's Queen gave birth to the girl who would become Mary Queen of Scots. But, six days later, at the age of 32, he died. For lack of solid principles he was incessantly tossed to and fro between the nobles and the priests, and whichever party was more adroit easily took the upper hand. He sinned much, but perhaps he was still more sinned against.

Does the Pope Believe in the Resurrection?

Matthew Vogan

The current Pope (Joseph Ratzinger) entered office with a formidable reputation as the Vatican's arch-conservative "enforcer" of doctrine. In Protestant circles, it was conservative Evangelicals rather than mainline liberals that welcomed his appointment.¹ Among those who praised his writings was Michael Horton (of Westminster Theological Seminary, California). While recognising that areas of disagreement exist, he considered that "Evangelicals will have reason to be encouraged by many of the new Pope's teachings".² He was one of the Evangelical scholars who endorsed Scott Hahn's recent book, *Covenant and Communion: The Biblical Theology of Pope Benedict XVI*.³ This comes in the context of recent "conversions" of conservative Evangelicals to Rome, such as Hahn himself. It is evident that the current Pope's writings are being presented in a way that will appeal to conservative Evangelicals and encourage them to "return home to Rome".⁴

Joseph Ratzinger's views are a little more complicated than his reputation suggests, however. During his early academic career Ratzinger admired, and worked with, radical liberal theologians such as Hans Küng, Karl Rahner and Edward Schillebeeckx and was also influential within the liberal majority at the Second Vatican Council in 1962.⁵ Ratzinger has gradually distanced himself from the extreme "progressivism" of his ultra-liberal colleagues.⁶ In a

¹Norman Geisler, president of Southern Evangelical Seminary in Charlotte, NC, rejoiced "in the choice because he's going to hold the line and he's not going to allow the liberal element in the Catholic Church to reverse any of those things". Charles Colson hailed it as "a great choice for orthodoxy". John Witvliet of Calvin College spoke of the appeal of his writings for Protestants as well as Roman Catholics (*Christianity Today*, 18/04/05).

²"What can Protestants expect from the new Pope?" posted on www.whitehorseinn.org on 21/04/05. Ratzinger's major work, *Introduction to Christianity* is said to have been influential in persuading some Evangelical thinkers that a doctrinal meeting point could be established with Roman Catholics.

³Horton has since clarified that he was endorsing an "eminently useful guide for . . . the thought of an important theologian of our time", rather than the theology of the book.

⁴This is largely because Ratzinger's theology is more influenced by Augustine than Thomas Aquinas and he refers to Scripture more frequently than other Roman Catholic theologians.

⁵Ratzinger even wrote a speech for Cardinal Josef Frings in which the Congregation for the Defence of the Faith (of which Ratzinger would later become head) was condemned. A sketch of Ratzinger's theological career, including his heretical views in relation to the doctrine of Scripture, is available in "Who is Benedict XVI?" in the book, *Pope Benedict XVI and the United Kingdom* (Free Presbyterian Publications, 2010).

⁶This was evident when Ratzinger was influential in the discipline of the theologian Hans Küng, despite having contributed, only a few years earlier, to *The Problem of Infallibility*, a book by Roman Catholic theologians, defending Küng's statements on papal infallibility.

1993 interview with *Time* magazine, Ratzinger asserted, “I see no change in my theological positions over the years”. He describes himself as a “balanced progressive”, evidently blending conservative and modernist approaches.⁷

The doctrine of the resurrection of the body. The continuity of Ratzinger’s theological views from his apparently-radical past is seen in his best known, most systematic book, *Introduction to Christianity*.⁸ The book seeks to explain the Apostles’ Creed in the light of contemporary Roman Catholic dogma. When Ratzinger approaches the clause, “I believe in the resurrection of the body”, he recognises that this doctrine is a “stumbling block to the modern mind” (p 232).⁹ His definition is both strange and ambiguous. “Resurrection”, he writes, “expresses the idea that the immortality of man can exist and be thought of only in the fellowship of men” (p 172). The doctrine, he claims, creates a “curious dilemma” (p 238) because modern liberal theologians no longer believe that body and soul can be identified as separate entities, something that Ratzinger dismisses, together with the immortality of the soul, as a Greek notion which has “become obsolete” (p 241).

Ratzinger’s book, *Eschatology: Death and Eternal Life*, covers, amongst other things, the nature of the resurrection. He notes that the accepted view among modern Roman Catholic and liberal Protestant theologians is that body and soul expire at the point of death and that “the proper Christian thing, therefore, is to speak, not of the soul’s immortality, but of the resurrection of the complete human being and of that alone” (p 105). He notes that the word *soul* has disappeared from Roman Catholic liturgy (also from Roman Catholic Bible translations) as a consequence. Ratzinger offers his own new definition of the soul: “The ‘soul’ is our term for that in us which offers a foothold for this relation [with the eternal]. Soul is nothing other than man’s capacity for relatedness with truth, with love eternal” (p 259). The soul is therefore defined heretically as the capacity for relationship rather than real spiritual substance; having a soul means “being God’s partner in dialogue”.¹⁰

In *Introduction to Christianity*, Ratzinger explicitly denies the resurrection of the body. “It now becomes clear that the real heart of faith in the resurrection does not consist at all in the idea of the restoration of bodies, to which we have reduced it in our thinking; such is the case even though this

⁷*The Ratzinger Report: an exclusive interview on the state of the Church*, with Vittorio Messori, Ignatius Press, 1985, p 18.

