



THE Free Presbyterian Magazine

AND

MONTHLY RECORD.

(Issued by a Committee of the Free Presbyterian Synod.)

"Thou hast given a banner to them that fear Thee, that it may be displayed because of the truth."—Ps. lx. 4.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
THE NEW ACCESSION DECLARATION ACT,	165
A SERMON. By the late Rev. John Kennedy, D.D., Dingwall,	169
THE PRESENT DANGERS OF THIS NATION, AND OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN IT. By Rev. Neil Cameron, Glasgow,	175
THE NEW ACCESSION DECLARATION. A Lecture by Rev. John R. Mackay, M.A., Inverness,	184
AN LEABHAR-CHEIST PROTASTANACH, LE LAN DEARBHADH O NA SGRIOBUIRIBH,	193
THE LATE ISABELLA MURCHISON, DRUMBUIE, LOCHALSH,	197
LETTERS BY THE LATE DONALD MACKAY, STUDENT, STRATHY,	201
NOTES AND COMMENTS,	202
CHURCH NOTES,	203
THE MAGAZINE,	204

N. ADSHEAD & SON,

Printers and Bookbinders,

11 and 92 UNION STREET, GLASGOW.



PRICE TWOPENCE.

THE

Free Presbyterian Magazine

And MONTHLY RECORD.

VOL. XV.

SEPTEMBER, 1910.

No. 5

The New Accession Declaration Act.

THE Accession Declaration Bill, which passed the second reading in the House of Commons on Wednesday, 27th July, was carried through the Committee stage without alteration in the course of the following two days, and was finally adopted by the House of Lords on Monday the 1st August. The whole question, and that one of national importance with far-reaching issues, was disposed of in four days' discussion. Only two peers, Lord Kinnaird and Lord Ashtown, raised any opposition in the Upper Chamber. One of the reasons for the change of front on the part of many in both Houses was a slight modification of the form of the Declaration as it was first presented to the country. In its original form the new Declaration made the King to declare himself "a faithful member of the Protestant Reformed Church by law established in England," but in its final form as submitted to the House of Commons by Mr. Asquith, the Declaration made the King declare himself simply "a faithful Protestant." This was certainly a slight improvement in the Protestant direction—a faithful member of the "Church established in England" might mean, as things go now, a faithful Romaniser—but, after all, the new Declaration is a very poor substitute for the old, which did efficient service for so many years. As we shall endeavour to show, it is not fitted to be of any real use for the purpose for which such a Declaration was intended. It runs as follows:—

"I (*the name of the Sovereign*) do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I am a faithful Protestant, and that I will, according to the true intent of the enactments which secure the Protestant succession to the Throne of my Realm, uphold and maintain the said enactments to the best of my powers according to law."

It is our intention in this article to sum up, as briefly and simply as possible, that all our readers may understand, the various features of the important change that has been made in our national Protestant constitution.

1. Let it be clearly noted that the change is a very sweeping one—almost revolutionary in extent. It is not the matter of the change of some words in the old Declaration, such as “superstitious and idolatrous,” as applied to certain practices in the Church of Rome—that would have been bad enough—but it is the removal of the old Declaration altogether, and the adoption of a new one of a very different cast that is largely agreeable to Romanists and Ritualists. The Pope and his followers are very happy over the change, and they have thanked Mr. Asquith for his successful efforts.

2. The new Declaration contains no positive testimony against the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome. The old was solely devoted to this. It was evidently the opinion of our forefathers that it was the duty of the professing Christian, whether he was king or subject, not only to declare his adhesion to truth but also his renunciation of error. This twofold testimony was regarded as necessary to evince the genuineness and thoroughness of his profession, and this view of matters has a clear Scriptural basis. The faithful servants of Christ not only proclaimed the truth in its fulness, but condemned in unmistakable terms the contrary error. The King of this realm has the high honour of being entitled “The Defender of the Faith,” and our forefathers naturally required that he would begin his reign with such a declaration of his faith as would be consistent with this honourable title. His natural lineage is only a subordinate link in his right to the throne; the moment he ceases to be a Protestant, he is no longer King of Great Britain and Ireland. During the recent discussion of this subject in the press, many, who were in favour of a change, were asserting that the old Declaration was hastily drawn up in a time of panic; but it was conclusively shown by others that such was not the case, but that it was framed during a period of calm with coolness and deliberation. The dread of Popery was no doubt on the spirits of our ancestors, and they would have been insane if it were not so, in view of the fearful havoc that Rome had previously wrought in the life of the nation during the reign of the Stuarts. They felt that it was highly essential not only to lay it down as a matter of law that no Roman Catholic could ascend the Throne, but to make it certain, as far as it was possible for man to do so, that each individual Sovereign who ascended the Throne was a genuine Protestant. Their experience of James II. in particular convinced them that this was an absolute necessity for the good of the kingdom. Protestantism in Church and State they found to be the only safeguard of the civil and religious liberties of the people. And the Jesuits themselves have admitted that the Declaration hitherto in use was an effective bar to the ascendancy of a Roman Catholic to the Throne. They have said, “No Catholic could speak the words and remain a Catholic.” Notwithstanding this acknowledgment, our present rulers have had the unwarrantable presumption to remove this effective bar to Roman aggression.

3. The new Declaration may be easily taken by a Papist. This may seem a bold statement, especially to those who shut their eyes to the wiles of Popery.

Mr. Balfour, in his speech in the House of Commons in favour of the new Declaration, spoke like a man with his eyes shut. One of the things he said was: "Really nobody has ever been able to explain to me how it makes it more secure, having a Protestant Sovereign, to insist upon his condemning two particular Roman doctrines rather than insisting that he should say he is a sincere Protestant." Now, the Sovereign in the old Declaration condemns more than *two* Roman doctrines, he condemns at least five, and two of these Mr. Balfour entirely overlooks. He condemns (1) Transubstantiation, (2) Invocation of the Virgin and the Saints, (3) The Sacrifice of the Mass, (4) The Doctrine of Equivocation or Mental Reservation, and (5) The Doctrine of Popish Dispensation. Passing by the Sacrifice of the Mass, which Mr. Balfour evidently includes under one head — Transubstantiation — we observe that he completely ignores the concluding part of the Declaration which embodies a condemnation of two doctrines that have a large place in the Popish system, and that are of the most intense practical importance in the present case. We have personally thought that the closing part of the old Declaration was in some respects the most important section of it, for it secured the truthfulness of the first part, and left no loophole for escaping the consequences of breach of faith. Now, this exceedingly valuable part is entirely omitted from the new Declaration and there is nothing whatever substituted in its place. How Mr. Balfour can regard the new Declaration as providing the same degree of security as the old, it defies us to understand. He has completely shut his eyes to the strong safeguard implied in an express renunciation of all Jesuitical devices of evasion, equivocation, and such like, on the part of the Sovereign declaring. Some may reply that it is an insult to insinuate that King George V. would be guilty of such devices, to which we answer that we are by no means suggesting that the present King will make the Declaration in a dishonest way, but that several things have to be remembered. First, the Declaration is designed for the future as well as the present, and as strong men as King George have fallen a prey to the influences of the Church of Rome. His new profession of faith will not put a serious barrier in the way. Secondly, as the Declaration is for all time coming, another King may arise who will be thoroughly leavened with Jesuitism from the Romish nurseries, now busily working in the Church of England, and he will find no difficulty in violating its terms.

