

THE  
GOSPEL MAGAZINE.

"COMFORT YE, COMFORT YE MY PEOPLE, SAITH YOUR GOD."  
"ENDRAVOURING TO KEEP THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT IN THE BOND OF PEACE."  
"JESUS CHRIST, THE SAME YESTERDAY, AND TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER."

No. 778. }  
NEW SERIES. }

OCTOBER, 1930.

{ No. 1978.  
{ OLD SERIES

The Family Portion ;

OR, WORDS OF SPIRITUAL CAUTION, COUNSEL, AND COMFORT.

"Who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God."—2 CORINTHIANS I. 4.

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE CRITICIZED.

I. THE BISHOPS AND THE BIBLE.

"Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of GOD : because many false prophets are gone out into the world."—1 JOHN iv. 1.

THE Lambeth Conference, consisting of three hundred and seven Archbishops and Bishops in full communion with the Church of England, has come to an end. It met at Lambeth, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Lang), on July 7th of this year, and concluded its deliberations on August 9th. The Bishops who met had come from all parts of the earth, and the number who gathered on this occasion was greatly in excess of the number attending any previous Conference of its kind. The results of its deliberations are printed in a volume of 200 pages. This volume consists of three parts.

1. An Encyclical Letter signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of the Conference.

2. Seventy-five Resolutions passed by the whole Conference, or rather by a majority thereof.

3. The Reports of Committees dealing with the six subjects which engaged the attention of the Conference.

"The judgment of the Conference is expressed in the Resolutions. . . . These, and these alone, are affirmed by the Conference. The Reports . . . have been received by the Conference; and the

Conference has directed that they should be published; but the responsibility for the statements and opinions which they contain rests with the several Committees by whom they were prepared."

We feel it to be our duty to criticize some of the statements and opinions set forth in these documents.

Many false teachers had gone out into the world in apostolic times, and it must be owned that false teachers are very numerous to-day. Amongst these are many of the leading men of the professing Church to-day. Without using any uncharitable words we feel bound to regard much of the teaching of Bishops and of leading men in other denominations as false, and contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures. Our LORD bids us to "beware of false prophets," and the Apostle John bids us to "try the spirits whether they are of GOD." It is our bounden duty to search the Scriptures for ourselves in order to discover whether the teachings of leading men in the professing Church are in harmony therewith.

In our view many of the teachings put forth by the Lambeth Conference Report are dangerous and unscriptural, and to some of these we would draw the attention of our readers.

*First, we would point out that the teaching of this Report in regard to Scripture is dangerous and unscriptural.* Resolution 7 says that "the intellectual meaning and content of the Christian doctrine of GOD cannot be fully apprehended without the aid of the highest human knowledge," and therefore "it is essential that Christian theology should be studied and taught in the Universities in contact with philosophy, science and criticism."

This is a denial of the great doctrine of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture.

The inspired apostle says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of GOD, and is profitable for doctrine . . . that the man of GOD may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17). The Scriptures alone are sufficient for the knowledge of all doctrine, including the doctrine of GOD. By means of them the man of GOD becomes perfect or mature in Divine knowledge, and is completely furnished unto all good works. The Lambeth Bishops say that the doctrine of GOD "cannot be fully apprehended without the aid of the highest human knowledge." By this they mean human philosophy, science, and criticism, presumably the

“higher criticism.” Scripture is not sufficient, according to the Bishops. In addition to the Bible we must have present-day philosophy, science, and criticism, if we would fully apprehend the truth about GOD.

If this be so, then all the writers of the Old and New Testaments were sadly deficient in their knowledge of the doctrine of GOD. They had no access to the writings of present-day philosophers, scientists, and critics. Shall we dare to assume that the professed Christian scholars of to-day know more about GOD than did the inspired writers of the Bible? This is in effect what the Lambeth Bishops teach.

What shall be said, too, of the large percentage of ordinary Christian men and women whose knowledge of GOD is dependent on their knowledge of the Bible? Are these humble Christians necessarily deficient in their knowledge of GOD because they know little or nothing of human philosophy, science, and criticism? Hear the testimony of one who took the same University honours as Bishop Colenso. He obtained a Fellowship at Trinity, Cambridge, and was considerably popular as a mathematical lecturer. He says that after he was ordained he “found a poor, ignorant old woman in his parish more than a match for him in Divine things.” At that time he was destitute of the SPIRIT’S teaching. But when he was made willing in a day of CHRIST’S power, and had passed from death unto life, he wrote, “I am quite certain no natural man can see the things of GOD; and I am equally certain he cannot make himself do so. . . . I see, as plainly as it is possible for me to see anything, that no natural man can receive the things of the SPIRIT of GOD”—quoted by Sir Robert Anderson in *The Bible and Modern Criticism* (pp. 33-35).

It is evident that Lambeth Bishops do not hold the great Protestant and Bible doctrine that Holy Scripture is sufficient for all true knowledge of GOD, all true knowledge of ourselves, and all true knowledge of the way of eternal salvation.

“The things of GOD knoweth no man, but the SPIRIT of GOD.” A man may be well versed in philosophy, science, and criticism, and yet destitute of any true insight into the things of GOD. The spiritual man knows “the things that are freely given to us of GOD,” because he has received “the SPIRIT which is of GOD.” “The

wisdom of this world is foolishness with GOD" (1 Cor. ii. 11-15; iii. 19).

We cannot too strongly insist on the truth that Scripture is sufficient for all knowledge of spiritual truth, and that only those taught by the SPIRIT can fully apprehend it. We turn to the Report on the Doctrine of GOD which is commended in Resolution 2 "to the study of all thoughtful people."

That Report speaks (p. 76) of "some of the inadequate or unworthy conceptions of GOD current in the Church itself." It says, "Many of these imperfect conceptions may be traced to *the belief, still prevalent, in the equal authority of all parts of the Bible.*" We underline this statement ourselves, and ask our readers specially to notice it. The Report goes on to say, "In spite of the light long since thrown upon the conditions under which its several books were written and upon the progressive revelation of sacred knowledge they record, *the Bible is even now too often treated as if every statement about GOD, contained in every part of it, must find a place in our present apprehension of Him* (italics ours). The result is a confused vision in which early and preparatory thoughts of Him are allowed to intrude upon the revelation of the Divine Being in the life and teaching of JESUS CHRIST. No Christian consciously denies that 'he who hath seen Me hath seen the FATHER.' Yet there are still many who, out of a mistaken reverence for the Old Testament, insist that all its teaching must be accepted in its literal sense. They have failed to realize that CHRIST gave His perfect revelation, not indeed by destroying, but by fulfilling and in so far superseding, all past teachings about GOD."

We must say that we are appalled at such Episcopal teaching concerning the Old Testament and concerning the teaching of our LORD JESUS CHRIST.

According to this Report, commended to our study by the Lambeth Bishops, we are *wrong in believing "in the equal authority of all parts of the Bible."* Such a belief is responsible, so the Bishops think, for "unworthy conceptions about GOD current in the Church." It seems that many of us have failed to accept the so-called "assured results" of the critics, and we still treat the Bible "as if every statement about GOD, contained in every part of it, must find a place in our present apprehension of Him."

Thank GOD, many of us still treat the whole Bible as inspired. We believe every inspired statement about GOD in every part of it. In doing this we follow the example of our LORD, and of His apostles. They never suggested that the GOD of the Old Testament was a different GOD from the GOD of the New Testament. Their reverence for the Old Testament led them to insist that all its teaching about GOD must be accepted in its literal sense. It seems, however, that such reverence for the Old Testament is "mistaken." Yet the Bishops have subscribed to the VIIIth Article of the Church of England, which says "*The Old Testament is not contrary to the New.*"

The Bishops say that Christ has in a measure superseded "all past teachings about GOD." We utterly repudiate such a doctrine. We ask where in His teaching did He do so? All our LORD's teaching concerning the Old Testament shows that He regarded it as the inspired Word of GOD. Not a single word did He utter repudiating any statement about GOD's character recorded in the Old Testament.

The Report goes on to give some instances of "unworthy conceptions of GOD" due to this "mistaken reverence for the Old Testament." It speaks (pp. 76, 77) of "such errors as the idea that GOD is alone responsible for all misfortunes not obviously due to human agency; that, for instance, He 'sends' disease, wars, catastrophes, untimely deaths, for inscrutable reasons of His own; that these must be accepted for our chastening and punishment because they are 'His will.'"

If to say that GOD sends disease, wars, catastrophes and untimely deaths is an error, a conception of GOD's character that is unworthy, then no doubt a large number of the true people of GOD are guilty of treating the Old Testament statements about GOD, and the New Testament statements also, as literally true. Has it come to this, then, that a majority of the 307 Lambeth Bishops can tell us that we must no longer treat the Old Testament as the very Word of GOD? Truly apostasy from the old truths has gained an awful ascendancy in the professing Church. There was a time when the English Bishops took a very different line in regard to the Bible. In Urquhart's *Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy Scripture* we read on pages 15 and 16 as follows:—

“The Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, in a united protest addressed to Bishop Colenso, in 1863, said: ‘All our hopes for eternity, the very foundation of our faith, our nearest and dearest consolations, are taken from us, *if one line of that sacred Book be declared unfaithful or untrustworthy.*’”

Truly the apostasy has developed since 1863. Perhaps the saddest thing about this teaching of present-day Bishops is the acquiescence in it of many who still claim the honoured name of Evangelical.

But is it an error to believe that GOD sends disease, war, catastrophes, and untimely deaths? Is it an error to believe that GOD sends death at all? Are we wrong in saying that GOD said to Adam, “In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die”? Was Paul wrong in saying, “As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned”? He evidently believed the Genesis account of sin and death. He evidently believed that GOD said to Adam, “Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.”

The Apostle Peter says, “Holy men of GOD spake as they were moved by the HOLY GHOST.” Ezekiel was one of these holy and inspired men, yet the LORD by his mouth said, “Thus saith the LORD GOD: How much more when I SEND *My four sore judgments upon Jerusalem, the sword, and the famine, and the noisome beast, and the pestilence, to cut off from it man and beast?*” (Ezek. xiv. 21). Here we read of disease, and war and catastrophe being *sent* by GOD. To say this is, according to the Lambeth Bishops, an error. It is an unworthy conception of GOD, a conception of Him which a knowledge of the teaching of CHRIST ought to dissipate. But are the Bishops right about the teaching of CHRIST? Have they not themselves fallen into serious error about the teaching of CHRIST in the New Testament? Some of CHRIST’s teaching occurs in the Sermon on the Mount, and what does He there say about GOD the FATHER? He says, “He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and SENDETH rain on the just and on the unjust” (Matt. v. 45). The control of the sun and of the rain are in GOD’s hands. This is New Testament teaching. It is CHRIST’s teaching. When therefore GOD makes His sun to shine more constantly and for an unusually prolonged period, and withholds the rain, thus

causing drought, failure of crops and famine, besides causing deaths from the heat wave, are we in error in saying these calamities are sent by GOD? Was Elijah under a delusion when He announced that the LORD as a judgment would withhold both the dew and rain for years in Ahab's day? Was he in error when later on he announced that GOD would "SEND rain upon the earth"? (1 Kings xvii. 1; xviii. 1). Yet our LORD endorsed the truth of this narrative (Luke iv. 25), and James, a New Testament inspired writer, says that both the drought and the rain were Divine answers to Elijah's prayers (James v. 17, 18).

The Old Testament tells us that GOD said to Noah, "Behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven" (Gen. vi. 17).

It also says, "The LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven" (Gen. xix. 24). Our LORD endorses the truth of both these narratives. He says "the flood came," and "it rained fire and brimstone *from heaven*" (Luke xvii. 27, 29).

Peter in the New Testament expressly says that GOD "spared not the old world" and brought in "the flood upon the world of the ungodly," and that He turned "the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes" (2 Pet. ii. 4-6).

GOD *sent* both these catastrophes. But according to the Lambeth Bishops this is an "unworthy conception of GOD." We are in error in believing such statements about GOD. But if we are in error, then inferentially we must say that CHRIST and His apostles were in error. If we reject the statements about GOD in the Old Testament, we must reject similar statements in the New. We must throw over both Testaments. We must cease to believe the testimony of the SON of GOD Himself.