⁸First published 1968, reprinted repeatedly (latest reprint 2004, with a new preface by Ratzinger; all quotations are from this edition).

⁹The Apostle Paul made no such concessions to unbelief in his day (Acts 17:18,32).

¹⁰*Introduction*, p 244. This refusal to identify the real substance of the soul connects with Ratzinger’s doctrine of God as “entirely relationship” rather than substance. (*Many Religions – One Covenant: Israel, the Church, and the World*, Ignatius Press, 1998, p 77.)

is the pictorial image used throughout the Bible". He says that the word *body*, or *flesh*, in the phrase, *the resurrection of the body*, "in effect means 'the world of man' . . . [it is] not meant in the sense of a corporality isolated from the soul" (pp 240-41).

Ratzinger is deliberately using a meaning that is impossible in the context, in order to explain away the clear meaning of the text. This is also done in relation to the word for *body* (Greek: *soma*), which he says can also mean *self*. He draws the conclusion that "one thing at any rate may be fairly clear: both John (6:63) and Paul (1 Cor 15:50) state with all possible emphasis that the 'resurrection of the flesh', the 'resurrection of the body', is not a 'resurrection of physical bodies' . . . Paul teaches, not the resurrection of physical bodies, but the resurrection of persons, and this not in the return of 'flesh body', that is, the biological structure, an idea he expressly describes as impossible ('the perishable cannot become imperishable') but in the different form of the life of the resurrection, as shown in the risen Lord" (p 246).

Ratzinger could not be more explicit about his interpretation of "the biblical pronouncements about the resurrection". He says that "their essential content is not the conception of a restoration of bodies to souls after a long interval; their aim is to tell men that they, they themselves, live on . . . because they are known and loved by God in a way that they can no longer perish . . . the essential part of man, the person, remains . . . it goes on existing because it lives in God's memory" (p 243).

The resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. Given the connection that Scripture makes between the resurrection of Christ and that of His people (1 Cor 15:15; 1 Cor 6:14), we might wonder how such views affect Ratzinger's theology of the resurrection of Christ. Certainly, he dismisses an "earthly and material notion of resurrection" and resists defining it as a real historical event.¹¹ "The Resurrection cannot be an historical event in the same sense as the Crucifixion is", he says. "For that matter, there is no account that depicts it as such, nor is it circumscribed in time otherwise than by the eschatological-symbolical expression 'the third day'."¹²

¹¹*Introduction*, p 212. He says that it is "impossible for the Gospels to describe the encounter with the risen Christ; that is why they can only stammer when they speak of these meetings and seem to provide contradictory descriptions of them" (*Introduction*, p 211).

¹²*Principles of Catholic Theology: Building Stones for a Fundamental Theology*, Ignatius Press, 2009, p 186. This is an obvious reference to the work of Ratzinger's longstanding colleague, Cardinal Karl Lehmann, who denies the historicity of the resurrection. Lehmann's 1969 book, *Auferweckt am dritten Tag nach der Schrift*, denied that the expression, "the third day", should be taken literally. Ratzinger established a theological journal with Lehmann in 1972 and the latter was on his staff in the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith for 10 years.

Ratzinger brushes aside all attempts to verify the resurrection as a historical event and asserts that it was really a matter of personal experience. Christ is “the one who died on the cross and *to the eye of faith*, rose again from the dead”.¹³ How far this is from the biblical truth of passages such as John 20:27: “Then saith He to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side: and be not faithless, but believing”. What a contrast with the clear and faithful summary provided in the *Westminster Confession*: “On the third day He arose from the dead, with the same body in which He suffered” (8:4).

The true doctrine of the resurrection of the body. Ratzinger flatly denies the fundamental biblical truth of the resurrection of the body, erring in not knowing “the Scriptures, nor the power of God” (Mt 22:29).¹⁴ It is a grave heresy, whose tendency is to “overthrow the faith of some” (2 Tim 2:18). It is evident from Scripture that the body that will be resurrected can be said to be the very same body that we now possess: “this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality” (1 Cor 15:53). “He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you” (Rom 8:11). What is presently “our vile body” shall be changed and made like to the glorious body of Christ (Phil 3:21).¹⁵ This is well summarised by the *Westminster Confession*: “All the dead shall be raised up, with the selfsame bodies and none other, although with different qualities, which shall be united again to their souls for ever” (32:2).