We have said that the new Declaration may be easily taken by a Papist, and this we shall now endeavour briefly to prove in detail. The King simply declares that he is "a faithful Protestant." Now, while the word "Protestant" has been invariably associated in the past with a disapproval of the whole doctrine and discipline of the Church of Rome, that does not say it shall

be always so. "Protestant" simply means "bearing witness for," and everything depends upon the nature of the things for which the witness is borne. These may not, of absolute necessity, be truly Scriptural and anti-Romish in their character. The Romanisers in the Church of England are quite well pleased with the word "Protestant" in the present case. Archbishop Laud claimed to be a faithful Protestant. Everything depends on what we are protesting for and against. The King is not now required to make his Declaration in "the plain and ordinary sense of the words," "as they are commonly understood by English Protestants"; he may use the words in any sense he pleases. Still further, he may employ deliberate evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation, or depend upon a dispensation from the Pope, in relation to what he asserts as his belief. Thus the whole engagement may be rendered "null and void." And the very fact that the clauses which barred out the ordinary possibility of a resort to such unholy devices, were at one time in the Declaration but are now entirely removed from it, is an incitement and an encouragement to any future King who may have Jesuitical tendencies or views, to make use of these very devices. Time will tell. But we are greatly afraid that future generations will curse the day that the flippant legislators of the present took upon them to change the time-honoured Declaration which kept the Pope and his minions and their baleful principles at a distance from the seat of authority and power in this hitherto highly-favoured Christian kingdom.

4. We do not hesitate to maintain that if ever there was a time in which the safeguards ought to be strengthened rather than weakened, it is the present. The emissaries of the Church of Rome are crowding into Great Britain. They are cast out by other countries who have known their ruinous influence too long, and they are coming in secretly, quietly, surely, with their smiling, fawning countenances. They are taking possession of all available lands, and are building their cathedrals and monasteries with imposing magnificence. With their policy of "the velvet glove," they are endeavouring to win the people of Great Britain, high and low, into their fold; they have many friends in heart in the Protestant Churches. Is this the time, then, to make it easy for a Jesuit to occupy the highest official position in the kingdom, the throne of a world-wide empire on which the sun never sets? Truly we have fallen upon an evil time. The smoke of the bottomless pit seems to be blinding the eyes of Lords and Commons and people. The people are not wholly left to the influence of a false and delusive charity. May the Lord in His abundant mercy awaken them more and more to a sense of the great evil that has been committed in our high places, and to the imminent danger in which we stand as a nation of becoming a prey to "Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, . . . the woman drunk with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." (Rev., chap. xvii.)

A Sermon.

BY THE LATE REV. JOHN KENNEDY, D.D., DINGWALL.

~~~~~  
"The Lord hath a controversy with his people, and he will  
plead with Israel."—MICAH vi. 2.  
~~~~~

(Concluded from page 93.)

III.—Let us now call your attention to some of the many grounds of the Lord's controversy with us.

1. First and greatest of all the sins that can be charged against us is our abuse of the Gospel. The rejection of Christ is the great sin of our land. He is despised and rejected by an unbelieving and hard-hearted generation, and were there no other cause of controversy this would suffice to justify all the dealings of judgment with which we could be visited. But not only is the Son of God contemned by the most of Gospel-hearers, as has ever been the case—this is now done by a generation that inherited costly privileges, in the abuse of which it has acquired an easy habit of rejecting the "unspeakable gift" of God. The most of us sleep profoundly under the power and guilt of unbelief—yea, to many the sound of the Gospel seems to be requisite only to keep them at their ease. How awful is it to think of how easy the habit of rejecting Christ has become to many! How hardened many are by their very familiarity with the Gospel! And although the Lord has been intimating to us that the candlestick may soon be entirely removed by taking away one after another of the godly ministers of our land, the carnal ease of the multitude still continues to increase. The true Gospel has become, too, a wearisome thing to many in this guilty generation, as the manna was to Israel, and, like these rebels in the wilderness, they seek a substitute. In judgment the Lord is giving them also the desire of their heart.

As a generation that inherited Gospel privileges—that were ever wantonly abusing them—that grew in hardness while our privileges were continued—that now find it an easy thing to reject Christ and His salvation—that provoked the removal of many precious ministers of the Gospel, and that, instead of profiting by this rebuke, continue still to despise "the sincere milk of the Word"—that, though once and again violently shaken by rousing providences and awakening strivings of the Spirit of God, have sunk again into a deeper sleep than before—oh, how guilty are we before God! Is it a strange thing that the Lord hath a controversy with us?

How is the Gospel abused by many who profess to preach it? By some of these it is treated as if all that was desirable about it were the profits of the trade of preaching it. They seek this work not because they believe the efficacy of the remedy which the

Gospel provides, but, like the street criers of quack drugs, that they may be paid for proclaiming it. Alas! by many who profess to preach Him, Jesus is treated as if He were but an imposter. By some others the Gospel is superseded by a worthless substitute, and the lives of many who profess to recommend it are a practical denial of its efficacy.

By many who profess to believe the Gospel Christ is dishonoured and unbelievers hardened in sin. These profess Christ because it is in fashion, not because they respect and love Himself. If they do not openly despise Him as if He were only "the carpenter's son," they seek but the honour of His name as "the son of David;" they know Him not, nor love Him as "the Son of God." And their conduct tends to confirm unbelievers in their contempt of Christ, since by it they tell these that, though Christ may deserve the homage of the lips, or rather that it is convenient to give Him this, He deserves no more, and that all besides may be given to the world.