Then we are told in this Report that "such misconceptions of the Divine nature in the minds of groups within the Church are often accepted outside it as characteristic of the whole Christian doctrine of GOD, with the result that people who should be attracted through the Church to the truth which is in JESUS are often actually repelled from it. It seems to them that the Church proclaims a GOD less perfect than His SON." Presumably, then,

we must deny the teaching of both the Old and New Testaments in order to placate those who cannot receive their teaching about the character of God.

It is such teaching as this that a majority of the Lambeth Bishops commends "to the study of all thoughtful people."

Against such teaching we would warn all our readers with all the force at our command.

*Whitington Vicarage,  
Stoke Ferry, King's Lynn.*

THE EDITOR  
(*Thomas Houghton*).

### THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

(From BISHOP J. C. RYLE'S *Is All Scripture Inspired?*)

THE view which I maintain is that every book, and chapter, and verse, and syllable of the Bible was given by inspiration of God. I hold that not only the substance of the Bible, but its language—not only the ideas of the Bible, but its words—not only certain parts of the Bible, but every chapter of the book—that all and each are of Divine authority. I hold that the Scripture not only *contains* the Word of God, but *is* the Word of God. I believe the narratives and statements of Genesis, and the catalogues in Chronicles, were just as truly written by inspiration as the Acts of the Apostles. I believe Ezra's account of the nine-and-twenty knives, and St. Paul's message about the cloak and parchments were as much written under Divine direction as the twentieth of Exodus, the seventeenth of John, or the eighth of Romans. I do not say, be it remembered, that all these parts of the Bible are of equal importance to our souls. Nothing of the kind! But I do say they were all equally given by inspiration.

In making this statement I ask the reader not to misunderstand my meaning. I do not forget that the Old Testament was written in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek. The inspiration of every word, for which I contend, is the inspiration of every original Hebrew and Greek word, as the Bible-writers first wrote it down. I stand up for nothing more and nothing less than this. I lay no claim to the inspiration of every word in the various versions and translations of God's Word. I only say that, so far as those translations and versions are faithfully and correctly done, so far they are, practically, of equal authority with the original Hebrew and Greek. We have reasons to thank God that many of the translations are, in the main, faithful and accurate. At any rate our own English Bible, if not perfect, is so far correct, that in reading it we have a right to believe that we are reading in our own tongue, not the word of man, but of God.

## Wayside Notes.

---

### THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE CRITICIZED.

#### II. THE BISHOPS AND CHRISTIAN UNITY, BIRTH CONTROL, AND THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN.

*"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."*

I THESSALONIANS V. 21.

IN our Family Portion we have drawn attention to the dangerous teaching of the Lambeth Conference concerning the Bible.

The whole Report of the Conference is sad reading. It would be strange if there was nothing good in it, but there is so much evil that it negatives the good, and we feel constrained to draw attention to a few other outstanding points in the Report which call for criticism.

1. *First, we draw attention to the Bishops' attitude towards Christian Unity.*

It is evident that the ultimate aim of the Bishops is to bring about complete re-union with Rome, as well as with all the other professing Christian Churches. Resolution 32 says, "Believing that our Lord's purpose for His Church will only be fulfilled when all the separated parts of His Body are united, and that only by full discussion between the Churches can error and misunderstanding be removed and full spiritual unity attained, the Conference expresses its appreciation of the courage and Christian charity of Cardinal Mercier in arranging the Malines Conversations, unofficial and not fully representative of the Churches though they were, and its regret that by the Encyclical, *Mortalium animos*, members of the Roman Catholic Church are forbidden to take part in the World Conference on Faith and Order and other similar Conferences."

We feel that the Bishops are in error in regarding all the members of the various denominations, including the members of the professing Church of Rome, as parts of Christ's Body. There is a lamentable failure in regarding the true Church of God as co-extensive with all the various denominations which go to make up what is called Christendom. Scripture teaches that the Church of God, purchased by His Own blood, is the Body of Christ (Eph. i.

22, 23; Acts xx. 28). Scripture also leaves us in no doubt as to who are the members of Christ's Body. If we go to the Epistle to the Ephesians, we find the apostle saying, "We are members of His Body," and who are the "We"? They are those blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ, chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, "predestinated unto the adoption of children," redeemed by Christ's blood, forgiven, quickened, and saved by Divine power and grace. (See Eph. i. 3-7; ii. 5-10; v. 30.)

If we go to the First Epistle to the Corinthians, we find the apostle saying to the saints at Corinth, "Now ye are the Body of Christ, and members in particular," and who are the "ye"? What are their characteristics? Hear the inspired apostle again. "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. vi. 11; xii. 27).

Can it be said that all who profess and call themselves Christians, including members of the Roman, Eastern and Reformed denominations are all real members of the Body of Christ? Are they all forgiven, regenerated, and saved by Divine grace? Are they all washed, sanctified, and justified? Is it not well known that the larger number of most of the members of the denominations are still dead in trespasses and sins, and walking in the broad way that leads to destruction? Besides, those who do really belong to Christ's Body are already united. They "are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 28).

Christ's prayer for unity is not a prayer for the unity of spiritually dead professors, but for the manifest unity of His living people. His Church consists of "that whole universal company of the elect, that ever were, are, or shall be gathered together in one Body, knit together in one faith, under one Head, Jesus Christ" (Archbishop Usher, quoted by Bishop Ryle, *Knots Untied*, p. 260).

Then, why this hankering after re-union with Rome by Bishops of the Reformed and Protestant Church of England? Were our fathers mistaken in breaking with Rome? Was the Reformation of the sixteenth century a blunder? Must we now retrace our steps and join forces with a Church which teaches the idolatry of the Mass?

The late Bishop J. C. Ryle says, "I should not lie down in

peace after writing on idolatry, if I did not declare my solemn conviction that idolatry is one of the crying sins of which the Church of Rome is guilty." Again he says, "To my mind, it is idolatry to worship that which man's hands have made—to call it God, and adore it when lifted up before our eyes. And if this be so, with the notorious doctrine of transubstantiation, and the elevation of the host in my recollection, I say there is idolatry in the Church of Rome" (*Knots Untied*, pp. 495, 496). On page 498 of the same work Bishop Ryle says, "What is Romanism at Rome, unfettered, unshackled, and free to develop itself in full perfection? Let a man honestly answer these questions, and I ask no more. Let him read such a book as Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome*, or *Alford's Letters*, and ask any visitor to Rome if the picture is too highly coloured. Let him do this, I say, and I believe he cannot avoid the conclusion that Romanism in perfection is a gigantic system of Church-worship, Sacrament-worship, Mary-worship, saint-worship, image-worship, relic-worship, and priest-worship—that it is, in one word, a *huge, organized idolatry*." Yet it is this Church with which a large number of Bishops wish us to unite.

The Committee of Bishops in their Report on the Unity of the Church adopt as their own these words: "There can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of re-union which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West."

And again, "The Committee feel that in any attempt at re-union the unity of the whole Church must be in their minds, and they are not without hope that the attitude of the Church of Rome may, in some parts of the world at any rate, change in the not very distant future" (*Report*, pages 48, 131). How different the attitude of the present Bishops compared with that of the great and famous Bishop Ryle, whom we have already quoted. He says, "It is vain to deny that a large party of English clergy and laity in the present day are moving heaven and earth to re-unite the Church of England with the idolatrous Church of Rome." The movement to bring about this end is connected with the rise of Ritualism in the Church of England, and it is increasingly evident that this movement is being fostered by a large number of the Bishops. The late Bishop J. C. Ryle says, "Rather than be re-united with

the idolatrous Church of Rome, I would willingly see my own beloved Church perish and go to pieces. Rather than become Popish once more she had better die!" Again he says, "For the true Church of Christ I have no fears at all. But for the Established Church of England, and for all the Protestant Churches of Great Britain, I have very grave fears indeed. The tide of events seems running strongly against Protestantism and in favour of Rome. It looks as if God had a controversy with us, as a nation, and was about to punish us for our sins" (*Knots Untied*, pp. 504-506).

It is no doubt true that before union with Rome is fully agreed to our Bishops and others may stand out for some slight changes in Rome's attitude, but it is clear beyond doubt that Bishops and others who want to unite with Rome are prepared in very large measure to renounce those great principles for which our Reformers stood. We have not space to deal with the efforts to bring about re-union with the Greek Church and with the old Catholics, but it is clear from this Report that many of the Bishops are prepared to bring about re-union with these Churches by sacrificing the position formerly taken by Evangelical and Protestant Churchmen. It is declared "that the meaning of the XXXIX Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer," instead of the Prayer Book being interpreted by the Articles.

The Lord's Supper is called a Sacrifice. It is stated quite erroneously that "the Anglican Church teaches the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice," and that we legally pray for the dead. The Bishops speak of the "*altars*" and "*pulpits*" of the Church of England, although they know that the word "altar" is never used in the Prayer Book in reference to the Communion table. (*Report*, pp. 27, 135, 139.)

2. *Secondly, we draw attention to the position taken by the Bishops in reference to Birth Control.*

For many years the subject of birth control and the limitation of families has been discussed in our newspapers. These newspapers penetrate into every corner of the country and most people have become familiar with the doctrine of birth control. The Lambeth Conference has now spoken on the subject, and for the first time in the history of the Church of England the majority of the Bishops who met at Lambeth agreed to a resolution that under some

circumstances artificial means may be employed to limit the number of a family. Resolution 15 says: "Nevertheless, in those cases where there is such a clearly-felt moral obligation to limit or avoid parenthood, and where there is a morally sound reason for avoiding complete abstinence, the Conference agrees that other methods may be used, provided that this is done in the light of the same Christian principles. The Conference records its strong condemnation of the use of any methods of conception-control from motives of selfishness, luxury, or mere convenience." This resolution was carried by 193 votes to 67.

In the Report of the Bishops on this subject (p. 89) we read, "The decline of the birthrate . . . is largely due to the increasing use of methods which are deliberately adopted to limit the size of a family. . . . There is no doubt that the diminution of the birthrate in modern times by 50 per cent is mainly due to the knowledge and use of methods which prevent conception. These methods are now widely used in every class of society." We ourselves have always refrained from seeking to become acquainted with the methods here referred to. All that we know is that what are called artificial means, or contraceptives, are employed to limit the size of families. At one time it was quite common for families to be large. Now they are almost universally small, and the Bishops declare that "methods are now widely used in every class of society" to prevent conception. The great question is, Can we, with the teaching of the Bible before us, regard the use of these methods as pleasing to the mind of God?

All will agree that *self-control* is needed in married life as in single, but are there any circumstances which warrant the use of artificial means to prevent parenthood? The Bishops fail to give any Scripture warrant for the serious position which they have taken up. They speak vaguely of "Christian principles," but they fail to give any text of Scripture in favour of principles which allow the use of contraceptives. We would here say that no doubt there are many parents who desire to have families but who are unable to gratify their desire. There are probably others who have thoughtlessly resorted to the use of artificial means to limit their families without considering the teaching of Scripture on the subject.

The large majority, however, who use these methods are not concerned at all as to the teaching of the Bible on this subject. Moreover, a large number of the Bishops and other leaders in the various denominations regard large portions of Scripture as legendary, mythical and fabulous, so that the whole Bible is no longer to them the only rule of faith and practice.

We, however, still believe in the full inspiration of the law, the Psalms, and the prophets, and of the whole of the New Testament. That being so, we would remind our readers of the teaching of the first chapter of Genesis.

When God created man he endowed him with the power of propagating his species, and He said, "*Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.*" After the Fall and in spite of it, God repeated this command to Noah and his sons (Gen. i. 28 ; ix. 1, 7). That command holds good to-day. It was given in the first instance to the first pair—the man and the woman. It holds good to-day in regard to all married people. To contribute to the multiplication of the human species and to the replenishing of the earth is a Divine command. That proper self-control may be exercised goes without saying, but deliberately to use artificial means to prevent the multiplication of the human species is plainly to go contrary to God's original design. In the New Testament we have the express teaching of the inspired apostle. He says to married people, "Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer ; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency" (1 Cor. vii. 5).

Self-control may by mutual consent be exercised for special reasons, but only "for a time." Nowhere, however, in the Bible is there the barest hint that any interference with the original design of God should be practised.