The bodies of believers are united to Christ (1 Cor 6:14-15) even when they rest in the grave until the resurrection (1 Th 4:14). To deny the resurrection of the body is not only to hand some victory to death and the evil one that “had the power of death”, but to take away from the fullness of redemption in this area (Rom 8:23).

Official Roman Catholic doctrine. Is Ratzinger in breach of Rome’s official doctrine on this matter. A couple of years before Ratzinger was appointed to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, a “Letter on Certain Questions Concerning Eschatology” was issued (23 July 1979). This avoided the use of the term *soul* but stated instead that there is a “spiritual element” in mankind that continues and exists independently after death. It did affirm, however, that resurrection is a resurrection of the whole person, body and soul. This was in order to counter the popularity of the “resurrection in death”

¹³Introduction, p 152, my emphasis.

¹⁴Augustine of Hippo said that: “There is no article of the Christian faith which has encountered such contradiction as that of the resurrection of the flesh” (Sermon on Psalm 89).

¹⁵See also Job 19:25; Is 26:19; Dan 12:2; Jn 5:28-29; Rev 20:13. For the resurrection body of believers as like to Christ, see 1 Cor 15:20,23 and 1 Jn 3:2.

theology among Roman Catholic theologians. The Fourth Lateran Council has asserted – and Councils are regarded as infallible in Roman Catholic dogma – that all men “will rise again with their own bodies which they now bear about with them”. Ratzinger was involved in producing the new *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, which was approved with “Apostolic Authority” by the previous Pope in 1992. This document states that “the ‘resurrection of the flesh’ (the literal formulation of the Apostles’ Creed) means not only that the immortal soul will live on after death, but that even our ‘mortal body’ will come to life again” (para 536; compare 997, 1016-17). While this could be more precise it appears reasonably categorical.

How then may the current Pope continue to deny such a statement of the Church’s official teaching?¹⁶ It can be done only by the Jesuitical distinction that he makes between his official and private views (despite the fact that his books are all marketed with “Pope Benedict XVI” more prominently displayed than his real name).¹⁷ Despite the seemingly-binding nature of the new *Catechism*, some point to the fact that it was not prepared by a full Council and are able to take some refuge in Ratzinger’s comments that the *Catechism* seeks to leave debated questions as open as possible.¹⁸ Ratzinger also views doctrinal formulations as having an “infinitely broken nature” in “man’s continual effort to go beyond himself and reach up to God” (p 98). It is alarming to think of the extent of the heresies held by those who have authority within the bounds of Rome if Ratzinger is to be considered conservative.

An explanation closer to the heart of the matter is that it is typical of Roman Catholicism to say both “yes” and “no” at the same time to biblical doctrine.¹⁹ It says “yes” to the authority of Scripture but simultaneously “no” by exalting the Church’s teaching above it. It says “yes” to Christ as mediator, while also saying “no” in giving priests, the Church, saints and Mary the real mediatorial

¹⁶A minority of traditionalist Romanists called sedevacantists believe that the current Pope together with his last three predecessors are heretics and cannot be regarded as valid popes.

¹⁷It goes without saying that this book is absolutely not a magisterial act, but is only the expression of my personal search. . . . So everyone is free to disagree with me.” (Preface to *Jesus of Nazareth* by Joseph Ratzinger, Pope Benedict XVI, translated by Adrian Walker, Random House/Doubleday, 2007.

¹⁸Joseph A Komonchak, “The authority of the Catechism”, in *Introducing the Catechism of the Catholic Church: traditional themes and contemporary issues*, ed Berard L Marthaler, Paulist Press, 1994, pp 18-31). In *Instruction on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian* issued by Ratzinger in 1990, There complicated qualifications as to when and how views differing from official doctrine can be proposed: for example, “withholding assent” is distinguished from “dissent”.

¹⁹This is mentioned by Leonardo De Chirico in “Roman Catholicism and the Evangelical Alternative”, *Foundations* (Spring, 2007).

function as “second Christs”. It says “yes” to a certain definition of justification by faith while giving a firm “no” to justification by faith alone.

This is not only entirely contrary to the nature of truth but also to the command of Christ (Mt 5:37) and the example of the Apostle Paul whose word was not “yea and nay” (2 Cor 1:18-19). This is also part of that “all deceivableness of unrighteousness” (2 Th 2:10) with which the system presided over by the man of sin is characterised.²⁰ It is well able to bring together the incompatible as well as the diverse. There is a deceivability that goes beyond any other, and a particular deceit in presenting itself with an appeal for every kind of person, whatever form of belief or unbelief they prefer. Woe unto any “Evangelical” deceived by it.

Book Reviews¹

Concerning the True Care of Souls, by Martin Bucer, published by the Banner of Truth Trust, hardback, 256 pages, £14.00.

Bucer was to Strasbourg what John Calvin became to Geneva. Bucer was the older Reformer; Calvin learned much from him during his stay in Strasbourg when exiled from Geneva. Eventually Bucer himself was forced out of Strasbourg and became a Professor of Divinity in Cambridge University.