And oh, my dear friends, how little sorrow of heart do any of us feel for "the hurt of the daughter of our people," and especially for the dishonour cast upon the Son of God! How easy it is for us to endure to see thousands around us rushing onwards to everlasting misery as they pass in contempt by the Cross of Christ! Oh, how little do any of us value and profit by the Gospel! Our barrenness, what a shame! Our carnal ease, what a reproach. Our selfishness, how guilty! Our prayerlessness, what a sure sign of deadness!

As we think of these things, what a scene is before us! An unbelieving generation busy banishing the Spirit of the Lord from among them, while the remnant of the faithful that are left are not stirred up to constrain Him to abide. Let each of us look to our contribution to this generation-guilt; and let the following questions be solemnly pondered by us all:—Have I received Christ on the terms of the Gospel? Have I ever experienced the power of the Gospel in my own soul? What conformity have I to the doctrine that teacheth me that "denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, I should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world?" What am I doing to promote the spread and success of the Gospel? And am I lamenting after the Lord who has been provoked to withdraw His presence, and to withhold His blessing from the preaching of the Gospel? If we only pondered over these things in secret and in faithfulness, we would soon find abundant reasons in our own hearts and ways why "the Lord hath a controversy with his people."

2. The countenance given to Popery in our land. In the face of God's declared abhorrence of Anti-Christ, and of His awful threats of judgment against those who partake of its sins—after all He has graciously done to free us as a nation from its power—notwithstanding of our experience of the many benefits resulting from this liberty—although again and again have we been taught

that to concede is to multiply its demands—with an island just lying beside us on which its abominations and its miseries are spread out before us—surrounded by proofs that its spirit is unchanged, though its policy may be shifting—and in breach of solemn professions and engagements—Popery is countenanced and supported in our land. Since Papists were admitted to a seat in the Legislature—though they are the sworn subjects of a prince who hates our nation, and to whom they owe their first allegiance—in how many ways has Anti-Christ been receiving encouragement and aid? The College of Maynooth is endowed as a nursery of priests, who are trained to be deceivers of souls, and who prove pests of society, and disturbers of the peace, when planted in the dark districts of Ireland. Jesuits are permitted to land on our shores, and to mature their plots in the midst of us. A Popish Cardinal is allowed to sport his titles, and to employ his influence, at the very seat of government. Convents are being erected, and they are not only tolerated, but will not even be inspected. Popish chaplains are admitted to our garrisons and our jails, and are to be paid for their services. Our Government permits the oppression of our countrymen in Popish lands, or but feebly protests against it. In the Colonies Popery is openly supported by our Government, and has so grown in power in some of them, as to have almost the ascendancy in influence and in numbers. And all this has been done in support of Anti-Christ, while nothing has been directly done by us, in our national capacity, for the rescue of its poor victims in Ireland. They have been left to perish in their ignorance, yea, their destroyer has been helped to ruin them. Oh, surely the Ruler of the nations will not wink at these things. And since these sins are marked in the record of the Lord, and are produced as charges in His controversy with our nation, need we wonder at tokens of his anger? Have we not acted as if our care was to establish a claim to a share of the plagues of Anti-Christ? Verily this shall be given us when the day of vengeance shall have come.

Let us not, my dear friends, lightly conclude that we have no share in the guilt of these national sins. Have we endured these things without all possible protest against them, and without all legitimate resistance? Have we not provoked the Lord to curse us with rulers that love not the truth, and are ashamed to defend it? Are we mourning in secret as we ought over their doings? Have we raised before God in secret our protest against them, as well as in public before men? Though we may have been petitioning Parliament, have we not neglected to plead with God? Have not applications to men for redress been too often substituted for importunity at the throne of grace? And although at present there is considerable bustle in the ranks of Protestants, although meetings are held, associations formed, information circulated, and minor differences merged, with a view to a united and vigorous resistance to the aggressions of Popery, how great is the tendency

to rely on what is done by ourselves, and not on what can only be done by the Lord!

3. The national denial of Christ as King of Zion. "The Claim of Rights," presented by the Church of Scotland before the Government of this country, was a demand in the name of Christ as King of Zion and King of nations. It asked that He should be acknowledged as supreme and only Ruler in His own house, and that the rights and liberties granted by Him should not be interfered with nor fettered by man. This claim was rejected with contempt. From union to a State that thus treated their King and His claims, and that would only support His Church on condition of her owning no king but Cæsar, the true subjects of Christ were compelled to remove. In their stead was owned and supported as the Church of Scotland a body of men whose principles are, "We have no king but Cæsar." This is the Church that claims to be the Church of Scotland, and a Church of Christ! While thinking with pity of the men, it is not a forbidden indignation we feel excited by their pretensions, who have so openly made choice of the world rather than of Christ. It becomes us all to be on our guard against wearying or being ashamed of our Church's testimony, or losing sight of our nation's sin in denying Christ, to mourn more over it in secret, and to tremble more before the anger which that sin has provoked.

4. The growing desecration of the Sabbath. There are three ways in which the progress of Sabbath profanation may be marked:—(1) By the prevalence of loose views regarding the binding obligation of the Fourth Commandment. By such views the Sabbath is profaned, however outwardly correct may be the conduct of those who hold them; and they indicate an advancing preparedness of the public mind for breaking through all the restraints that guard the sacredness of the day. (2) By systematic traffic on the day of the Lord. The extent of such traffic has fearfully increased of late. It is permitted and countenanced by the Government of our country, and the guilt connected with it is in consequence a national sin. (3) By the growing disregard of Sabbath sanctity, and neglect of Sabbath duties, by the body of the people. How common are Sabbath excursions of pleasure become! By how many thousands in our land is the house of God forsaken for the pleasures of sin on the Lord's own day? But not to pass over ourselves. By some of you is the Sabbath profaned by excuseless absence from the means of grace—by others in walks of amusement—by others in visits to friends and relations—by others in idle conversation on their way to and from the house of God—by many in abuse of precious Sabbath privileges—by the majority in the neglect of God's word and prayer in secret—by others who use not their influence for God and His day with children, servants, and neighbours—and by all of us in not mourning as we ought over the many grievous desecrations of the Sabbath by ourselves and others. If the Sabbath is now, as it

was of old, "a sign" between God and "his people," and between "his people" and Him—if the continued observance of that day is a token of His goodwill to them, and of their loyalty to Him—what does its desecration teach us but that they are departing from their allegiance to Him, and that He therefore and justly hath a controversy with them?