For ourselves we cannot but regard it as a sin to tamper with God's original design.

But, besides the evil arising from these methods being employed by married people, there is the great sin connected with their employment by the unmarried. The Bishops in Resolution 18 say, "In view of the widespread and increasing use of contraceptives among the unmarried and the extension of irregular unions owing

to the diminution of any fear of consequences, the Conference presses for legislation forbidding the exposure for sale and the unrestricted advertisement of contraceptives, and placing definite restrictions upon their purchase."

The Bishops, then, presumably have ground for declaring that there is a "*widespread and increasing use of contraceptives among the unmarried.*" Yet they sanction their use under certain circumstances for the married. These contraceptives, it seems, are exposed for sale and are advertised without restriction. All that the Bishops desire is a limitation to this evil. Surely they should stand out against their use by all, married and unmarried.

But how appalling it is to realize that breaches of the Seventh Commandment are taking place on a large scale, possibly larger than ever before, as a result of the knowledge attained that the use of contraceptives would prevent the usual consequences of a breach of a Divine law.

In former days, if a breach of the Seventh Commandment took place, the sin came to light in due time, and the guilty parties became known. Now this sin may be committed without fear of consequences. To what lengths may the corruption of English society go, if this traffic in contraceptives and this encouragement of their use be favoured! Do the Bishops realize what they are doing?

Moreover, let no one suppose that breaches of the Divine law can ever take place with impunity. Consequences may even now follow of which neither the Bishops nor others are aware. In any case sin is sure to be followed by punishment. "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished" (Prov. xi. 21). Any failure to walk according to the teachings of God's Word is sure to end in disaster sooner or later.

"At a public meeting at Llandrindod Wells, Principal Griffith-Jones, President-Elect of the National Free Church Council, said he was surprised and grieved that Bishops had given even hesitating blessing to birth control. The Church of England and Nonconformists did not realize what they were doing. The Church would fall into insignificance. Children were fading out of Free Church congregations, and he knew of a Church where forty married couples had not a single child" (*The Times*, Aug. 27th, 1930).

We are glad to read the following paragraph in the *English Churchman* for September 4th: "The Rev. H. E. Boulton, Vicar of Bebington, in a sermon on the Sunday following the issue of the Lambeth Report, severely criticized the action of the Bishops in regard to the question of birth control, and described their utterances as 'extremely painful to those who are trying to uphold New Testament standards, and to lead their fellow-men into the paths of virtue and self-denying purity of life.'"

3. *Thirdly, we draw attention to the Bishops' pronouncement on the public ministry of women.*

We have long felt that the professing Christian Church was flouting the authority of Scripture by encouraging women to speak publicly to mixed audiences. We can only briefly refer to the subject. Hitherto the public ministry in the Church of England has been limited to men. For many years a loose attitude has been taken on this subject, even by people who were otherwise on the whole loyal to Scripture. Now, however, the Bishops sanction the ordination of deaconesses who may read the prayers in Church and, "with the licence of the Bishop," may "*instruct and preach, except in the service of Holy Communion*" (Resolution 70). We feel that this is in direct opposition to the teaching of Scripture.

The Apostle Paul, inspired by the Holy Ghost, says, "*Let your women keep silence in the Churches (Assemblies): for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. . . . It is a shame for women to speak in the Church (Assembly)*" (1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35). Again the apostle says, "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (1 Tim. ii. 12).

The Bishops, however, although they claim to be the successors of the apostles, take an opposite line to that of the inspired apostle. In like manner, in spite of apostolic teaching, they omitted the word "obey" from the Marriage Service in their revised Prayer Book. Godly women have abundant opportunities for ministry amongst their own sex, and in the home and in the family. Departure from Scripture in this matter will, like all other departures, sooner or later end in disaster. We cannot walk contrary to God's Word without evil consequences following. *But how few in these days tremble at God's Word!* We would direct our

readers to an article on this subject by Professor Warfield in another part of this issue.

4. *Our final word is to express our grief at the encouragement which the Bishops give to monasteries and nunneries.*

They "rejoice in the growth of religious communities within our own Communion as a sign of spiritual vitality, and as a source of spiritual strength to the whole body of the Church" (*Report*, p. 31).

We should have thought that the evils of monasteries and nunneries, with the vows of celibacy taken by many of their occupants, were sufficiently patent from history to prevent any Episcopal encouragement being given to them in these days.

We must confess that the Report of the Lambeth Conference is not likely to advance the cause of Bible truth.

No one who really values the great foundation truths for which the Reformers and the great Puritan writers stood is likely to receive any spiritual uplift from a perusal of its pages.

THE EDITOR

(*Thomas Houghton*).

*Whittington Vicarage,  
Stoke Ferry, King's Lynn.*

#### HUMAN INABILITY.

"FOR, as men cannot be sensible of this death, while they abide in it ; so neither can they help themselves out of it. Death strips away all *power*, as well as all *perception*. A dead body may as well restore itself to life, as a dead soul. A fallen angel may as soon re-kindle spiritual life, and regain his first estate, as a fallen man. Nothing can produce the spiritual life, and a spiritual mind resulting from it, but the Spirit of God. His breath alone brings this life, which Jesus intimates, when He breatheth upon His disciples, and said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost' (John xx. 22).

"Yet, while men are without this life, and walk the rounds of moral decency, they bravely talk of will and power to make themselves the sons of God ; and think St. John a mere driveling for affirming they are born, not of the *will* of man, but of God (John i. 13)."—*John Berridge*.

"FULL obedience has been rendered by Christ, as the Substitute of His people, both to the precept and the penalty of the law ; not one jot or tittle has passed ; all has been fulfilled ; and, consequently, the justice of God, so far from being an obstacle to the salvation of the redeemed, is, in fact, their security."—*J. A. Haldane*.

## Pilgrim Papers.

## WELLSPRINGS.

*"Bring my soul out of prison, that I may praise Thy Name. The righteous shall compass me about; for Thou shalt deal bountifully with me."*—PSALM cxlii. 7.

THE heading of this Psalm tells how "David sheweth that in his trouble all his comfort was in prayer to God." It has reference probably to the time when he was in the cave Adullam, hiding from his treacherous and evilly-inclined enemy; and he did the best, the wisest and safest thing he could do in his trouble, he "cried unto the LORD," poured out his soul into that ear which is never dull of hearing, and to Him Who is always at hand in His people's extremity and will give His help, and ultimately deliver. You and I have often endorsed this truth as we have sung of the worth of our mercy-seat.

"Ah, whither could we flee for aid,  
When tempted, desolate, dismay'd;  
Or how the hosts of hell defeat,  
Had suffering saints no mercy-seat?"

There is a blessedly strong confidence running through the language of this Psalm. It tells us where David always looked for succour, how he expected help from the only One from whom help could come, and how he was not disappointed of his hope and expectation.

He is comforted in the thought that even when his spirit was "overwhelmed," then the Lord knew his path; and as surely as He knew He cared, for the Lord Who knoweth the days of the upright, as our beloved Mr. Ormiston once said, as surely "knew their number, their nature, and their need." And the Psalmist's need and extremity is very great just now. His spirit "overwhelmed," his flesh weary, and he brought "very low," so low that his soul is in those depths of distress and fear. Up through the darkness, out of the awful dungeon and fearful gloom, the cry of the distressed heart goes up, and reaches his God, from Whom deliverance will assuredly come sooner or later, and the soul be emancipated from its prison house. "Bring my soul out of prison," there is the child of God's request, "that it may praise thee," is his chief reason in crying for deliverance. "The righteous shall compass me about" suggests the company he will seek out, that he may tell to them, all that God has done for his soul. And finally there is the holy confidence in his delivering God, "For Thou wilt deal bountifully with me."

This is a larger and deeper experience than that of the hiding from bodily harm in the fastnesses of the rock. The Psalmist refers to a greater "prison" than that. His soul is in darkness, and his spirit is overwhelmed, and he looks on the right hand, and there is no man to know him and refuge fails him, and no man cared for, or sought after, his soul. But David knew where to turn from a past experience; and

to the Lord's dear servants, Paul and Silas, to sing His praise even from their inner prison and heard by the other prisoners; of Peter sleeping in calm and reposeful peace of mind, even when death seemed close at hand, but he was delivered by the miracle of the angel and "the gate opening of his own accord." We think of the aged Apostle John in Patmos too; yes, and the many bonds which bound the faithful ambassadors for Jesus Christ in later days; by whose bitter experience we are so greatly enriched by Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, and the Christ-exalting Letters of dear Samuel Rutherford. You will get a little into the secret of how the Lord Himself cared for and felt for his dear imprisoned servants by taking note of His words to His sheep when He comes again—"I was . . . in prison, and ye came unto Me"!

And there are, besides literal prisons, others well known in the experience of everyone of Zion's sons and daughters. There is that spiritual darkness from which He Who is appointed "for a Covenant to the people, for a light of the Gentiles" is pledged to deliver them. "To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house" (Isa. xlii. 7). Hence the God-implanted faith in every redeemed sinner's heart "who walketh in darkness and hath no light," who stays himself upon God, and says meanwhile, whilst waiting for the deliverance, "when I sit in darkness, the Lord shall be a light unto me."

There is the prison experience of affliction, adversity, seeming desertion, cross-handed providences, sorrow and bereavement, gloomy doubts and fears, well known to every child of grace in the appointed pathway, the "much tribulation" whereby they must enter the everlasting kingdom, where tears and sorrow are unknown. Meanwhile, trust thy delivering God, dear, tried, tempest-tossed reader. Remember that these "clouds are but the dust of His feet," Who is hastening to thy support and deliverance.

"Mountains of unbelief and sin,  
Before Him crumble into dust;  
Thy humble heart shall then begin  
His all-restoring hand to trust.

By Him exalted, know thy state,  
A garden rich in fruit and flower;  
Thy gracious Master's loved retreat,  
The wonder of redeeming power."

Our prison-house experience, dear, tried child of God, is all known, appointed, and watched over by our God. All your trials and humblings are dealt out to you "in measure" and weight in His infinite love and perfect wisdom.

"They come in His appointing hour,  
Clad with a high commission'd power;  
Perform the purpose of His heart,  
Engender good, and then depart."

May our grace-exercised souls look much to it, that we get all the

from the blessed truth enforced upon his heart, that there was One Deliverer Who would never fail him and Whom he should "yet praise," as he says in another place, "as the health of his countenance and his God."

Yes, he wants again to give his testimony—"Bring my soul out of prison that it may praise thee." And then he looks for the good and gracious company of the Lord's people; those who shall join him in giving praise; those to whom he can call upon to "magnify the Lord with him and exalt His Name together." It is the company of His people whom the saints long after, even when all goes well with them, but how much more when they are in trouble and sorrow. How do they then know and prove that the only earthly ones who can administer soothing comfort and sympathy are the fellow-members of Christ's mystical Body. When deliverance is again graciously afforded them they call upon their own souls, and those who can sympathize with them in their trouble, to testify together of His faithfulness, loving-kindness and salvation.

How often in looking back on her long life of "countless tender mercies by the way" does the writer think with adoring gratitude of the sweet rich Christian fellowship, of sacred meetings she has rejoiced in, when our hearts have burned within us as Jesus Himself drew near and communed. Little companies have found their way together to tell of the goodness and lovingkindness of their God, and to speak of that sweetest of all themes, Jesus and His all-transporting worth. How sweet have been the hallowed seasons when the Lord's remembrancers have gathered around His precious Word, and proved the truth of His own promise written over the very portals of this little home, *the Lord is there, Jehovah-Shammah*. And with the individual fellow-saint, how by grace-constraining help, have we encouraged and strengthened each other in the rehearsal of what our God has done for us in Providence and Grace—and in the pouring out of our hearts to the "Dear Refuge of our weary souls," to whom we can always flee in our troubles. Yes, David was right when he said, "The righteous shall compass me about, for Thou shalt deal bountifully with me." He also says elsewhere, counting upon the faithfulness and the deliverance of his God, "I will sing unto the Lord, because he hath dealt bountifully with me." "The righteous also shall see it and fear." It is thus a new song which is put into the mouth of the believer and by which he glorifies the God of all his salvation. There were many like the Psalmist who had their literal prison experience. We think of Joseph so unjustly cast into the prison in which the very "iron entered into his soul," and yet how he was enabled to glorify his God there, and have such honour conferred upon him by the heathen monarch. We think of Micaiah too, fed with the bread and water of affliction in the dungeon for his faithful words to the false prophets of Ahab. We think of Jeremiah also, shut up in the court of the prison by Zedekiah, King of Judah, and of the wonderful words of deliverance spoken to him there, by his almighty and delivering God. We also think of those songs in the night given

good out of the sanctified trial which the Lord has put in it; and that faith may look to the performing hand of her God to bring the soul out of prison, that it may praise Him, and with the righteous who compass us about testify of the bountiful, all-gracious delivering hand of our God, as also of His all-supporting grace in the furnace. Bountiful dealings are His purpose of love in the gracious and sanctified "afterward" of affliction!

