

sentiments opposite to his will very readily turn to account. But, avoiding any general discussion, allow me to glance at some matters of fact.

Dr. Ferrier says, in your last number, page 326 :—

“It has been stated by some of ourselves, that our Church has held no testimony to Christ being King of nations—we mean as our brethren hold it. Now this is true in one sense, for there is no such doctrine as theirs, and we will not submit to give our testimony to such a chimera. But it is not true in another sense. For all along, in our testimonies as a Church, we have maintained not only the headship of Christ over His Church, but his headship over all things besides; and this comprehends, among all other things, what the Scriptures mean by the nations,—the heathen, or, in general, all mankind not included in the Christian Church. Those who are acquainted with our testimonies, and some other writings, not official, such as “Gib’s Display,” which have always been held in respect among us, but from which it would be unreasonable to make quotations, know that the great doctrine of the universal headship of Christ has by us been invariably maintained.”

Now, Sir, I suspect Dr. F. here refers to a paper of mine in your number for August, in which I say, page 242 :—“I make bold to affirm that our Church has no doctrine on the points respecting which we are blamed for not declaring ourselves. Whoever talks about that doctrine talks about a nonentity—a thing which exists only in his own imagination.” Supposing this to have given occasion to the Doctor’s remarks, I beg to say, first, that it was not of the reality of Christ’s headship I was speaking. In the second paragraph of my paper, I had, in the distinctest manner, acknowledged not only the headship of Christ over the Church, but His absolute and unlimited supremacy—His headship over the universe. The difference between us and our brethren, I said, respected the species of government which Jesus Christ exercises over the world; and it was mainly with reference to this point that I meant to say our Church had no doctrine; that while some of us, to a great extent agreed with the Free Church, others of us thought quite differently. Secondly, I beg to say, I did not speak of what *has been* held, but of what *is* held. I was at considerable pains to show that certain articles once adopted by some of the branches out of which our Church was formed had now lost all their authority. I am still of opinion that our Church, as an organized body, has no doctrine on the point in question; and I submit that if I be in error, the proper mode of refuting me is by producing the document.

Again, Sir, I observe that Dr. F. speaking of your correspondent “*Quivis*,” to whom he pays a compliment, says that that writer has judiciously shewn that the passage in the end of Psalm xxii. is “prophetical referring to what was then future, namely, to the Gospel age, when Christ, having finished his Father’s work during his humiliation, had all power given to him in heaven and on earth.” Now, unless I am much mistaken, the view of “*Quivis*,” page 298, is that the period referred to was not only future when the Psalm was written, but is future still—that it is the period when all the ends of the