5. Growing forgetfulness of God amidst the bustle of worldly business. This is especially true at present when trade is prosperous, new channels of commerce opening up, and the utmost efforts put forth to take advantage of them. It is always true that "the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the Word" in the minds of men, and lead them further and further away from God. But who can estimate the effects on a country of the cares of business—on a country like ours which is the modern Tyre of the world, and especially in a season of unusual bustle and prosperity. We were struck lately with observing, in one of the streets of a great commercial city, a tide of busy men pouring on to their various pursuits and employments. We were reminded by the sight of "the course of this world," and saw, in the hasty movements of that crowd, a representation of the race for riches in which our country is going fast away from God. But the jealous eye of God is on the worshippers of Mammon, and a time to plead with them for their forgetfulness of Him shall surely come. Our country may soon be arrested in its course of advancing commercial prosperity, and it were no wonder that, with the fame and spirit of Tyre, we should yet experience her doom.

6. Growing boldness in ungodliness and sin. Of this, alas! we have too many proofs. It indicates an awful hardness of heart towards God contracted in the wilful abuse of precious privileges. There is, too, a bold spirit of lawlessness arising, making men unashamed to sin before those who ought to be a check and a terror to them. Alas! there is guilt on both sides. The few who should be a "terror to evil doers" have lived down the authority of their position, and while those whose lives were a rebuke to the ungodly around them are removed, the witnesses for God who survive are too much conformed to the mass. And if the drunkard, the Sabbath breaker, the unclean, and the profane have learned to sin with a high hand, and show before God and man a forehead that refuseth shame, have we not before our eyes a proof of our ripeness for judgment? Is this added to all the other causes of controversy? Verily, the time is drawing very nigh when the Lord will plead with our land.

IV.—Let us now, in conclusion, and in a few words, call your attention to the position in which we are placed, and the exercises to which we are called, by the announcement of the text.

1. It is an intimation to us of a breathing time in the controversy. The Lord has not yet arisen in the full vengeance of judgment. He tells us that a time to plead is coming; "the day of vengeance is" yet in His "heart," but it is surely coming. Till it comes

there is an opportunity of peace. How solemn, then, is our position during that interval. How much depends on our knowing this time of visitation. How awful the result of its being abused!

2. We are called by the text to be silent, and to tremble before the Lord. Shall this announcement be heard with indifference? Is the Lord's anger a thing to be made light of? Is a controversy with the Almighty a small matter to weak worms of the dust? Shall men go on in their various pursuits of business and pleasure, as if the summons of the King eternal were a thing to be despised? Alas! my dear friends, there is but little true trembling of heart before God this day amongst us, or in the assembled congregations of our land; and when the services of the day are past there is much cause to fear that the multitude will go down "the course of this world" as before, utterly forgetful of God, and with all the impressions of His word blotted from their minds.

3. But if we are called to observe the tokens of wrath, and to tremble before the anger which they indicate, we are called also to search for the causes of controversy. Our sins have provoked the Lord. It is our duty to search for these, and it is our mercy that we are yet called to do so. Are we willing to find them? Are we ready to entertain the light that would reveal them? Can we honestly apply to the Lord for His teaching to enable us truly to know and to feel them? Oh, what if the "Spirit of grace and supplications" be not poured out on us ere this interval of mercy pass! Oh, what if, instead of that "mourning apart" which is the fruit of His coming, we care not to search for the causes of controversy, or if, professing to do so, we look only to others! What if, instead of realising the anger of God, and discovering the sins which deserve it, we shall seek to gratify an unholy anxiety to anticipate the details of the judgment that cometh!

4. But if we are called to discover and acknowledge our offence, it is that we may feel our need of being turned to the Lord. An opportunity of a gracious settlement of the controversy is yet given us by the Lord. He "waits that he may be gracious" when we as guilty sinners return to seek Him on His mercy-seat. Though "He will be exalted" in having mercy, mercy He is yet willing to bestow. Oh then, that the cry were heard by Him from our land—"Turn us, O God of our salvation, and cause thine anger towards us to cease. Wilt thou be angry for ever? Wilt thou draw out thine anger to all generations? Wilt thou not revive us again, that thy people may rejoice in thee? Shew us thy mercy, O Lord, and grant us thy salvation." Would that we were led thus to plead with God, that families and individuals might yet be turned unto Him, that the opportunity of peace be not lost by our land, and lest the controversy terminate in the full execution of judgment.

But, in conclusion, let me remind each of you, my dear fellow-sinners, who are yet unconverted and Christless, that the Lord hath a controversy with you individually; that all must be wrong

with you till it be graciously settled ; that there is but one way in which peace can be obtained, even by Christ, and through His precious blood ; that the peace which God hath made through the blood of the cross is yet in your offer, for Christ Himself is yet to you free ; and in Him the guiltiest sinner who receives Him finds “redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.” Oh flee to Christ, the only refuge from “the wrath to come,” while yet in the Gospel you are called to do so, and run not, by wilfully rejecting Him, the sure and awful risk of an eternal war with God.

The Present Dangers of this Nation, and of the Church of Christ in it.*

WE observe, with deep grief and alarm, the encouragement given by our legislators to Popery, by removing one after another, from the Statute Book of this Protestant realm, the safeguards set up by our forefathers against that intolerant and persecuting system, and the rapid growth of the idolatrous and superstitious tenets of the Papacy in the Churches of England and Scotland. We appeal to our fellow-Protestants and countrymen not to sell their blood-bought birthright for mere sentimentalism and false charity. We offer the following reasons why we should uncompromisingly retain our protests against the Papacy :—

(1) The Papacy boasts of being always the same. All the laws of that diabolical system against such as dare to differ from her idolatrous worship and blasphemous doctrines are still in full force, taught daily in her schools and colleges, and form the very essence of that system, without which it would cease to exist. They make no secret of the fact that heretics (that is, Protestants) should be put to death, had they the power to do so. In the last Parliament an extraordinary effort has been made to remove the Protestant Declaration required of the Sovereign of this realm on coming to the throne. This was done at the instigation of the Pope and his hierarchy. The Protestants of England, Ireland, and Scotland flooded the House of Commons with protests and petitions against its removal. Instead of listening to the voice of this Protestant country, the leaders of the House of Commons took advantage of the differences of Protestants by shaping their Bill at the last hour so as to give a sop to this and that party, and then forced it through the House in three hours' time. Does not this traitorous conduct prove that our Protestantism is unsafe in the hands of these men? Both Mr. Asquith and Mr. Balfour have lost for ever the confidence of the intelligent Protestants of this country, and so have their weak-kneed followers. They now