R.

## CHRIST LIVING AND DYING FOR HIS PEOPLE.

(FROM BISHOP J. C. RYLE'S *Old Paths*, pp. 220, 221.)

"CHRIST has *stood in the place* of the true Christian. He has become His Surety and His Substitute. He undertook to bear all that was to be borne, and to do all that was to be done, and what He undertook He performed. Hence the true Christian is a justified man (Isa. liii. 6).

"Christ has *suffered for sins*, 'the just for the unjust.' He has endured our punishment in His Own body on the cross. He has allowed the wrath of God, which we deserved, to fall on His Own head. Hence the true Christian is a justified man (1 Pet. iii. 18).

"Christ has *paid the debt* the true Christian owed, by His Own blood. He has reckoned for it, and discharged it to the uttermost farthing by His Own death. God is a just God, and will not require his debts to be paid twice over. Hence the true Christian is a justified man (Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19).

"Christ has *obeyed the law* of God perfectly. The devil, the Prince of this World, could find no fault in Him. By so fulfilling it He brought in an everlasting righteousness in which all His people are clothed in the sight of God. Hence the true Christian is a justified man (Dan. ix. 24; Rom. x. 4).

"Christ, in one word, has lived for the true Christian. Christ has died for Him. Christ has gone to the grave for him. Christ has risen again for him. Christ has ascended up on high for him, and gone into heaven to intercede for his soul. Christ has done all, paid all, suffered all that was needful for his redemption. Hence arises the true Christian's justification,—hence his peace. In himself there is nothing, but in Christ he has all things that his soul can require (Col. ii. 3; iii. 11). Who can tell the blessedness of the exchange that takes place between the true Christian and the Lord Jesus Christ? Christ's righteousness is placed upon him, and his sins are placed upon Christ. Christ has been reckoned a sinner for his sake, and now he is reckoned innocent for Christ's sake. Christ has been condemned for his sake, though there was no fault in Him,—and now he is acquitted for Christ's sake, though he is covered with sins, faults, and shortcomings. Here is wisdom indeed! God can now be just and yet pardon the ungodly. Man can feel that he is a sinner, and yet have a good hope of heaven and feel peace within. Who among men could have imagined such a thing? Who ought not to admire it when he hears it?" (2 Cor. v. 21).

## Sermons and Notes of Sermons.

### TESTING TIMES.

A SERMON PREACHED BY THE LATE REV. JAMES ORMISTON ON  
FEBRUARY 16TH, 1896.

*“ And Abram said unto Lot, Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, and between my herdmen and thy herdmen ; for we be brethren. Is not the whole land before thee ? separate thyself, I pray thee, from me ; if thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right ; or if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left.”*—GENESIS xiii. 8, 9.

I DO not know, beloved friends, how you view this matter, how you feel about what you have been hearing read this evening. For myself I look upon this episode in the history of these two men of God—for such Abraham and Lot undoubtedly were—as a very sorrowful, a very sad incident. “ We be brethren.” This was true even in regard to human relationship. Abraham was the uncle of Lot. In that sense there was a natural kinship, which was very close indeed, existing between these two men. Next, they had been associated together in regard to the past. They had both left their native country and had gone forth whither God would lead them, though, be it observed, when God called Abraham He called him *alone*, and bade him leave his natural kinship. How far Abraham was justified therefore in taking with him Lot I know not. We read he also took Terah (chapter xi) and Terah travelled with him on the road a certain distance, as far as unto Haran, and Terah died in Haran. To that extent Abraham was free from this earthly association, but yet Lot, you see, continued with him. Now I have noticed this, that when others than those whom God has called to a way of service attach themselves by way perhaps of imitation to others of God’s people they are not prosperous. If I am right in my experience and observation it would therefore be desirable for us all to be quite clear in our own minds concerning the will of God towards us individually. It is no use for me to attempt to walk in your footsteps, nor is it any use for you to attempt to walk in mine. You need and I also need to wait upon God individually to know His holy will concerning us personally. Lot appears to have attached himself when his uncle was called and, as we have seen, he went forth with him. But Lot was never, I think I may say, any help to Abraham, and I am quite sure he was a great hindrance. When God called Israel out of Egypt there went up with Israel a mixed multitude, and you read afterwards how these people who attached themselves to Israel, but who were not of Israel, fell a-lusting in the wilderness, and led a rebellious movement against God. Be careful, therefore, beloved in Christ, how you accept the fellowship of others. Beware of accepting a fellowship with any which is not clearly of God’s mind. You may argue, and I may, in particular instances, that it

cannot be wrong to accept the fellowship of any professing child of God. Well, in the abstract, that is plausible, but in practice it is not wise. What are we told in God's Word? To lay hands suddenly on no man. Do not appropriate fellowship with others till you clearly know it to be the will and mind of God to have it so. But when once God has made plain to you His holy mind, then be swift to do His will.

Now Abraham and Lot were both men of God, so that in a spiritual sense likewise they were brethren. Now discord, contention, is unlovely even between unconverted persons, but between children of God how uncomely, how unlovely. How ill it comports with their common calling by grace. And this all the more because the Canaanite and the Perizzite are still in the land. The world is looking on. I daresay you have noticed in this chapter the words that I have just now quoted, the seventh verse, immediately preceding our text: "And there was a strife between the herdmen of Abram's cattle and the herdmen of Lot's cattle: and the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land," and no doubt they were witnesses of this uncomely contention between the herdmen of these two men of God. So that it is well for us, fellow-believers, to bear with one another as far as grace enables us if differences arise. Let us adopt in such instances, if we are ourselves involved in such matters, the language of holy Abraham as he addressed his nephew Lot: "Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, for we be brethren." I know, dear children of God, by experience, it takes a good deal of grace, and also rich grace, to keep the peace sometimes; but if we in the spirit of our father Abraham really desire peace for the Lord's sake and for the truth's sake, we shall endeavour to cover a multitude of sins. You may be grievously wronged, cruelly wronged, even by a Christian brother. Well, you have a God to Whom you can turn, and you have an Arbitrator in the Person of Jesus, why not refer the matter for arbitration instead of fighting it out in your own wisdom and strength? "We be brethren."

Now I want for a few moments to contrast these two men of God. I suppose there is no one here to-night who doubts that Lot was a man of God when the New Testament calls him "just Lot," and speaks of his holy soul being grieved because of the abounding iniquity of the people of the place which he himself selected for a residence. He was a man of God, but contrast him with Abraham. Before, however, we do so, let us observe a common characteristic between these two men of God. We read in the previous chapter that God sent a famine into the land of Canaan where Abraham and Lot were sojourning. Now Abraham's faith in God failed him under the test when God cut off temporal supplies. It occurred to the heart, the natural heart, of Abraham to go down to Egypt where plenty was to be found. For a moment, and it was a crucial moment, Abraham forgot the God of the promises. Now I am not sorry in my own interest, my soul's own interest, that Abraham was thus tried in his faith. I am not sorry—I am very glad—that inasmuch as his faith failed him God put that

failure on record in the Bible, otherwise I might sometimes be tempted to think that Abraham was not a man of like passions with myself. Well, his faith failed him and he left. He struck his tent and he left behind him the altar where he had hitherto worshipped, and—as we read incidentally in our own chapter, the fifth verse, “Lot which went with Abraham”—he took Lot with him down into Egypt. Now there was a sad example of how the erring footsteps of one man of God may seduce another child of God to do likewise. You see Lot was now with Abraham, but this is unbelieving Abraham. This is Abraham walking in his own wisdom. This is Abraham who is leaning upon Egypt for help. This is Abraham who, put to the test, fails to believe his God is all-sufficient without Egypt, and Lot falls into the snare. I suppose Lot’s faith was not at any time the faith of Abraham. Be that as it may, both these men of God went down into Egypt for supplies, and Abraham who was the prime leader in the matter fell grievously into disgrace in Egypt. He put his wife upon speaking that which was not true in order to shelter his own life, and God used the heathen king to rebuke His servant, His friend Abraham. “And Pharaoh sent Abraham and his wife and all that they had away” in disgrace. And Abraham retraced his footsteps till he came to the spot near Bethel where at the first he had builded the altar, and fell to communion with the God of the promises. Abraham the backslider is recovered and with him Lot, another backslider, is recovered.

But now we mark a contrast between these two men of God. God has prospered both of them in temporal things. God had multiplied their flocks and their herds. Now this becomes a temptation. Ah, child of God, set not your affections on things on the earth, set your affections on things above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God, where the true treasure is alone to be found, where the moth and the rust consume not, where the thieves break not through nor steal; where the treasure is in good keeping. If God multiply wealth in the case of any one of His people, by so doing He subjects the spiritual man to a sharp ordeal of trial. What wise and what weighty and what prudential advice is given in Psalm lxii, the tenth verse, “If riches increase, set not your heart upon them.” Now Abraham’s riches increased, and he set not his heart upon them. Lot’s riches increased, and he set his heart upon them. There is the all-important distinction between these two men of God. “We be brethren, brethren in prosperity, brethren now in wealth, God has caused riches to increase and what has it led to? Well, between our herdmen at any rate it has led to strife, not peace.” We do not know anything about these herdmen. We do not know whether any of them were followers in the footsteps of the faith of their master Abraham or not. It is a great privilege for a godly master to be served by a fellow-believer, to have a Christian for his servant. And it is a great privilege for a godly servant to serve a godly master. That condition of things has been anticipated in the Word of God. The godly master is warned in regard to his godly servant, not to despise him because he

is a servant, but to love him as a brother. You will remember that lovely letter Paul personally wrote to Philemon in the behalf of Onesimus who as a slave had run away from his master Philemon, but who in the providence of God was brought under the personal ministry of the Apostle Paul at Rome and was converted there, by the grace of God. That epistle was penned by the Apostle Paul, beseeching Philemon to receive back again his fugitive slave, "not now," says he, "as a bond-servant" but as "a brother beloved." This is the mind of the Lord. As far as lieth in *you*, live at peace with all men. You see the emphasis—"as far as lieth in *you*, live peaceably with all men." It is a personal concern. It is an exhortation or precept addressed to the individual believer. As far as lieth in *you*, determine upon peace, as Abraham did. Said he to Lot: "Now the way parts. Here is a right hand road, here a left hand road, take you one, and whichever you leave shall be mine." There again we see the law of charity at work. Abraham might have claimed precedence over his nephew. Abraham might with all propriety have said, "I choose this road, the right; take you that on the left," or vice versa. But he gave Lot the choice, he gave Lot the choice. "Separate, I pray thee, thyself from me." I think there is a good deal in that point. It must have been a trial, and not a small one nor an easy one, to the heart of Abraham to speak these words, "Separate from me: if thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right," or vice versa. This was a testing time. What was the test in the case of the two men? In the case of Lot, sight, outward appearance, furnished the standard of test. What did he do? He cast his eyes about, he looked on the right-hand road and on the left-hand road, and his eyes fell upon the well-watered plain of the Jordan, the richest soil in Palestine, where from physical reasons—the climate is sub-tropical—the richest vegetation flourishes naturally. Moreover it is well watered, it needs not to be watered with the foot, that is, to be irrigated—artificially watered. Now the test was a natural one in the case of Lot. He said, "This is for me. This is the best I can find. It is full of promise for my flocks and herds. There is room enough for me and mine."—It was all *self*. It was all for *the creature*. It was all for self-advancement, a further increase in plenty. There is *the man of sight*. But Abraham, *the man of faith*—he takes Lot's leavings. He views matters from another standpoint. His eye is upward turned. His thoughts go out after God. He has been learning lately a very painful lesson. He has found the way of transgressors hard. He went down into Egypt lately, mistrusting God and leaning upon the arm of flesh, and he has learnt by grace the profitable lesson, "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man," that is, in himself, or in his own wisdom in devising a lot for himself. And so we find Abraham ceasing from man now, from man "whose breath is in his nostrils," saying, as it were, within himself, "for wherein is he to be accounted of?" He had lately seen the manner of man he himself was when left alone; therefore he could give away with both hands, my friends, all that Lot could with his natural eyes behold, "You

take the right, I will take the left, or you the left and I the right, as you will. My affections are not here but yonder." Like Moses, Abraham at this point esteemed the riches of earth as unworthy to be compared with the riches of Christ. Abraham the man of faith judges not what is best by the outward appearance, he commits his way unto the Lord, trusts alone in Him and leaves Him to bring to pass the promises and the purposes of His heart.