This volume has now been translated into English for the first time, by Peter Beale, a retired English minister. Bucer desired that every Christian should “thoroughly learn what sort of fellowship the Church of Christ is, how Christ the Lord alone rules, what ministry he requires in that rule and how that ministry is to be ordered and performed, in relation to all those are brought to the Church of Christ”.

He discusses “how the lost sheep are to be sought”. He refers to the Lord’s words: “Compel them to come in”, and explains: “It is not that anyone can be compelled to come to Christ against his will, but that one should be so persistent with people that to the evil flesh it seems to be a compulsion and urgent pressing, because the Spirit in this way works against the flesh in order to lead people to Christ”. This is true care for the lost.

But the author spends most time on “the hurt and wounded sheep”, and how the Church should deal with them. Repeatedly he uses the word *penance*, but he does *not* mean the Romish sacrament. One could wish that a different word had been used in the translation, but Bucer indicates his meaning when he sums up as follows: “Those who are Christians . . . and continue in obed-

²⁰Calvin notes that this “must consist partly in false doctrine . . . and errors”.

¹All books reviewed here are obtainable from the Free Presbyterian Bookroom.

ience to the gospel, but fall into conscious sin, are to be given counsel and help so that through true repentance and amendment of life they may again become healthy and well, that is, return to real, holy Christian life"; he is referring to the nurture and discipline of the Church.

A helpful "Historical Introduction" has been provided, from the pen of the late Professor D F Wright. Mr Beale indicates that he has sought "accuracy of translation at the expense of felicity of expression". It is therefore most surprising to find him using an English translation of the Scriptures, the NIV, which uses rather different principles. This book will clearly be most useful to ministers and elders, though it is not exclusively directed to them.

Repentance, by John Colquhoun², published by the Banner of Truth Trust, paperback, 211 pages, £6.00.

This treatise, originally published in 1825 and entitled *A View of Evangelical Repentance*, is a precious description of the grace of repentance. The name of its author, the highly-esteemed Dr Colquhoun of Leith (1748-1827), will be familiar to many readers of this Magazine. He traces the grace of repentance to the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, and shows how it flows out of a true, spiritual sight and sense of sin. This gracious repentance is a turning of the whole man from all that is sinful and hateful to God. "The sincere penitent", Colquhoun writes, "forsakes all iniquity from right principles, by right motives, in a right manner, and to a right end."

Colquhoun shows the reasons why evangelical repentance is absolutely necessary, and carefully distinguishes it from mere legal repentance and all counterfeit and superficial remorse for sin. The latter he states is an abomination to God since it does not flow from a heart regenerated by grace and purified by faith. The fruits and evidences of real repentance, such as Paul outlines in 2 Corinthians 7, are discussed. Colquhoun then goes on to elaborate the priority of that justifying faith which secures forgiveness and comes before the exercise of evangelical repentance. The influence of the Marrow theology, and especially of Thomas Boston, is highly evident here. Colquhoun's work, in line with the writings of the Marrowmen, breathes the warmth of the glorious gospel and, whilst it is most solemn in its denunciation of all sin, it is full of evangelical consolation to believers seeking a greater assurance of their knowledge of Christ.

He demonstrates how this blessed exercise of soul may be obtained. Since Christ is exalted to give repentance, we are to trust in Him for it as well as for pardoning grace. We are to choose God in Christ as our covenant-God and portion. We must be frequent and earnest in prayer for the grace of

²Colquhoun's valuable volume on *Saving Faith* has recently been reprinted by Free Presbyterian Publications hardback and costs £16.00.

repentance. Furthermore, we must endeavour to see sin in its hatefulness, especially the sin of our nature. The contemplation of the death of Christ is essential if we would see the awfulness of sin and what it deserves, and we should meditate much on death and judgement to come.

The subdivisions are clearly and attractively set out and help the reader who can perhaps only read a small portion at a time. It hardly needs stating that the material handled so judiciously and profitably here by John Colquhoun is of the highest importance to everyone, and therefore this is a work that comes with our highest recommendation. *(Rev) A W MacColl*

Word Wise, vol 1, *God's Amazing Book*, and **Bible Numbers**, both by Alison Brown, published by the Banner of Truth Trust, booklets, 32 pages, £3.50 each.

These two titles are for children. Parents should find them useful and children should find them enjoyable. The first book focuses on a selection of the main events in the Bible, from the Creation to the second coming of Christ, but most attention is given to Genesis and the Gospels. This book also gives some teaching about what the Bible is, and it will help children to learn the order of the books in the Bible. Each page has some useful activity for the youngsters to carry out.

Of the two, the second book seems more accessible to somewhat younger children. It very briefly recounts a Bible story for each number from 1 to 12. These include the “six big waterpots” at the wedding in Cana and the “eleven full sacks” of Joseph’s brothers. This author’s earlier books for children were recommended in this Magazine.