* This is the closing part of historical paper read by Rev. Neil Cameron at last Synod, partly re-written and extended.

offer the further insult of telling us that we are as safe without that Declaration as having it on our Statute Book. We freely grant them that we would be as safe without the new Declaration ; but we know full well why the Declaration abrogated was drawn up by our forefathers, and we are confident that there has not been, for the last two hundred years, more need of it than at the present hour. But the Papists know what their own aim is. This was done on very purpose to open the way to our throne for a Papist, so as to have the temporal power of the Pope restored. This would cause more immediate danger to Protestants than the most are aware of, or are willing to believe. For our Army, Navy, Police, Civil Courts, Post Office Officials, and the most of the Press of our country are already very much under the thumb of Rome. In the event of a Roman Catholic king coming to our throne, the whole power of this kingdom could easily be made use of by him to crush Protestants. This would be nothing new in this land ; for both Charles II. and James II. have committed terrible atrocities by using the armies of England, Scotland, and Ireland to compel our forefathers, at the point of the sword, to become Roman Catholics. This was the root-cause why the King's Protestant Declaration had been framed—so as to make sure that no such calamity could ever again befall our country. It was made on very purpose, and in the very terms used in it, so as to make it impossible for a Roman Catholic in disguise to have made it. Any Jesuit can make the new Declaration.

Thousands of Jesuits have been banished from France on account of their abominable plots against the *Republican* civil government of that country, and all these have been received with open arms into England and Scotland. The baneful effects of their presence in our midst are noticeable already in riots and bloodshed. Freedom of speech is being lost. If any one dares to expose the soul-ruining errors of the Papacy, his mouth is shut by the violence of Roman Catholic ignorance and intolerance instigated by priests, and by the decision of the judge on the bench. The riots last year in Liverpool and Motherwell, and the judge's decision in each case, prove partiality toward the Papacy. Roman Catholic priests lecture in our towns and country, and write unblushingly lying accusations against the Reformers and the Reformation in our public Press, without suffering any violence at the hands of Protestants. This reveals the difference between an intolerant and persecuting anti-Christian system and the principles of Christian toleration set forth in the Bible. The civil government of our country ignores the laws that are on our Statute Book against these intriguing Jesuits. On the contrary, a Jesuit university has been endowed in Ireland, to the amount of fifty thousand pounds annually, out of the revenue of this Protestant nation, to keep the youth of that wretched country under the traitorous control and teaching of these men. Our Government has pledged itself to grant Home Rule to Irish

Papists, led by the hierarchy of Rome, to bind that country in fetters under the Pope's blighting power; while they see before their eyes the sad spectacle of poverty, ignorance, illiteracy, and crime in the parts of Ireland which crouches under priest-rule, and the prosperity and moral and religious habits of the rest of the people, and their intelligence which they owe to their Protestant education. The same spectacle of woe and misery prevails in every country in the world which has not thrown off his galling yoke. The groans of the people of Spain may be heard in the British Parliament, and is heard throughout this nation, except by those who are in authority. Surely blindness and deafness has happened in our Houses of Parliament! Besides, our fellow-Protestants in Ireland will be placed in dire danger (if Home Rule be granted) of having civil war forced upon them; for as soon as Home Rule becomes law, there will be no toleration for Protestants in Ireland, and they will have either to leave that country or to fight for their civil and religious liberties. Ought not the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland combine and with one voice say to our infatuated legislators: "Hands off the few remaining safeguards of our Protestantism"? Roman Catholics should be compelled to obey our laws, or suffer the consequences of breaking them. We do not advocate persecution in any form, but we do think that the constitutional good laws of this realm should be enforced without partiality against all that break them, and that none of them should be changed or abrogated for pleasing men who are bent on our ruin as a nation. If these men will gain the end they have set before themselves, our civil, social, and religious liberties will be gone, and we shall have to become slaves, physically and spiritually, or fight again, through blood, groans, and tears, the battle of a Third Reformation, in order to regain our valuable freedom. Protestants should make sure that their representatives sent to Parliament are men of sound Protestant principles, and that they will not follow any leader—either Liberal or Unionist—in destroying our Constitution.

(2) The alarming number of Ritualists in the Church of England (formed into secret societies), who deliberately endeavour to overthrow the Reformation and to set up the Papacy on its ruins, show that the enemy is already within the fort. It is computed that nine thousand of the ministers in that Church, assisted by a large number of the laity, are busily engaged in undermining the Protestantism, doctrines, and worship of the Church of England. If this movement be connived at by both the ecclesiastical and civil governments of that Church, as has been the case for the last seventy years, and all efforts put forth by the people to bring these Papists in disguise to an account for their perjury, the Protestantism of England will soon be at an end, and it will fall an easy prey to the Papacy. Both Unionists and Liberals are alike guilty, when in power, of encouraging these law-breakers by promoting them to the highest positions in that Church, so that now the

most of her bishops are in favour of union with Rome. The Nonconformists in England are so bent on Disestablishment and Disendowment and religious equality, that they stand aloof from rendering any helping hand to the Church of England in this struggle; so that the prospect before the eyes of those who see in England is very dark.

In the Established Church of Scotland there are many ministers and some laymen who look upon the Reformation as a great mistake, and who endeavour to bring that Church back to the bosom of Rome. There are secret societies in it, plotting to bring about union with the Papacy. The image of the Virgin Mary, crosses, and other images are set up in several churches, and the doctrines taught from many of her pulpits savour not a little of the superstitious and blasphemous doctrines of the Church of Rome. Many of her ministers, for some time past, made no secret of their dissatisfaction with the doctrines and principles set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith, but they were bound to it by an Act of Parliament, and by another Act they were bound to assert, maintain, and defend the whole doctrine contained in it. How to get rid of this last Act, which bound them on oath to teach it to the people, was their dilemma. At last an opportunity appeared. When the Bill to allot the property and money of the Free Church came before the House of Commons, Balfour of Burleigh took advantage of slipping in a clause at the end of that Bill to repeal that part of the Act of 1693 which bound the office-bearers of the Established Church to assert, maintain, and defend the doctrines of the Confession. This relieved them from any danger which might come from the Statute Book or the law of the land. The next step was to agree about a Formula which would suit orthodox and heterodox alike. Since they got relief from Parliament, in 1904, they have been trying to construct words which would leave those who desired no change formally bound to the Confession, and which would give others the widest latitude they could desire. After five years' hard labour they have managed to draw up and to approve of this Formula: "I hereby subscribe the Confession of Faith, declaring that I accept it as the Confession of Faith of this Church, and that I believe the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith contained therein." Be it observed that there is not a word about asserting, maintaining, or defending its doctrines, and that each one is only bound to what he considers "the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith contained therein. One may believe all its doctrines fundamental, while another may not consider the doctrine of the fall in Adam of all his posterity, or the doctrine of election, or the doctrine of the divinity of our Lord, or the doctrine of a limited atonement, or the doctrine of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, etc., etc., fundamental, and consequently he is not bound by his oath to assert that he believes any or all of these doctrines. The Revolution Settlement