Lot chose to pitch his tent, we are told, when he had separated from Abraham, "toward Sodom." I find no mention of any altar having been built by Lot. I read of his tent but no altar. When I follow Abraham down to the plain of Mamre I find him there in fellowship with God. You notice the words in the eighteenth verse, "Then Abram removed his tent, and came and dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron, and built there an altar unto the Lord." We delight to think of the man of faith, that he cannot pitch his tent anywhere without his God. Oh, see to that, my friends, see to it that wherever your tent is pitched God is honoured. Confess Him there. That is where true religion need ever begin—in the household at home, in the family daily worship especially, the daily reading together of God's most holy Word; the pouring out of the heart in supplication and thanksgiving, the mutual praise, prayer and the giving of thanks. Now I think the future of Lot, the sad future of that dear man, must be associated with the fact that he neglected the ordinances of Divine worship. Coldness of heart in the closet in prayer is the beginning of backsliding, habitual backsliding. See to it, beloved hearers, that your private worship is pure, sincere, vital, deep. That Bible of yours—is it often opened in private? Is it your daily companion? Do you often seize thankfully a by-moment to look into its holy words? And has God not then often met you with some most suitable expression of His love? But a neglected Bible is a crooked walk. A neglected Bible and an altarless tent means getting nearer and nearer to the world. I will grant you prosperity, outward, may attend the backslider's goings, but, as God is true, that backslider shall be filled with his own ways. Abraham went down to Hebron and dwelt there, not in a city but in a tent. Lot, little by little, gets inside Sodom's gates and dwells in the city of destruction, for God's curse was upon that place when Lot entered it. And God's curse is upon the world when any child of His goes back into it. Take care of your steps. The way of God is always uphill, and it is much easier to slide backward several footsteps than it is to take one footstep forward. What then? "*Hold Thou me up*" need be our daily, hourly prayer to Him Who "keepeth the feet of His saints."

Now we read in Hebrews xi., ninth and tenth verses, of Abraham *how* he lived in this Land of Promise, how *unlike* his nephew, Lot. "By faith he sojourned in the Land of Promise," not by sight but by faith, "as in a strange country, dwelling in tents"—or as it is translated, "tabernacles"—"dwelling in tents," not in houses, "with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise. For he looked for a

city," he did not claim one, and he did not build one. He did not say with his nephew, Lot, "I will dwell in the city, it is a goodly one, it is a prosperous one; the people are a wealthy people, I would like to be on terms with them." Oh, society is often a deadly snare even to the children of God. When they are tempted to look at outward appearances they will say, some of them, "Well, I must enter society in the interests of my young family. I must introduce them and promote their interests in the world." Abraham "looked for a city," he possessed none, "a city which hath foundations." Sodom's city had no foundations in the day when God visited the iniquity of that people. And it will be found that every false abode built upon the earth has in reality no foundations when the Lord shall visit in judgment the works of men. Take care, fellow-believers, that you dwell in tents and not in houses built with hands. Take care, as I have lovingly warned you, that the altar is honoured in the household. Set not your affections on earthly prosperity, earthly advancement—"great things," that is how the Word of God puts it. Seek not for those "great things." Nay, rather, seek good things. To be good through grace is better than to be great without grace.

May the Lord bless His Word for Christ's sake. Amen.

---



---

### SERMONETTE.

#### THE PARABLE OF THE PRODIGAL SON.

BY THE VEN. ARCHDEACON NOYES, M.A., B.D.

THE definition of a *Parable*, often given to Sunday School scholars, that it is, "*An earthly story with a heavenly meaning*," is a very good one. Most are familiar with the Lord's parable of the Prodigal Son, recorded in Luke xv. Though it may have a deeper national and dispensational meaning, it has for us "a heavenly meaning," a spiritual application; one which has been much blessed to countless numbers of new-born souls. Let me try and gather up some portion of it, with the prayer that the Holy Spirit may bless it to those who read.

1. We note from the story the conscious desperate state of a sinner in whose soul the Holy Spirit has begun a work of grace. He has found no satisfaction in the sinful pleasures of the world, and is in danger of perishing everlastingly. "Them that are perishing" writes the Apostle Paul (2. Cor. ii. 15; and iv. 3). Such, being "without Christ," have "no hope," and are "without God in the world" (Eph. ii. 12). When the Prodigal Son "came to himself," he said, "I perish with hunger."

2. We have depicted in the parable the rise and progress of spiritual life. The sinner who is "born from above," realizes his sinfulness, and his perishing condition, and in his distress his thoughts turn to God and to Christ. He is "in want" in a spiritual sense, and "perishing with hunger," and so, receiving the glad tidings of salvation through Christ Jesus, he turns to God as his Father. "I will arise and go to

my Father." He goes to the Lord Jesus Christ, "the Bread of life," Who said, "He that cometh to Me shall never hunger," and believes on Him as "the Water of life," Who said, "He that believeth on Me shall never thirst." "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink." Then there will be the confession, "I have sinned," and the acknowledgement of utter unworthiness. He is willing to be saved as one who has no merit or goodness of his own. "I will arise and go to my Father, and will say unto Him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and before Thee, and am no more worthy to be called Thy son" (verses 18, 19).

3. Turning to God in Christ, he finds forgiveness full and free, reconciliation, and reinstatement into his Father's house *as a son*, who was "lost" but now is "found."

Like the father in the parable, our Heavenly Father "waits to be gracious," and is ready to receive all repentant, returning sinners who come to Him in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, Who said, "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me" (John xiv. 6). He freely pardons them; clothes them with a robe of righteousness; and makes them His sons. "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father."

"Come, ye weary, heavy laden,  
Bruised and mangled by the fall,  
If you tarry till you're better,  
You will never come at all!  
Not the righteous—  
Sinners Jesus came to call."

---

#### "BUT."

READING the sweet article of dear "R." in "Wellsprings" of this month's (September) GOSPEL MAGAZINE, has brought many memories of "buts" in the Holy Word which have appealed to me. The "buts" which characterize David, Hezekiah, Jonah, the Prophets, and the Book of Proverbs, are all so full of instruction and encouragement and suggestion. These Old Testament "buts" are resumed in the New. I have noticed especially of late in reading St. John's Gospel, how often he used the word, and in his Epistles, too. Sometimes it is explanatory, and very often consolatory.

And sometimes it is used to strongly emphasize. Who that has ever heard dear Dr. Doudney, a former beloved editor of this MAGAZINE, read the First Lesson of the service, Daniel iii., in his own Church of St. Luke's, Bedminster, could forget the forceful "*But if not*," in verse 18? We could feel how strong the resolve, how firm the faith, of these three witnesses for God's power and glory. The striking emphasis Dr. Doudney laid on the words will never be forgotten by those who heard him. "*But if not—but if not*." The three witnesses stood resolutely against the will and threats of the heathen king, meanwhile magnifying the power of God: "Our God Whom we serve

is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and He will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. *But if not . . .* we will not serve thy gods." They loved not their lives unto the death; their concern was His glory. But if not, if He see it good that we pass into the burning fiery furnace we will not serve thy gods. And He saved them by a wonderful and sweet and mighty deliverance. *He Himself walked with them* in the midst of the fire, and *they had no hurt*. He brought them *through* unharmed.

To turn to St. John's Gospel, note how the word "but" occurs in stating contrasts, bringing them out in striking words. See John xvi. 20: "Ye"—that refers to His loved disciples when Jesus held His last conversation with them after His last supper—"Ye shall weep and lament, *but* the world shall rejoice." It always does rejoice when the children of God are in perplexity or distress. See David's mourning in the Psalms, David, "the man after God's own heart." They speak not peace; they said, "Aha, aha, our eyes have seen it." They rejoiced in his distress. But note also, "This *Thou* hast seen, O Lord." His God was watching to deliver him.

Child of God, be not cast down when all things seem against thee, when trials and sorrows abound on every side. Thou and the world are set apart. The world's joy is not *thy* joy, neither are the issues what *thou* wouldest desire. Thy weeping shall issue in songs of deliverance. Thy sorrow itself shall be *turned into* joy. Many of us have experienced this. Light affliction, but for a moment, *worketh* for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. We know that all things work together for good to those who love God, who are the called according to His purpose. See the contrast of the "light affliction"—*weight of glory*: "but for a *moment . . . eternal*." Even in this world seeming misfortunes work out wonderful deliverances. Remember the broken leg of the dear man of God going on the way as he thought to his burning. The circumstance saved his life; for in the meantime, while waiting for his recovery, Mary, the queen, died, and with the advent of Queen Elizabeth persecution ceased. Many times in stories of various people of God we find that at the very seeming impossibilities, "He turneth the wilderness into a standing water." That which "seemed a barrier, a stepping-stone shall be"; the actual barrier transformed. All things work together for good to the beloved of the Lord.

Then there are the "buts" of explanation, or I should rather say, explanatory "buts." See John xv. 19, "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: *but because* ye are not of the world, *but* I have chosen you out of the world, *therefore* the world hateth you." Verse 21, "*But* all these things (persecutions) will they do unto you for My name's sake." Again, chapter sixteen, verse four, "*But* these things have I told you, that when the time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them." How lovingly He went into all the difficulties in front, and prepared the minds of His beloved disciples for all the circumstances that were before them—the why? wherefore?

how? *But* all these things for *My* name's sake. The claims of love, the love that "endureth all things."

Again, there are the "buts" of cheer and comfort. John xvi. 7, "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; *but* if I depart, I will send Him unto you." And I do think verse 12 inexpressibly sweet, "I have yet many things to say unto you, *but* ye cannot bear them now." How tender He was with the sinking, burdened hearts: and He is *just the same* now. "Come unto *Me*, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take *My* yoke upon you." Thus He is yoked with His people, and "My yoke is easy, and My burden is light." And now in this heart-to-heart conversation He goes on to say, "And ye *now* therefore have sorrow (the sorrow of His going away); *but*, *BUT* I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you." The joy of His resurrection was before Him and He rejoiced because He knew of this joy before *them* too, and His *complete redemption*.

And just one more "but," the "but" of cheer and triumph: "In the world ye shall have tribulation; *but* be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

He has overcome—He has triumphed—He has suffered and bled and died—He has borne hatred and wrong and strife. In Him we who love His name shall be overcomers, too. We shall triumph *in* Him:

"Love's redeeming work is done;  
Fought the fight, the battle won."

"*Because I* live, ye shall live also." "Be of *good cheer*; I have overcome." "*But* when the Comforter is come, Whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, *He* shall testify of *Me*." "Be of good cheer." "Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

NETTIE.

---

#### "THE WARS OF THE LORD."

THE expression occurs in Numbers xxi. 14, and we cannot read it without spontaneously feeling sure of one thing, viz., that the Lord would be the Victor; also that if He fought in any kind of campaign He would be the Leader. He could not be fighting behind or at the order of any of us. Christ is given to be a Leader and a Commander of His people, Satan being the leader in the opposing force. Moses was told that the Lord would fight for him; all his part on that occasion was to stand still. God has the laws of nature and all the elements for His weapons, or He can take away the breath of tens of thousands in a night without any manifested cause of death. No wonder that David said that he would not fear what man could do to him while he knew that the Lord was on his side; as, for instance, when he came out of hiding, and asked Saul why he so pursued him.