Protestant View

The Papal Visit

In a recent editorial *The Daily Telegraph* warns, “Freedom of speech must be respected; but it would be wrong for the licence fee or any other public money to be used to pay for biased and mean-spirited attacks on the Pope. . . . If Benedict XVI is greeted with hostility and manufactured scandals, then British Christianity as a whole will be weakened.”

We respond that the hand of friendship should never be extended to the man who is the enemy of our Protestant heritage. Nor is it necessary to manufacture scandals against Rome – they already abound. Nor will British Christianity be weakened; it will rather be strengthened by resisting the advances of Rome. To impose a papal state visit upon this Protestant nation is truly shameful. Even the British Ambassador to the Vatican (a devoted

Roman Catholic) admits that Britain “is not a majority Catholic country”. Protests are not only justifiable but necessary.

The *Telegraph* adds, “Benedict XVI’s arrival is an opportunity to celebrate a culture that planted our Christian roots, for it was a Pope who sent St Augustine¹ to Britain”. This false statement about establishing Christianity here is echoes one on a Roman Catholic UK website: “Until the 1530s, the Church in this country, as in the rest of Western Europe, was under the final authority of the Pope, and its doctrine and worship were Catholic”. Christianity was planted in England long before Augustine came to England in 597. The papacy imposed its authority on a Christian Church that already existed.

But more than protests are necessary: we must continue praying to “the Most High that He prevent the schemes and plans of the Roman Antichrist against this Protestant nation”, as the resolution of the last meeting of our Synod exhorts. “I will turn thee back, and put hooks into thy jaws” (Ezek 38:4), was God’s warning to Gog, (whom some able commentators take to be representative of antichristian forces). Be that as it may, we are certain that God is able to turn back the papal Antichrist. May we have the prayer of faith which good King Asa had: “Asa cried unto the Lord his God, and said, Lord, it is nothing with Thee to help, whether with many, or with them that have no power: help us, O Lord our God” (2 Chr 14:11).

The West to Be “Re-evangelised” by Rome

How is the Roman Catholic Church to staunch the haemorrhage of its membership on account of the paedophile scandal? In Austria, for example (at one time a fortress of Roman Catholicism and a defence against the Reformation), it is estimated that due to the revelations about child abuse, 80 000 could forsake the Church this year. The answer of the Pope, says one report, is “the establishment of a new Pontifical Council for the promotion of new evangelisation in countries ‘where the first proclamation of the faith already resounded’ but are now ‘going through a progressive secularisation of society’ and a sort of ‘eclipse of the sense of God’”.

The initiative, which he announced at the end of June, is aimed at disillusioned and lapsed Roman Catholics – but what new evangel is to be presented to them? It can only be the gospel according to Rome – basically the gospel of salvation by works, peace by penances, blessedness by submission to the Church – which, of course, is another gospel. “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed” (Gal 1:8).

Many former Roman Catholics have reason to bless God for the day they

¹Not Augustine of Hippo, the Church Father referred to elsewhere in this issue (Ed).

first heard the “gospel of the grace of God”, by which they were led to salvation by faith in Christ alone, “peace through the blood of His cross” (Col 1:20), and were blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus (Eph 1:3). May the promised day soon come when many more of those in thrall to Rome will be liberated by the gospel of Christ. “And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free” (Jn 8:32). *NMR*

Notes and Comments

Symptoms of Spiritual and Moral Decay

The common tendency is to bemoan, and rightly so, the ills of society but to fail to go behind them to their spiritual and moral root causes. For example, politicians complain that we are an ageing population with a decreasing number of younger people, who have to support the pensions, social services and benefits of an increasing number of elderly people. Employers allege that the small pool of suitable workers necessitates immigration from within and out-with the European Community. Is consideration given for a moment to how many more younger people there would be, and potentially how many more native contributors to the economy and suitable recruits for the labour market, had there not been such a slaughter of the unborn over recent decades? How many recognise that this situation is consequent upon the legalised breach of the Sixth Commandment, “Thou shalt not kill”? Disregard for this commandment, together with ignorance of God’s right to determine the duration of our lives and ignorance of the solemn realities of judgement and eternity, is also manifest in discussions regarding euthanasia and assisted suicide.

There are frequent complaints about the lack of affordable housing. There are those for whom circumstances beyond their control, and contrary to what they would desire, mean that they do not enjoy family life based on the biblical pattern of husband and wife, father and mother and children, together at home. But does not disregard for the marriage ordinance established at the beginning of human history, expressed in such ways as casual relationships, single parenting, easy divorce, considerably account for, among many other even more serious consequences, the fact that many more homes are required than would otherwise be the case? Disregard for the Seventh Commandment is also evidenced in such legalised aberrations from the Divine order as civil partnerships, and it accounts for many children being brought up in ways that deprive them of a stable home and a moral compass.