would not suffer them to go further. Are these men the successors of the Reformers of the Church of Scotland? What would John Knox, Andrew Melville, Alexander Henderson, Samuel Rutherford, Richard Cameron, and James Renwick say about this tinkering with the faith once delivered to the saints in Scotland, were they to rise from their graves? Would they not declare that these men are traitors in the Church of the Reformation in Scotland? "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in Askelon."

In the Free Church of Scotland the doctrine of the infallibility and inerrancy of the Bible was attacked both by her ministers and professors in her divinity chairs, and when libels were brought before some of her Presbyteries and General Assemblies against these men, Dr. Rainy and his followers shielded, repeatedly, these heretics from the discipline of the Church. The same thing was done when the divinity of Christ was brought in question. The doctrines of the Confession of Faith were vehemently attacked in some of her Courts during several years. Ultimately a Committee was appointed by the General Assembly to consider how the Church understood some of the phraseology of the Confession, and it produced the Declaratory Act in 1891, which, being by the Assembly of that year sent down to Presbyteries under the Barrier Act, with the result that a majority of the Presbyteries were found in its favour, was passed in 1892. Protests were lodged against it, and appeals were sent up to the Assembly of 1893 to have it repealed. To these remonstrances the Assembly would not listen. In that Act, interpretations of the Confession are set forth which are as contrary to its plain meaning as light is to darkness. The doctrines of election and of a limited atonement are replaced by the doctrines of universal love and atonement; the doctrine of the fall of all mankind in Adam is replaced by the doctrine that man retains still the image of God, that he has knowledge of God and his duty, and is capable of doing good works. The doctrine of man's need of regeneration by the Holy Spirit is replaced by the doctrine that man can turn to God by the aid of the Holy Spirit; and the doctrine of man's right of private judgment, in accordance with God's Word, is replaced by the Popish doctrine that the individual has to believe what the Church teaches in her Assembly from year to year. This was an extraordinary change made on the public creed of the Church all at once. The meaning of it all is that Arminianism, Pelagianism, and a limb of Popery were set up for her future creed. The most fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith were thrown away, and old heresies, against which the Church of Christ contended unto blood, put in their place. It was on account of the fact that these heretical doctrines were to be in future the declared creed of that Church that we left her communion in 1893, in order that we might hold before the world the Confession of Faith in all its articles. The aim of the Rainy party in framing and enacting this new creed

was two-fold:—(1) They purposed to put an effective stop to processes against Rationalists (*i.e.*, Higher Critics) in the Church's Courts; (2) They wished to bring the creed of the Free Church as near as possible to that of the U.P. Church with a view to union. The union took place in 1900, and, so far as we know, the above-stated doctrines compose the creed held now by the United Free Church of Scotland. There is a movement now on foot for union between the Established and U.F. Churches. In a document published by this "Union Association," we find very ominous statements. One of these is from no less an authority than Dr. Whyte, now Principal of the New College, Edinburgh. It reads as follows:—"Just try enough love on the re-union of Christendom and see . . . Let all those men who would put out a hand to bind up the long-standing wounds of the Church be lowly-minded men . . . When we look not so much at our own short history, however brilliant to our own eyes that history may be, nor so much to our own peculiar attainments and possessions as Protestants and as evangelical believers, however precious and inalienable those attainments and possessions may be, but when we look more at the antiquity, and the nobility, and the grandeur, and the stateliness of those other Churches (*i.e.*, Greek and Latin), as over against the too great provincialism and rusticity and indecorum of speech and action that have often far too much characterised ourselves; when we have humbled ourselves to admit that some other Churches have things of no small moment to teach us and to share with us, and things it will greatly enrich us to receive and to assimilate; when we are of a Christian mind enough to admit, and even to welcome, thoughts and views and feelings like these, then the day of a reconstructed Christendom will have begun to dawn, at least for ourselves." Be it noted that these anti-Protestant sentiments have been homologated by the "Church Union Association," and that, therefore, the real aim of this movement is union with Rome. What would Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Cunningham, or the Erskines think of their successors? "How are the mighty fallen"!

The present Free Church is the minority who refused to enter into union with the United Presbyterian Church in 1900. It was not on account of these drastic changes, made in 1892, on the Creed and Constitution of the Church that they separated from the majority; for it is well known that, had the other party listened to their pleas against union, they had no thought of separating from them. They remained seven years under the altered Constitution, although they had declared on the floor of the Assembly that the Declaratory Act regulated all the procedure of the Free Church, and that it was useless to tell them that they were not under it. Immediately the separation became a fact they began to declare that they had always adhered to the Confession of Faith as adopted in 1846. In our Deed of Separation we charge the then Free Church, of which this

minority formed an integral part, with having abandoned "the whole doctrine of the Confession of Faith," by substituting in its place "the substance of the Reformed Faith therein set forth," "whereby," we say in that document, "they have ceased to represent the Church of Scotland as settled in 1843." That is the ground on which we took our stand in 1893, and upon which we justified our separation from the Free Church in that year. To abandon it now is to give away the real cause of our separation, and to make apostates of ourselves. We don't hold to this position on account of pride or stubbornness, but because we cannot perceive how we can, with intelligence and a clean conscience, grant to these men that they have done right in remaining in that Church when we were constrained to separate from it by the Word of God, and with the approbation of our own consciences guided by that Word. That the civil court decided in their favour is one thing; but that they had in fact adhered to the Confession of Faith right through, in accordance with truth and conscience, is quite another thing. The civil court dealt with property only, and that in accordance with two doctrines of the Free Church of Scotland, viz., predestination and national establishment of religion; but were these men tried before a spiritual court of conscientious men as regards the duty of men towards a Church which ceases to hold the fundamentals of the Christian faith, I am convinced the verdict would be against them on the point of their having always adhered to the Confession as adopted in 1846. At the same time let no one think that we regret that they gained their case in the civil court, for we are fully convinced that the other party had no right to money and property that had been contributed and built to uphold doctrines and principles upon which they had turned their backs.