The Lord was his shield then ; He taught his hands to war and his fingers to fight, and he blessed God for the mercy. The Lord, he said, is a man of war, the Lord is His name. Abraham knew this ; with the dignity that God put upon him he went and rescued from their captors, "his brother Lot," all the goods, "the women and the people." He recovered all, as did David after him, as the Lord's people do, when from all the condemnations and accusations of their conscience, all their convictions, fears, discouragements and difficulties they look up and see, that though they are in the valley as Joshua was, there is One on the mountain of God with hands that are never weary, pleading their cause with omnipotence and giving them the field. They are safe, if they are weary. Dodo was weary, but his hand clave to the sword, and the Lord wrought a great victory that day. In which book of the Bible is there no sound of battle or mention of foe, of fightings without, or fears within ? Even in the Song of Solomon they all held swords because of fear in the night. What a variety there is in the account of Joshua's wars ; from the strange method of walking in silence round the walls of Jericho (that was the way to victory), to the triumph over the Amorites when the sun stood still in the valley of Ajalon. It is very sweet, I think, to notice that at the end of all Joshua's victories over the Canaanites, the Lord with His own hand of love and peace and power intervened between the disputing two-and-a-half and nine-and-a-half tribes, and forbad that the misjudging majority should go against their brethren. What a comfort it was to them all to see, when they took possession of their possessions, that God Himself had indeed been with them all through, uniting them against their enemies ; keeping them at one among themselves.

I like to think of the way in which Elisha was more than chariots and horsemen to his people. He sat in his house, he knelt, he prayed, and the enemy thought if his breath was stopped the day would be theirs. But God kept him alive, worth more than ten thousand footmen.

I was thinking of these things and the pros and cons of one's cogitations, when the other morning's post brought a request for repetition of last year's subscription to a Scripture society, and glancing at the literature accompanying, I read (the words being in large type), "Making it possible for God to speak." Oh, the discouragement of it ! I wondered how Jeremiah would have felt, who mourned that God had made him a man of contention. What hope could there be from any point of view if any of our doings, our sending some money, could augment the resources or increase the opportunities of the Almighty ? What would David have done ? In what a childlike way he used to act. God, "shall I go up ?" And perhaps the Lord would tell him to wait till the heat died down, to wait and listen for the quiet breath of the blessed Spirit amongst His fruits of meekness and fear and patience.

What an anchor of the soul, what a hope and a stay that long ago,

all power in heaven and in earth was given to the Lord Jesus. Nothing can be added to it, nothing can be taken from it. It is His power brought to us by the Comforter that we need in our hearts, His faith, our victory that overcometh the world. The child of God can say, be it what it may that brings him down, "Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy; though I fall, I shall arise." There is no uncertainty about the issue. The warfare is accomplished; iniquity is pardoned.

And whether the battle increase or the land has rest, the words of the Lord Jesus remain, "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid."

FOLLOWER-ON.

### WOMEN SPEAKING IN CHURCH.

BY THE LATE PROFESSOR B. B. WARFIELD, D.D.,  
PRINCETON.

(From *The Free Presbyterian Magazine*, April, 1926.)

"Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church."—1 CORINTHIANS xiv. 34, 35.

I HAVE recently received a letter from a valued friend asking me to send him a "discussion of the Greek words "laleo" and "lego" in such passages as 1 Corinthians xiv. 33-39, with special reference to the question: "Does the thirty-fourth verse forbid all women everywhere to speak or preach publicly in Christian Churches?" The matter is of universal interest, and I take the liberty of communicating my reply to the readers of *The Presbyterian*.

It requires to be said at once that there is no problem with reference to the relations of "laleo" and "lego." Apart from niceties of merely philological interest, these words stand related to one another just as the English words "speak" and "say" do; that is, "laleo" expresses the act of talking, while "lego" refers to what is said. Wherever then the fact of speaking, without reference to the content of what is said, is to be indicated, "laleo" is used, and must be used. There is nothing disparaging in the intimation of the word, any more than there is in our word "talk"; although, of course, it can on occasion be used disparagingly as our word "talk" can also—as when some of the newspapers intimate that the Senate is given over to mere talk. This disparaging application of "laleo," however, never occurs in the New Testament, although the word is used very frequently.

The word is in its right place in 1 Corinthians xiv. 33ff., therefore, and necessarily bears there its simple and natural meaning. If we needed anything to fix its meaning, however, it would be supplied by its frequent use in the preceding part of the chapter, where it refers not only to speaking with tongues (which was a divine manifestation and unin-

telligible only because of the limitations of the hearers), but also to the prophetic speech which is directly declared to be to edification and exhortation and comforting (verses 3-6). It would be supplied more pungently, however, by its contrasting term here—"Let them be silent" (verse 34). Here we have "laleo" directly defined for us. "Let the women keep silent, for it is not permitted to them to speak." Keep silent—speak: these are the two opposites; and the one defines the other.

It is important to observe, now, that the pivot on which the injunction of these verses turns is not the prohibition of speaking so much as the command of silence. That is the main injunction. The prohibition of speech is introduced only to explain the meaning more fully. What Paul says is in brief: "Let the women keep silent in the Churches." That surely is direct and specific enough for all needs. He then adds explanatorily: "For it is not permitted to them to speak." "It is not permitted" is an appeal to a general law, valid apart from Paul's personal command, and looks back to the opening phrase—"As in all the Churches of the saints." He is only requiring the Corinthian women to conform to the general law of the Churches. And that is the meaning of the almost bitter words which he adds in verse 36, in which, reproaching them for the innovation of permitting women to speak in the Churches, he reminds them that they are not the authors of the Gospel, nor are they its sole possessors—let them keep to the law that binds the whole body of Churches and not be seeking some new-fangled way of their own.

The intermediate verses only make it plainer that precisely what the apostle is doing is forbidding women to speak at all in the Church. His injunction of silence he pushes so far that he forbids them even to ask questions; and adds with special reference to that, but through that to the general matter, the crisp declaration that "it is indecent"—for that is the meaning of the word—"for a woman to speak in Church."

It would be impossible for the apostle to speak more directly or more emphatically than he has done here. He requires women to be silent at the Church meetings. For that is what "in the Churches" means; there were no Church buildings then. And he has not left us in doubt as to the nature of these Church meetings. He had just described them in verses 36ff. They were of the general character of our prayer meetings. Note the words, "Let him be silent in the Church," in verse 30, and compare them with "Let them be silent in the churches," in verse 34. The prohibition of women speaking covers thus all public church meetings—it is the publicity, not the formality of it, which is the point. And he tells us repeatedly that this is the universal law of the Church. He does more than that. He tells us that it is the commandment of the Lord, and emphasizes the word "Lord" (verse 37).

The passage in 1 Timothy ii. 11ff. is just as strong, although it is more particularly directed to the specific case of public teaching or

ruling in the Church. The apostle had already in this context (verse 8, "the men," in contrast with "women" of verse 9) pointedly confined public praying to men, and now continues: "Let a woman learn in silence in all subjection; but I do not permit the woman to teach, neither to rule over the man, but to be in silence." Neither the teaching nor the ruling function is permitted to woman. The apostle says here, "I do not permit," instead of as in 1 Corinthians xiv. 33ff. "it is not permitted," because he is here giving his personal instructions to Timothy, his subordinate, while there he was announcing to the Corinthians the general law of the Church. What he instructs Timothy, however, is the general law of the Church. And so he goes on and grounds his prohibition in a universal reason which affects the entire race equally.

In the face of these two absolutely plain and emphatic passages, what is said in 1 Corinthians xi. 5 cannot be appealed to in mitigation or modification. Precisely what is meant in 1 Corinthians xi. 5, nobody knows. What is said there is that every woman praying or prophesying unveiled dishonours her head. It seems fair to infer that if she prays or prophesies veiled she does not dishonour her head. And it seems fair still further to infer that she may properly pray or prophesy if only she does it veiled. We are piling up a chain of inferences. And they have not carried us very far. We cannot infer that it would be proper for her to pray or prophesy in Church if only she were veiled. There is nothing said about church in the passage or in the context. The word "Church" does not occur until the sixteenth verse, and then not as ruling the reference of the passage, but only as supplying support for the injunction of the passage. There is no reason whatever for believing that "praying and prophesying" in Church is meant. Neither was an exercise confined to the Church. If, as in 1 Corinthians xiv. 14, the "praying" spoken of was an ecstatic exercise—as its place by "prophesying" may suggest—then there would be the divine inspiration superseding all ordinary laws to be reckoned with. And there has already been occasion to observe that prayer in public is forbidden to women in 1 Timothy ii. 8-9. Unless mere attendance at prayer is meant, in which case this passage is a close parallel of 1 Timothy ii. 9.

What then must be noted, in conclusion, is:—

(1) That the prohibition of speaking in the Church to women is precise, absolute, and all-inclusive. They are to keep silent in the Churches—and that means in all the public meetings for worship; they are not even to ask questions; (2) That this prohibition is given especial point precisely for the two matters of teaching and ruling—covering specifically the functions of preaching and ruling elders; (3) That the grounds on which the prohibition is put are universal, and turn on the difference in sex, and particularly on the relative places given to the sexes in creation, and in the fundamental history of the race (the fall).

Perhaps it ought to be added in elucidation of the last point just

made, that the difference in conclusions between Paul and the feminist movement of to-day is rooted in a fundamental difference in their points of view relatively to the constitution of the human race. To Paul the human race is made up of families, and every several organism, the Church included, is composed of families, united together by this or that bond. The relation of the sexes in the family follows it therefore into the Church. To the feminist movement the human race is made up of individuals; a woman is just another individual by the side of the man; and it can see no reason for any differences in dealing with the two. And, indeed, if we can ignore the great fundamental natural difference of sex, and destroy the great fundamental social unit of the family, in the interest of individualism, there does not seem any reason why we should not wipe out the differences established by Paul between the sexes in the Church. Except, of course, the authority of Paul. It all, in the end, comes back to the authority of the apostles, as founders of the Church. We may like what Paul says, or we may not like it. We may be willing to do what he commands, or we may not be willing to do it. But there is no room for doubt of what he says. And he certainly would say to us, what he said to the Corinthians:—"What? Was it from you that the word of God went forth? or came it to you alone?" Is this Christianity ours—to do with as we like? Or is it God's religion, receiving its laws from Him through the apostles?—*The Presbyterian* (Philadelphia).

---

### COMFORT IN TRIBULATION.

BY MR. J. E. FLEGG, SECRETARY OF THE AGED PILGRIMS' FRIEND SOCIETY.

TRIBULATION'S path is no new road to the child of God. In the Inspired Volume provision is made for the various conditions in which the saints are found, and the application of the Word by the Holy Ghost warms the heart and cheers the spirit.

When the Lord sent Ananias to Saul of Tarsus, He said to him, "Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto Me, to bear My name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the Children of Israel: for I will show him how great things he must suffer for My name's sake." And, as the servant of Christ, he endured hardness; yet in his sufferings he experienced the consolation of God, so that, in writing to the Corinthians (2 Cor. i. 4, 5) he was able to say, "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort; Who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God."

In these words we see—

*A man in trouble praising God.* It is no difficult thing to sing when the trouble is past, and one is rejoicing in having been delivered out of it; but the sigh escapes the lips more often than the song while the path of tribulation is being trod. The apostle, however, ere he

is delivered, blesses God, Who is comforting him in tribulation. This is the effect of grace. He was able, even then, to rejoice in God as the Father of mercies, and would dwell rather upon His tenderness and comfort than upon the tribulation. Trouble, of itself, does not soften the heart, but grace experienced in the trouble will hush the voice of complaining; the tribulation being sanctified and the consolation of God realized, His mercies are not shut out from view, and the soul can then sing songs in the night.

Is it not thus that the reality of one's religion is evidenced? Faith has to be tested in some way:

"The Lord beholds it fit  
That faith be sharply tried."

Satan questioned the reality of Job's religion, and permission was given to test the Patriarch. When trials came thick and fast upon him, what was Job's testimony? "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: *blessed be the name of the Lord.*" To the same effect are the words of Habakkuk: "Although the fig tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labour of the olive shall fail . . . and there shall be no herd in the stalls: *yet I will rejoice in the Lord.*"

Such an occupation as praising God is fitting, for are not our mercies far, far beyond our trials? Yea, is not His mercy experienced in the trial? The confession of every child of God is, "He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquity."