The precarious condition of the economy preoccupies the minds of many, together with the sometimes-indecent gap between the financial status of the

very rich and the very poor. Is it not the case that the situation itself, and also much of the dissatisfaction with it, spring from greed? Disregard for God's commandments, "Thou shalt not steal" and "Thou shalt not covet", understood in their full Biblical extent, as expounded helpfully in *The Larger Catechism*, accounts for much of this situation. The love of money accounts for all kinds of evil in society.

Behind these and other breaches of the commandments, which are intended to regulate relations between human beings, is disregard for the First Commandment. It requires us "to know and acknowledge God to be the only true God, and our God; and to worship and glorify Him accordingly", and forbids "the denying, or not worshipping and glorifying the true God as God, and our God; and the giving of that worship and glory to any other, which is due to Him alone" (*Shorter Catechism*, Answers 46,47).

We cannot, as a nation and society which have enjoyed the full light of God's revelation, deny the uniqueness of God and His right to determine the moral standards which are to govern our relationships, without serious consequences following. That such denial does characterise us and our elected representatives as a people is evident, not only in the large scale abandonment of true religious worship, but also in such ways as legislation which endorses practices which God abominates; the trampling of the Sabbath underfoot by business, pleasure, sport and political activities; the state recognition afforded to the Pope, whose projected visit is in defiance of our Protestant constitution; the recognition given to religions which are inconsistent with and opposed to the truth as it is in Jesus, together with the attempts to impose restrictions on Christians at work and upon Christian witness.

We earnestly hope that we have not yet reached the situation of Judah in the days of Jeremiah: "Then said the Lord unto me, Though Moses and Samuel stood before Me, yet my mind could not be toward this people: cast them out of My sight, and let them go forth (Jer 15:1). There is hope, as long as the Lord gives His people a mind to pray, that He may yet return to us in power to work that change in hearts and minds which can alone turn us again to Him and away from the paths of destruction along which we rush at present. As His people we need to look beyond the sad symptoms to the spiritual and moral roots of our decay and make His name's glory our chief concern. HMC

Blows Against Religious Freedom

Two high-level decisions, one in America and the other in Europe, have attacked freedom of religion. In the USA, the Supreme Court has ruled that a student group, the Christian Legal Society (CLS), does not have the right to restrict its membership to practising Christians. The CLS refuses to let

non-Christians and those engaging in a “sexually immoral lifestyle” to become voting members.

The liberals on the Supreme Court, says one report, upheld the rights of sexual orientation over the rights of religious freedom by comparing Christian beliefs to racist beliefs. The dissenting judges on the Court put on record their view that the majority decision “is a serious setback for freedom of expression in this country”, and the American Center for Law and Justice said the decision “significantly damages the constitutional rights of religious organisations.”

The second decision was by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (EUAFR), which rejected the application of a Romanian Christian pro-family group, the Alliance of Romania’s Families (ARF) to join it. It also denounced the Alliance as promoters of hate because it states on its website: “So-called alternatives such as ‘families’ consisting of same-sex partners, are nothing but expressions of human degeneration”. The Alliance responded by saying that the EUAFR decision against them “evinces an attempt to weed out organisations that express, based on their freedom of expression and religion, views that are different from those officially espoused by the Agency”. At the same time, the EUAFR has shown its anti-Christian bias by granting membership to the British Humanist Association, one of Britain’s most outspokenly anti-Christian lobby groups, bent on removing all signs of Christianity from public life in Britain.

Governments and their agencies may curtail religious freedom, and undoubtedly will do so increasingly, but when God, according to His promise, will send forth His gospel with power among the nations, it will be wonderfully seen that “the word of God is not bound” (2 Tim 2:9). *NMR*

Israel’s Unrelenting Enemies and Her Greatest Need

An Israeli newspaper reports that a United Nations organisation teaches jihad in textbooks in schools in the capital of Israel. The textbooks, supplied by the Palestinian Authority (PA), are used by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) in its schools in Jerusalem and not only incite young schoolchildren to armed struggle against Israel but also praise terrorists as “martyrs” if they are killed while attacking Israel. UNRWA is funded primarily by the United States and the European Union.

The PA Minister of Education Lamis al-Alami, in a frank interview with the newspaper, stated that the textbooks provided by the PA for UNRWA schools are precisely the same in Jerusalem as in Ramallah, Shechem and Gaza, where Palestinian school children have been incited against Israel for many years. The newspaper comments that this is “the first education system

since the Third Reich which prepares its pupils to demonize Jews and to wage war against the Jews”.

At the same time the main stated objective of the United Nations is to facilitate “a more peaceful, prosperous and just world”. But it betrays its double standards by giving such practical support to a Palestinian terrorist organisation which, as the UN well knows, has its own main objective to bring the existence of Israel to an end.

While it is our duty to pray that God’s ancient people will be preserved from both evil enemies and false friends, our primary petition must be that they would see the glory of Christ and turn to Him as the Messiah who has already come and broken down the middle wall of partition (Eph 2:14). It is said of the Jews that “even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it [that nation] shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away” (2 Cor 3:15,16). NMR

Church Information

Rev Donald MacLean

Mr MacLean passed away, on August 13, at the age of 95, after a long, useful ministry, most of it in his native Glasgow. We send our sympathy to his family.