The first Professor of Divinity appointed by this Church turned out to be a Higher Critic. This was amply proved by a book which he published a few months before he was appointed, called *Demonic Possession*. When this fact became known throughout the Church, several of her Courts appealed to the General Assembly craving that the man should be brought up for trial, and dealt with according to the law of the Church. The Assembly declared that there was nothing unsound in the book, and the man was eulogised as being quite orthodox. The fact that others had read the book never seems to have dawned on the Assembly. This procedure brought the whole Assembly under the stigma of conniving (like the Rainy party in the old Free Church) at unsound views on the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible. This man holds still his Divinity chair, and so far as we have seen, he has not confessed yet that the views propagated by him in that book are heretical, or that he has seen his error and repented of it. We are fully aware that the book has been withdrawn from publication; not because it was condemned, which it was not, but because the people of the Free Church would not tolerate its continuance in

circulation. He has made a statement since, which satisfied some; but in it there was not one word uttered by him about this unsound book. This is as it ought not to be.

This Church opened the door of admission so wide that the majority of the ministers now within her pale came from Presbyterian Churches with which, as they are now constituted, the Free Church in 1843, and for many years after that date would have had no such alliance; others have been admitted from Congregational and Baptist Churches, who repudiate Presbyterianism. What doctrines these now hold and teach, Free Church hearers can judge. Divine power alone could transform these men into orthodox Free Church ministers; but, as yet, it is evident that some of them bewray their origin. The last Assembly has done more to bring them in line than has been done hitherto; for this we are not displeased. Is this Church in reality the true representative of the Free Church of 1843?

Thus, the Church of the Reformation in Scotland has been laid in heaps, like Jerusalem of old, and the fair stones, of which she was built, lie scattered on the ground. Rationalists, Ritualists, Arminians, and Voluntaries have destroyed the people's faith in the Bible, in the worship and Sabbath of Scotland's past, and in the faith of the Church of Christ as settled at the Reformation. "How long, Lord?"

(3) The greater number of the people are quite apathetic and unconcerned. They have become so dead to spiritual matters that very few search the Word of God in order to find out for themselves what the Scriptures teach concerning God, or the duty He requires of man. This causes them to follow blindfold men who teach the vain dreams of their own imaginations instead of God's everlasting truth. The doctrines of man's fall in Adam, of redemption by Christ, and of regeneration by the Holy Ghost are either ridiculed, or passed over in silence, and man's merits and good works are held forth as the foundation of acceptance with God, and as a sure right to heaven and everlasting happiness. Is this the Gospel, or is it not another gospel upon which the curse of God rests? This is very deplorable. Family worship has become very rare. Families are reared who never saw their parents on their knees, and whose example on Sabbath and week days has a baneful effect on their children. This is a very dark picture of the religious conduct of the people, but it is quite true and without any exaggeration. The public press and vain literature (read so much by the people) sneer at serious godliness, and encourage them to profane God's holy day by turning it into a day of pleasure. If the Lord will not, of His great mercy, pour the Holy Spirit upon us as a people to bring us to repentance, we will soon become a nation of atheists and infidels, or fall an easy prey to the idolatry and superstition of the Church of Rome. God forbid that either should become an accomplished fact!

(4) The Reformation is vilified as the blunder of bigoted and

uncharitable men by quasi-Protestants, while Jesuits endeavour to brand the Reformers as men of no character. But the many noble testimonies recorded, by friends and foes, of the Reformers and the Reformation in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries are such that ignorance of history or something worse must be at the bottom of this tirade against them. That Roman Catholics should endeavour to brand these men and their work with infamy might be expected, but that Protestants should assist them is surprisingly sad. We record the following quotation from the *Literary World*: "They send their light across the darkness of the period which, but for their purity and fortitude, would hardly be redeemed from being numbered with the dark ages. It is not surprising that the countrymen of these heroes and heroines of the old Scottish faith should resent as a personal insult any slur which might be cast upon their fame. Indeed, if Scotland were to forget the worthies who stood by her Solemn League and Covenant, we should deserve the punishment which always falls upon a people who forget that they were 'fathered in a mighty past.' We feel it to be a sorry experience to meet with a Scotsman who exhibits any, even the slightest, indifference to the great story of the old Church of his country. A man who hardly cared that John Knox was a Scotsman, if he himself were proud of being one, must have been deaf to the proudest history of his nation, or dead to the noblest emotions of a patriot's heart. The debt that Scotland owes to her Covenanting heroes it would be difficult to exaggerate. By their fidelity to conscience, they rolled back the tide of spiritual tyranny which entered with the Restoration, and made it for ever impossible that even Prelacy, still less Popery, should have the upper hand in the land of Knox." With these noble sentiments we fully agree. The time may come, yea, we are afraid it will soon be upon us, when the same struggle for civil and religious liberty will have to be fought over again in Scotland. We trust that the Lord will raise up from our midst heroes and heroines to defend His truth and cause, who will prefer death rather than lose the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. "Even from the days of your fathers ye have gone away from mine ordinances, and have not kept them. Return unto me, and I will return unto you, saith the Lord of Hosts."

N. C.

Services in Winnipeg.—Rev. Donald Macleod expects (D.V.) to be in Winnipeg, Manitoba, on the first Sabbath of September, and to officiate also for some Sabbaths following. The Communion will be dispensed on the third Sabbath of September, and services in Gaelic and English will be held on the usual week-days, beginning with the Thursday previous. The place of meeting is now the Scott Memorial Hall, Princess Street, corner of Rupert Avenue.

The New Accession Declaration.

A LECTURE BY REV. JOHN R. MACKAY, M.A., INVERNESS.