*Paul's blessing God in tribulation arose from his reflecting upon God.* Listen to his words—"The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, the God of all comfort."

The believer stands in close relationship to the Lord. Christ is not ashamed to call them brethren. *His Father is their Father.* He is our God and Father in Christ Jesus.

"Sovereign Ruler of the skies,  
Ever gracious, ever wise,  
All my times are in Thy hand,  
All events at Thy command."

But the Sovereign Ruler of the skies, believer, is your Father, pitiful and kind in all His dealings. Too wise to err, too good to be unkind, His love governs all His actions.

He is the Father of mercies, the source of all good that is enjoyed. Every mercy that we experience is from Him. Not only so, but He is the merciful Father, the Father Who is full of compassion. "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him." He doth not afflict willingly. If trial is our portion, there must be a needs-be for it. The surgeon does not use the instrument in order to inflict pain, but to promote health. The husbandman does not prune for the sake of cutting, but that the vine shall produce more fruit.

Whatever it may be that constitutes the trial, it cannot be beyond His power to afford consolation in it; he is able to succour and relieve, for He is the God of all comfort.

*The truth of this the apostle experienced in his own life; for he blessed*

God Who comforted him *in all his* tribulation. That there should be tribulation should not surprise us.

"The soul that would to Jesus press  
May fix it firm and sure,  
That tribulation, more or less,  
He must and shall endure."

It is through much tribulation that we must enter the kingdom, and our Infallible Teacher has taught us, "In the world ye shall have tribulation," but

"Ye who know the Saviour's love,  
And His indulgent mercies prove,  
In cheerful songs His praise express,  
For He'll not leave thee comfortless."

And what is it to be comforted? See, the apostle says, "Who comforteth us *in all our* tribulation." He had not then immediate deliverance out of the trial. To comfort is to cheer, to revive, to give ease. Blessed be God, this is a matter of experience. He will give grace to bear, if the thorn is not removed. He will speak the word, by which we shall be strengthened with strength in our soul. Paul was comforted on one occasion by the coming of Titus. By the Holy Spirit we are led experimentally into the meaning of the Redeemer's precious declaration—"In Me ye shall have peace."

*This consolation is blessedly proportioned.* How beautiful is the linking of the two small words "as" and "so." "For," says the apostle, "as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation aboundeth by Christ." Thus is fulfilled the old-time promise, "As thy days, so shall thy strength be."

This consolation is realized through the Comforter.

"When some sweet promise warms my heart,  
And cheers me under every care,  
It is the Spirit's gracious part  
To take that word and fix it there."

Thus in the hands of an all-wise Father, trials are made to subserve a useful purpose; through them at times our spiritual education is furthered. He teacheth to profit, and there are some lessons we had never known but for the tribulation, and the consolation we have enjoyed therein.

The apostle discerned a reason for both the trial and the comfort, which was that he might be of greater service, "that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble."

Have you, dear reader, known the way of tribulation, and experienced therein the comforts of the Holy Ghost? Can you add your benediction as you recall the tenderness and mercy of your Father? Then remember that there are hearts that ache and tears that fall in secret, and seek to minister to souls distressed, and it may be that someone will, with thankfulness, say that God comforted him by your means. The Lord bless you in so ministering.

## "CHRIST: AS THE SON OF MAN."

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE CLIFTON CONFERENCE, ON  
OCTOBER 7TH, 1903, BY THE LATE REV. WILLIAM SYKES, VICAR  
OF HILLSBOROUGH AND WADSLEY BRIDGE, SHEFFIELD.

YOU will notice, dear friends, at the heading of the paper which was sent out to us by Mr. Ormiston, that which struck me at the first as a very important and yet peculiar expression, viz., that the subject of yesterday was announced as "God the Son;" and I asked Mr. Ormiston the reason for it. I hope he will tell you why he expressed the subject as "God the Son" and not as "the Son of God."

If we look at Christ as "God the Son" we must go beyond all time in order to understand the manifestation of the love of God in sending Christ as "the Son of Man." If we go beyond all time we shall then be enabled to see the Covenant, the everlasting Covenant, which was made between the Three Persons in the Glorious and the Blessed Trinity, and we shall see that all the arrangements were then made for the work, the words, and everything which the Lord did whilst He was down here upon earth.

In the first place I want to observe about Christ as God the Son, that it is a Trinitarian revelation. In Hebrews x. 5 you will find a remarkable expression which is used by Christ as God the Son, when, or just before, He came into the world. "When He cometh into the world, He said unto His Father, Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared Me." Hence we see the Father's work respecting the body for Christ. Then again we come to Hebrews ii. 14, and there we find it is stated "As the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He likewise Himself took part of the same." He took! Here is the active work of Jesus Christ as the Son of Man. "He taketh not hold of angels (I am quoting the marginal reference), but of the seed of Abraham He taketh hold." I notice that Witsius has a very important remark to make. He says that Jesus Christ took not hold of angels for the purpose of their deliverance, but He took hold of the children of Abraham, His beloved family, that family which in the Epistle to the Ephesians, the Holy Ghost by Paul says was "chosen in Him before the foundation of the world." He took hold of the seed of Abraham for the purpose of *their deliverance*. Again in Luke i. 35, we have the work of God the Holy Ghost. The Father's work was to design and prepare the body, the Son's work was to take that body, and the Holy Ghost's was to form that body. When the message of the angel was given to the Virgin Mary, it was that "the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, therefore, that Holy Thing Which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." Hence, then, we are called upon to view the Lord Jesus Christ when coming into this world and taking our nature upon Him as the work of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

Continuing this subject, we find another threefold reference to this

Trinitarian work. You take that prophecy from Isaiah ix., written by God the Holy Ghost, "Unto us a Child is born": then you read in Philippians ii. 7, "He made Himself of no reputation" (here is the Son); then you turn to Romans viii. 3, and you have what to me is a most striking passage, in which it says, "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh." The expression "sinful flesh" to me is one of very deep importance. It is not *innocent* flesh, but "the likeness of sinful flesh." We find Him as the "Emmanuel, God with us," not as a human person, but taking the human nature, and having the Divine nature, the two natures forming one Person—the Lord Jesus Christ. I will now ask you to note in Hebrews ix. 24, 26, 28, one English word, "appear," and you will find that word has a threefold meaning with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ. In the 26th verse it is His appearance here upon earth—"He hath appeared to take away sin" (past); 24th verse, "now to appear in the presence of God for us" (present); then in the 28th verse it is, "He shall appear the second time" (future). I want to occupy the few minutes that are given to me in speaking of these three appearances.

The first appearance and its object is stated in the 26th verse—"He hath appeared to take away sin by the sacrifice of Himself," and I look at the very commencement of the life of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the remarkable phrase "Son of Man" occurring about eighty times in the Gospels. I notice that in Matthew viii. 20, "The Son of Man hath not where to lay His head." There you have that which is so comforting to the Church of God, the providential dealing of God with His Son Jesus Christ. Whilst not for one moment would we think of Him divesting Himself of His Divinity, whilst we always think that He is both God and Man, and because He is God and Man in one person we not only say "He knew no sin," "He did no sin," but we also say "He could not sin" (and hence you see the glory and the beauty of the Lord Jesus Christ before He came into the world; and when He came into the world victory was assured, because of His essential Deity). Yet He Who was the Lord of glory came into this world the poorest person that possibly could be. He lived in absolute dependence on the supplies of His Heavenly Father in order that He might be fed, clothed, and have a place of rest. Those few women of whom we read in Luke's Gospel who ministered to Him in His necessity were raised up of the Father in order that these providential mercies should be given to Jesus as the Son of Man. Is there not something here to illustrate His sympathy with us, His beloved and chosen people?

Look at His utterances. "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" "My meat is to do the will of My Father." Consider the whole life of Jesus and you will find that from beginning to end it was a carrying out absolutely in every detail the work His Father had given Him to do. Why did He live at Nazareth? Refer to Matthew ii. 23, and you will find why. Because He had to fulfil Scripture—"He shall be called a Nazarene."

Look at the words which He utters in His instructive parables. Why did He speak these parables? To fulfil prophecy. Turn to John xii. 50 for the commandment of the Father—"And I know that His commandment is life everlasting; whatsoever I speak therefore *even as the Father said unto Me so I speak.*" So that the words the Lord Jesus Christ uttered, and which the Holy Spirit makes to be such sustaining consolation to God's people, were words which were agreed on between Him and His Father before He came into our world.

Once more, in respect to this glorious Son of Man. We notice the wonderful power that He used in the miracles He performed. Turning to Matthew ix. 6 we find that significant expression, "The Son of Man hath power on earth." I would note that assertion. It was the power which was given unto Him as Son of Man.

Look again at the work of the Holy Ghost when Jesus went up to be tempted in the wilderness. "He was led up of the Spirit to be tempted," says Matthew; "The Spirit driveth Him," says Mark; and we see in His temptation, and all through His life, that He acted in the power of the Holy Spirit.

We must consider also His death. Look at the suffering He endured in Gethsemane, look at His sufferings upon the cross. Why did He suffer so upon the cross? He suffered in order that He might "take away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." He suffered there, as it is written in 1 John iv. 9, that "We (the beloved) might live through Him." We note those sufferings of the Son of Man as the couplet has it—

"As the Son of Man He suffered and bled and died;  
But as God in Man He satisfied."

And as we behold Christ's sufferings upon the cross we see there that which is written in the 53rd of Isaiah "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." We see the sins of the whole elect family of God laid upon Him. Not "I lay my sins on Jesus," but the Lord laid my sins there, and the sins of all His people, upon the Lord Jesus Christ. We see our sins laid upon Him—*imputed* to Him. We by faith behold Him as the expiatory sacrifice, as our Substitute.

Just for one minute we come to the fact that *now* Jesus is upon the throne. He is there on the throne of grace. One passage I must ask you to notice—that in which it is said that He sympathizes with us! He is sympathizing there now at the right hand of our Heavenly Father; *there* He knows exactly what we need. *There* He feels more intensely than we can feel. "We have a High Priest Who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities." Christ as Son of Man is tenderly sympathizing with all His suffering members here upon earth.

And lastly, He will come again, and when He does come again, it will be to *receive His people to Himself*, "to send forth His angels to gather together His elect from the four winds," it will be that they shall be with Him, to rejoice with Him over the salvation that He has procured for them.

## Our Young Folks' Page.

## "IN THE MORNING."

THESE words occur twice in one of the verses of the fifth Psalm. The verse contains exactly the words which suit the lips of every loving, trusting child of God. Do you know them, my dear young reader? If not, *learn* them at once, that they may be used by you when you wake from sleep and are thankful to God for a good night. They are: "My voice shalt Thou hear *in the morning*, O Lord; *in the morning* will I direct my prayer unto Thee, and will look up."

There is a beautiful prayer in Psalm cxliii. 8, which is very suitable for us to use too. It is: "Cause me to hear Thy loving-kindness *in the morning*; for in Thee do I trust: cause me to know the way wherein I should walk, for I lift up my soul unto Thee." In such words we acknowledge how helpless we are, and ask Him to *cause* us to hear and know.

If this is your cry, the whole day will be influenced by the thoughts it contains, and your prayer will be answered, for the Lord's mercies are "new every morning" (Lam. iii. 23). In Psalm xlv. 5 we read, "God shall help her, and that right early." A little boy whose mother was ill wrote these words on a piece of paper, and took it to her in bed. The comfort received was great indeed. The words "right early" might be translated "when the morning appeareth" according to the margin.

Do you remember the wonders which God wrought for the children of Israel when He brought them out of the land of Egypt with His mighty arm? You can read the story in Exodus xiv. After the Lord had divided the sea, at His command "the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground: and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left." This was all done at night. But as soon as they were safely over, the Egyptians pursued after them, and you will remember that the Lord took off their chariot wheels, and they found themselves in great confusion, and cried, "Let us flee from the face of Israel." They knew that the Lord was against them, and as they fled, "the sea returned to his strength *when the morning appeared*."