Special Day of Prayer

The Synod has appointed “a special Day of Humiliation and Prayer on Wednesday, 8 September 2010, to be held throughout the Church to beseech the Most High that He prevent the schemes and plans of the Roman Antichrist against this Protestant nation, and that He pour out His Spirit upon the professing Church in our land and the whole world, and that the people might return to His Word and find repentance for their departures from Him”.

(Rev) John MacLeod, Clerk of Synod

Committee Meetings

Synod committees will meet, DV, in Inverness Free Presbyterian Church on Tuesday, October 6, as follows:

- 9.00 - 9.30 Church Interests Committee
- 9.30 - 11.00 Training of the Ministry Committee
- 11.00 - 12.00 Magazines Committee
- 12.00 - 1.00 Sabbath Observance Committee
- 2.00 - 3.00 Outreach Committee
- 2.00 - 5.00 Finance Committee
- 3.00 - 5.00 Religion and Morals Committee
- 6.00 - 7.30 Publications and Bookroom Committee

7.30 - 8.30 Welfare of Youth Committee

7.30 - 8.30 Dominions and Overseas Committee

(Rev) John MacLeod, Clerk of Synod

Theological Conference

This year's Theological Conference will be held, God willing, in the Free Presbyterian Church, Inverness, on Tuesday and Wednesday, December 7 and 8. All meetings are to be in public, and it is expected that the following papers will be read:

The Course of the Scottish Reformation

Rev D Campbell

John Knox and the Preaching of the Gospel

Rev H M Cartwright

The Scottish Reformers' View of the Papacy

Rev D W B Somerset

The Scottish Reformers and Biblical Church Government

Rev J R Tallach

The Benefits to the Nation of the Scottish Reformation

Mr M Vogan

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

Dominions and Overseas Fund

By appointment of Synod, the special collection on behalf of the Dominions and Overseas Fund, is due to be taken in congregations during September.

W Campbell, General Treasurer

Acknowledgement of Donations

The General Treasurer acknowledges with sincere thanks the following donations:

Legacy: Estate of the late Miss Annie MacKintosh, £2877.73 for each of Ballifeary Home Fund, China Mission Fund, General Building Fund, Home Mission Fund, Jewish & Foreign Missions Fund, and £5755.48 for Sustentation Fund.

Eastern Europe Fund: Anon, £30.

Jewish & Foreign Missions Fund: Anon, for Themviso Children's Home, £200; Friend, £2000 per Rev JM; Mrs P Garrard, for Kenya Mission, £50.

Legacy Reserve Fund: Estate of the late Mrs Jessie M MacLeod, £7000.

Congregational Treasurers acknowledge with sincere thanks the following donations:

Fort William: *Congregational Funds:* D&LC, £150; F MacPherson, £200.

Gairloch: *Communion Expenses:* Anon, £15 per Rev AEW; Anon, £50. *Congregational Funds:* Anon, "where most needed", £20 per Rev AEW; Anon, £30.

North Uist: *Congregational Funds:* Anon, £1000, £1000.

Portree: *Congregational Funds:* Anon, "Where Most Needed", £70; The estate of the late Mr Donald J MacLeod, £1000. *TBS:* Anon, £50.

Raasay: Anon, "In memory of M & A MacLeod, Armish", £800 for communion expenses, £1000 for church and manse expenses.

Shieldaig: *Communion Expenses:* Anon, £60, £120, £60, £20, £50, £300; Friend, Kyle, £10 per DMC.

Staffin: *Manse Building Fund:* Anon, £300, £200; HG, £50; Anon, "In loving memory", £100; JM, Lewis, £1000; Friends, Stornoway, £50; Friend 'C', Lewis, £20; Friend, £200; Friend, Edinburgh, £20; Anon, £100 per Rev WAW; TCS, Portree, £200.

Stornoway: *Communion Expenses (Achmore):* Friend of the Cause, Stornoway, £20. *Congregational Funds:* Doig, for Sabbath School outing, £20.

Sydney: *Congregational Funds:* Anon, £200; Singapore Friend, \$110 per Rev GBM.