We read of our Lord Jesus Christ, after a heavy day's work on the Sabbath, that "*in the morning*, rising up a great while before day, He went out, and departed into a solitary place and there prayed." Morning prayer is of the utmost importance to the one who wants to "walk with God." Again, we read of our Lord, "Early *in the morning* He came again into the temple"; and on another occasion, "all the people came early *in the morning* to Him in the temple, for to hear Him."

What a terrible morning we read of in Mark xv. 1: "Straightway *in the morning* the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council, and bound Jesus, and carried Him

away, and delivered Him to Pilate." But how wonderful to hear Him telling Pilate, "Thou couldst have no power at all against Me, except it were given thee from above." The Lord Jesus gave Himself for the sheep. He took their place, dying in their stead, the Just for the unjust.

"Jesus is our Shepherd, for the sheep He bled,  
Every lamb is sprinkled with the blood He shed."

But is it not lovely to read at the end of all the Gospels about the glorious morning when our Lord Jesus Christ was raised from the dead? Luke tells us of the women going to "the sepulchre with their spices, very early in the morning." How heartily each believer can sing,

"Jesus lives! our hearts know well,  
Nought from us His love can sever:  
Life, nor death, nor powers of hell  
Tear us from His keeping ever.

Alleluia!"

What a wonderful morning that will be, when the Lord returns to take His people to Himself! "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh *in the morning*" (Ps. xxx. 5).  
E. A. H.

---

#### THE "GOSPEL MAGAZINE" FUND.

THE Trustees of the GOSPEL MAGAZINE gratefully acknowledge the receipt of the following donations to the Fund:—

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
"A Lover of the Magazine" ...	1	0	0	"Hope" ...	1	0	0
"A Thankoffering" (per Miss L. Ormiston)...	1	0	0	Pert, Mr. E. M. ...	0	5	0
Atkinson, Miss M. J. ...	2	0	0	Pratt, Mr. S. T. ...	0	5	0
Browne, Miss M. ...	0	4	0	Prince, Miss A. G. ...	0	14	0
"From a Reader" ...	0	10	0	Rankin, Miss M. B. ...	0	14	0
				Tremain, Mr. W. ...	0	14	0
				Waters, Mrs. ...	0	2	6

---

"SATAN cares little, comparatively, for Christ the Prophet and Christ the King, so long as he can persuade man to forget Christ the Priest. For ever let us stand fast on this point. That Christ is carrying on the office of a Priest in heaven, is the crown and glory of Christian theology."—*Bishop J. C. Ryle.*

"LET none encourage themselves to a freedom in sin, and presume upon God's preservation of them without the use of means. No! The electing counsel upon which this victory is founded, chose us to the means as well as to the end. He that makes such a consequence, I doubt whether he ever was a Christian. I may safely say that any person that hath settled, resolved, and wilful remissness, never yet was in the Covenant of Grace."—*Charnock on Weak Grace.*

## In Memoriam.

---

### THE REV. WILLIAM SYKES.

WE are much grieved to have to record the death of the Rev. William Sykes, which took place at his residence, The Horizon, Southborough, Tunbridge Wells, on Sunday, August 24th. Mr. Sykes was ordained in the year 1889, and began his ministry at St. Clement's Church, Lower Broughton in the Diocese of Manchester. Later in 1890 he became curate of St. John's, Tunbridge Wells, the vicar of which church was the late Rev. T. W. Weston, LL.B. In 1891 he became curate of the late Rev. J. W. Merryweather at St. Bartholomew's, Carbrook, Sheffield. In 1895 he became vicar of Hillsborough and Wadsley Bridge, Sheffield. Here he laboured for 14 years, after which he accepted from the Church Association the living of Audley, Staffordshire.

Two years ago he felt obliged through ill health to resign his living, and subsequently he and his wife settled at Southborough, Tunbridge Wells.

Mr. Sykes had five sons and three daughters by his first wife. One daughter is a "missionary dispenser in a ladies' hospital in the Punjab" and one son is in Vancouver. The other four sons and two daughters are in England, and they were all present at the funeral which took place on August 28th. Three of his sons are clergymen of the Church of England, and these all at their father's express desire conducted the funeral.

Perhaps the best known of his sons is the Rev. W. Dodgson Sykes, who is the Vice-Principal and McNeile Professor at St. John's Hall, Highbury, London. Mr. Sykes married, after the death of his first wife, the daughter of the late E. Newman Knocker Esq., of Reigate. Mr. Knocker was people's warden at St. John's, Tunbridge Wells, when Mr. Sykes became curate there. Mr. Knocker was a great lover of the doctrines of grace, and "he acquired a great respect and liking" for Mr. Sykes, who himself valued these great truths.

Mrs. Sykes writes in a letter we have received from her, "I think the GOSPEL MAGAZINE ought to be informed that my dear husband passed away last Sunday (Aug. 24th) in his seventieth year. The funeral was on Thursday, the 28th instant—two years to the day since we left Audley (my husband's last living), on account of his serious heart trouble. After three months in London at our eldest son's vicarage, we bought this house, where we expected probably to end our days. We came here in November, 1928. My husband had a serious illness after our arrival in Southborough. Last August he was allowed to undertake occasional preaching, but in February all activities had to be stopped. Previously he had to give up his writing, not being equal to it. Since the beginning of May he has been very ill, with several relapses. He has seemed very near 'the portal' at these times, but has been restored to us. He had two nurses for three months and

more before he left us, and he owed the prolongation of his life perhaps, under God, to their skill. Although there have been complications during his long illness, the main trouble has been the heart, which he wore out by his strenuous life.

"His two medical daughters were able to minister to him during the first part of his illness.

"My husband was the President of the 'Sovereign Grace Union' and held the Office for about 17 years.

"The GOSPEL MAGAZINE has been supplied to Mr. Sykes for a long time. His daughter has enjoyed reading it after he had finished with it.

"My husband introduced the B.C.M.S. at our parish of Audley, Staffordshire."

We feel sure that the hearts of our readers will go out in tender Christian sympathy to the sorrowing widow and family of God's servant who has now been called to his heavenly Home. On another page we print an address which Mr. Sykes delivered at the Clifton Conference in October, 1903.

Mr. Sykes was one of the few clergymen who held what are known as the great doctrines of grace. We have no love for a harsh and forbidding setting forth of these truths, but we greatly deplore the fact that they find no place whatsoever in most of the theology of the day. Yet they were taught by our Lord and His apostles and they are set forth in the Tenth and Seventeenth Articles of the Church of England. The failure to teach them is surely a sad sign of the times.

---

## Protestant Beacon.

---

### MONASTERIES AND NUNNERIES.

(From the late BISHOP J. C. RYLE'S  
 "What do We Owe to the Reformation?")

BUT the blackest spot on the character of our pro-Reformation clergy in England is one of which it is painful to speak. I mean the impurity of their lives and their horrible contempt of the Seventh Commandment. The results of auricular confession, carried on by men bound by their vow never to marry, were such that I dare not enter into them. The consequences of shutting up herds of men and women in the prime of life, in monasteries and nunneries, were such that I will not defile my paper by dwelling upon them. The details will be found in Strype, Burnet, and Fuller, by those who care to look them up. Suffice it to say that the discoveries made by Henry VIII's Commissioners, of the goings-on in many of the so-called religious houses, were such as it is impossible to describe. It is a shame even to speak of them. Anything less "holy" than the practice of many of the "holy" men and women in these professedly "holy" retreats from sin and the world the imagination cannot conceive. If ever there was a plausible theory weighed in the balance

and found utterly wanting, it is the favourite theory that celibacy and monasticism promote holiness. Romantic young men and sentimental young ladies may mourn over the ruins of such abbeys as Battle, and Glastonbury, and Bolton, and Kirkstall, and Furness, and Croyland, and Bury, and Tintern. But I venture to conjecture that many of these houses are more useful now in their ruined condition than they ever were in the days of affluence and prosperity. Monasteries and nunneries were frequently sinks of iniquity.

All monasteries and nunneries were not equally bad. I admit that there were religious houses like Godstow nunnery, near Oxford, which had a stainless reputation. But I fear these were but bright exceptions which only proved the truth of the rule. The preamble of the Act for Dissolution of Religious Houses, founded on the Report of Henry VIII's Commissioners, contains broad, general statements which cannot be got over. It declares "that manifest sin, vicious, carnal, and abominable living, is daily used and committed in abbeys, priories, and other religious houses of monks, canons, and nuns, and that albeit many continual visitations have been had, by the space of two hundred years or more, for an honest and charitable reformation of such unthrifty, carnal, and abominable living, yet that, nevertheless, little or none amendment was hitherto had, but that their vicious living shamefully increased and augmented."—(Fuller, ii, 208.)

After all, there is no surer receipt for promoting immorality than "fulness of bread and abundance of idleness" (Ezek. xvi. 49). Take anywhere a number of men and women, of any nation, rank or class—bind them by a vow of celibacy—shut them up in houses by themselves—give them plenty to eat and drink, and give them little or nothing to do—and above all give them no Bibles, no true religion, no preaching of the Gospel, no inspection, and no check from public opinion, and if the result of all this be not abundant breach of the Seventh Commandment, I can only say I have read human nature in vain.

I make no apology for dwelling on these things. Painful and humbling as the picture is, it is one that in these times ought to be carefully looked at, and not thrown aside. I do not want men to pass severe judgment on our poor ancestors and say they were all lost. We are not their Judge. To whom little light has been given, of them little will be required. But I do want modern Churchmen to understand from what the Reformation delivered us. Before we make up our minds to give up Protestantism and receive back Monasticism and the "Catholic system," let us thoroughly understand what the state of England was when Popery had its own way unchecked and uncontrolled. My own belief is, that there never was a change so imperatively needed as the Reformation, and that no Englishmen ever did such good service to their country as the Reformers. In short, unless a man can disprove the plain historical facts recorded by Strype and Burnet, he must either admit that the times before the Reformation were bad times, or be content to be regarded as beside

himself. To no class of men does England owe such a debt of gratitude as to her Protestant Reformers.

But what shall we say of the modern proposal to give up the principles of the Reformation, and to return to the communion of the Church of Rome? What shall we say, indeed! I say the man who makes such a proposal must have taken leave of his senses, or be utterly ignorant of the facts of history. Are we to return to a Church which boasts that she is infallible and never changes—to a Church which has never repented of her pre-Reformation superstitions and abominations—to a Church which has never confessed and abjured her countless corruptions? Are we really to go back to gross ignorance of religion—to childish immorality? Is this the Catholic land of promise? Shame on us, I say, if we entertain the idea for a moment! Let the Israelite return to Egypt, if he will. Let the prodigal go back to his husks among the swine. Let the dog return to his vomit. But let no Englishman with brains in his head ever listen to the idea of exchanging Protestantism for Popery, and returning to the bondage of the Church of Rome. No, indeed! We owe a debt to the Reformation for having delivered us from an enormous mass of evil.

#### AGED PILGRIMS' FRIEND SOCIETY.

THE Committee are grateful to the many friends by whose co-operation the necessary funds are furnished for carrying on the beneficent work of the Society. There are 1060 poor and aged Christians belonging to various denominations receiving pensions regularly. When it is borne in mind that the income of these pensioners, apart from the pension of the Society, is only 15s. a week if single, and 25s. if married, it will be easily recognized how urgent is their need and how much the pension is valued. A large number of the pensioners have far exceeded the three-score years and ten and many of them are in various ways afflicted.

Valued helpers pass away and the Committee appeal earnestly for new subscribers to fill the gaps and extend the list.

The *Quarterly Record* for October, besides many interesting items concerning the work of the Society, contains a portrait and brief sketch of Mr. George Doudney, who passed away in his ninetieth year and was for many years an esteemed member of the Board.

On Oct. 1st (D.V.) there will be services at the Baptist Chapel, Devizes. On the 3rd the Rev. R. H. Talbot, B.D., will preach the Annual Sermon at St. Mary Woolnoth Church, Lombard Street, at 6 o'clock. On the 7th the Annual Sale of Work and Meeting in connection with the Brighton Auxiliary will be held in the Presbyterian Church, North Road, Brighton. On the 21st a Meeting will be held in the Schoolroom of St. Luke's Church, Leamington, and on the 29th the Eastbourne Auxiliary hold their Sale of Work and Meeting at Grove Road Chapel, Eastbourne. The presence and help of friends at these meetings will be heartily appreciated.