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.
- Breascele:** no services meantime.
- Dingwall:** Church, Hill Street: Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. **Beauly** (Balblair): Sabbath 6.30 pm, Thursday 7.30 pm. Rev Neil M Ross BA, Dingwall, 10 Achary Rd, IV15 9JB; tel/fax: 01349 864351, e-mail: nmross2001@yahoo.co.uk.
- Dornoch:** Sabbath 11.30 am. **Bonar:** Sabbath 6 pm. Wednesday 7.30 pm (alternately in Dornoch and Bonar). **Lairg:** Church and Manse; **Rogart:** Church; no F P services. Contact Rev G G Hutton; tel: 01463 712872.
- Dundee:** Manse. No F P Church services.
- Edinburgh:** 63 Gilmore Place, Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Thursday 7.30 pm. Rev Hugh M Cartwright MA, Napier House, 8 Colinton Road, Edinburgh, EH10 5DS; tel: 0131 447 1920.
- Farr,** by Daviot: Sabbath 12 noon and 6 pm. Prayer meetings: Thursday 7.30 pm in **Farr**, **Stratherrick** or **Tomatin** as intimated. 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; **Strathlyon:** 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, 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. Rev D Campbell MA, F P Manse, North Tolsta, HS2 0NH; tel: 01851 890286.
- North Uist:** **Bayhead:** Sabbath 12 noon, 6 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm (fortnightly). **Sollas:** Wednesday 7.30 pm (fortnightly). Rev D Macdonald BA, F P Manse, Bayhead, North Uist, HS6 5DS; tel: 01876 510233.
- Oban:** Church and Manse. No F P services at present.
- Perth:** Pomarium, off Leonard Street. Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Manse tel: 01738 442992. Contact Mr J N MacKinnon; tel: 01786 451386.
- Portree:** Sabbath 12 noon, 6.30 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. 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 6 pm. Tuesday 7 pm (alternately in Shieldaig and Applecross). Shieldaig manse tel: 01520 755259, Applecross manse tel: 01520 744207. Contact Rev D A Ross; tel: 01445 731340.
- Staffin:** Sabbath 12 noon, 5 pm; Wednesday 7 pm. Rev W A Weale, F P Manse, Staffin, IV51 9JX; tel: 01470 562243.
- Stornoway:** Matheson Road, Sabbath 11 am, 6.30 pm; Thursday 7.30 pm. **Achmore:** Sabbath 12 noon; Tuesday 7 pm. Rev J R Tallach MB ChB, 2 Fleming Place, Stornoway, HS1 2NH; tel: 01851 702501.
- Tain:** Church and Manse. **Fearn:** Church. No F P services. See Dornoch and Bonar.
- Uig (Lewis) Miavaig:** Sabbath 12 noon Gaelic, 6 pm English; Wednesday 7 pm. Manse tel: 01851 672251.
- Ullapool:** Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Wednesday 7.30 pm. Manse: Quay Street, IV26 2UE. Tel: 01854 612449.
- Vatten:** Sabbath 6 pm; Wednesday 7 pm (fortnightly). **Glendale, Waternish:** As intimated. Contact Rev J B Jardine; tel: 01859 502253.

England

- Barnoldswick:** Kelbrook Road, Sabbath 11 am, 6 pm; Friday 7.30 pm; Wednesday 8 pm, alternately in Haslington and Gatley. **South Manchester:** Sabbath 6.00 pm, in Trinity Church, Massie Street, Cheadle (entry at rear of building). Contact Mr R Middleton, 4 Rhodes Close, Haslington, Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 5ZF. Tel: 01270 255024. Manse tel: 01282 851782.
- 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 8 pm. Manse, 23 Upper Cairncastle Road, Larne BT40 2EF. Tel: 02828 274865. Contact: 02828 273294.

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. Rev L T Smith. Tel: 409 925 1315; e-mail: lyletsmith@gmail.com.

Australia

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

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

New Zealand

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

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

Tauranga: Girl Guide Hall, 17th Avenue, Sabbath 11 am, 7 pm; 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 Opland, P O Box 150, Carterton, 5743. Tel: 02 7432 5625

Israel

Jerusalem / Tel Aviv: Rev J L Goldby MA, P O Box 10578, Jerusalem 91105. Tel: 00972 2 6738181. Sabbath: 11 am in Jerusalem YMCA, 7 pm in Tel Aviv; for further details contact Mr Goldby.

Singapore

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

Ukraine

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

Ingwanya: Church and Secondary School. Rev A B MacLean. Postal Address: Ingwenya Mission, Private Bag T5445, Bulawayo. John Tallach School tel: 00263 85343.

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

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

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

Kenya

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

Free Presbyterian Church Bookroom

133 Woodlands Road, Glasgow, G3 6LE Tel: 0141 332 1760
E-mail: sales@fpbookroom.org Website: www.fpbookroom.org

Book Selection

	RRP	Offer
Catholicism East of Eden by Richard Bennet		
Banner of Truth, 2010, pbk, 323pp	£8.00	£6.00
The Church of Rome at the Bar of History by William Webster		
Banner of Truth, 1995, hbk, 256pp	£7.50	£6.00
Geese in their Hoods- Writings on Roman Catholicism by C H Spurgeon		
Pilgrim Publications, 1997, pbk, 204pp	£6.95	£5.50
Daniel by John Calvin		
Banner of Truth, 1995, hbk, 409pp	£17.00	£15.00
All of Grace by C H Spurgeon		
Christian Focus Publications, 2008, pbk, 137pp	£5.00	£4.00

(Postage is extra)

Subscription rates, including postage:

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

Combined £28.50