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE following Lecture, which is copied with the very slightest change from the *Northern Chronicle* of 27th July, 1910, was delivered by me at a meeting of Inverness Protestants, who convened in the Free Presbyterian Church, Inverness, on the evening of 26th July. The new Accession Declaration which, in this Lecture, is made the subject of a brief criticism, is not exactly the Declaration which has now become law. What our King is now required by law to declare at his first meeting with Parliament is what follows: "I do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I am a faithful Protestant, and that I will, according to the true intent of the enactments to secure the Protestant succession to the Throne of my realm, uphold and maintain such enactments to the best of my power." The face value of this last form of the Royal Declaration may be a trifle more than that of the form criticised in the ensuing Lecture. Yet it will be seen, upon perusal of the Lecture, that the criticisms offered on Asquith's first suggested form of Declaration apply also to the form ultimately adopted by our Legislature. As things now stand we have nationally ceased to protest in a plain outspoken way against the idolatry of the Roman Catholic Church. To protest against idolatry in high places might not have been popular, but it was very salutary, and this country may realise its folly sooner than many anticipate. Further, it does not forbode well for this country that it was largely to please the sacerdotalists of the Church of England that the description, "Protestant Reformed Church by law established in England," which occurs in the first suggested altered form of Declaration, is dropped in the form finally adopted. For, to our mind, no circumstance connected with us as a nation is more fitted to bring the wrath of the Highest upon us than the growing idolatrousness of the Church of England itself. Since this Lecture was delivered I had a visit from an ex-priest of the Church of Rome, who may, indeed, even now not have fully declared his resolution and determination to the Papal authorities. He told me that at first, upon his concluding that he must needs leave the Church of Rome, it was his intention to become a minister of the Church of England, as the orders of the Church of Rome are recognised as valid in the Church of England. With this end in view he quite recently communicated with a bishop of the Church of England. The bishop asked him why he had made up his mind to leave the Church of Rome. "Because," replied he, "I can no longer accept the doctrine of the Real Presence (Transubstantiation)." The English bishop, so far from encouraging the ex-Roman priest

in fleeing from idolatry, urged him to remain as he was—in the Church of Rome. “For,” said the bishop, “I am as sure of the truth of the Real Presence as I am of the fact of the chair upon which I now sit; and the only difference between the Church of Rome and us on that point is that the Church of Rome tries to explain the change, whileas we give no explanation.”

The incident, as recorded by the ex-priest, I relate as being fitted to reveal the depth to which the Roman leprosy has affected the Church of England. May not one say that a duty lying upon lovers of the Reformation in this country is to help in forming and promoting an Independent Protestant party for the House of Commons?—J. R. M.

THE OLD AND THE NEW DECLARATIONS.

DEAR FRIENDS,—I had hoped that there would be a meeting representative of the Highlands, in such a building as the Music Hall, to protest against Mr. Asquith’s new Accession Declaration, but through the apathy, I fear, of leading men in this town in matters of this kind, that hope could not be realised. I felt, notwithstanding, that I had a duty to perform in this matter, and on that account took the responsibility of calling this meeting, and I am glad that so many have responded to the call. What is our reason for gathering? It is primarily—for reasons which I hope to develop as I proceed—to protest against Mr. Asquith’s new Accession Bill. Let me explain. Over and above the Scottish Oath, whereby at his first meeting with the Privy Council the King pledged himself to maintain the Protestant Presbyterian Church in Scotland, and the Coronation Oath, whereby he will (D.V.) in June next pledge himself to maintain the Protestant Episcopal Church in England, the King will at his first meeting with Parliament make a declaration of his personal faith. William III., Anne, the Georges (I., II., III., IV.), William IV., Victoria, and Edward VII., all made that Declaration in the following terms:—

“I, —, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I do make this Declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope or

any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this Declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope or any other person or persons or power whatsoever should dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning.”—(Bill of Rights, 1 William III. and Mary II., Sess. 2, cap. 2, sections 8 and 9; and Act of Settlement, 12 and 13 William III., cap. 2.)

According to the Bill of Rights, this Declaration the Sovereign ought to make “at the first meeting of the first Parliament after his coming to the Crown.” I cannot, for my part, get over the impression that it was only through a violation—if not of the letter at least of the spirit—of the law that King George V. was not advised to make the same Declaration with his forefathers on the 8th of June last. However that may be, Mr. Asquith now proposes that when, in fact, King George V. meets his Parliament for the first time he shall utter not the Declaration now read but the Declaration which follows:—

“I do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I am a faithful member of the Protestant Reformed Church as by law established in England, and I will, according to the true intent of the enactments which secure the Protestant succession to the Throne of my realm, uphold and maintain the said enactments to the best of my powers according to law.”

HENCE THIS CONTROVERSY.

For you will notice, if you carefully consider these Declarations, the old and the new, that they agree in so far as either Declaration consists of two parts, which I call the formal and material parts. They agree also in so far as the formal part is in either Declaration identical—in either case it runs: “I do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare.” But when we come to the material part of these Declarations, we find that the old and the new are quite diverse; they have almost nothing in common. The material part of the old Declaration consists of three sections in which the Roman Catholic system is defined in its essential features, and defined only to be disowned. The first of these three sections touches upon the doctrine of Transubstantiation and denies the verity of it; the second touches upon Roman views of the worship to be paid to the Virgin Mary, and of the Sacrament of the Mass, and denounces these views as superstitious and idolatrous; the third section touches upon the Pope’s claim to grant dispensations from oaths, and disowns that claim. On the other hand, the new Declaration refrains from outlining Popery in its essential features at all, refrains from mentioning a single Roman Catholic doctrine, refrains, of course, from denouncing such doctrines. And it is not only the case that

Asquith's new Declaration makes no mention of essential Roman Catholic doctrines, but those documents which may be supposed, in the judgment of charity, to underlie and to be referred to in the new Declaration do not define Roman Catholicism in its essential features, nor specify any particular Roman doctrine. What are "the enactments" which he speaks of, and "which secure the Protestant Succession to the Throne"? I can think only of the Coronation Oath, and of the Bill of Rights. Of these two instruments I give the salient parts. It belongs to the Coronation Oath that the Archbishop or Bishop ask the Sovereign :

"Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the Laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law? and will you preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of this realm and to the Churches committed to their charge all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them or any of them?"

To which the Sovereign replies : "All this I promise to do."

Again, the Bill of Right enacts that :

"Whereas it hath been found by experience that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant Kingdom to be governed by a Popish Prince, or by any King or Queen marrying a Papist, the said Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, do further pray that it be enacted that all and every Person or Persons that is, are, or shall be, reconciled to, or shall hold communion with the See or Church of Rome, or shall profess the Popish Religion, or shall marry a Papist, shall be excluded, and be for ever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy the Crown and Government of this Realm and Ireland and the Dominions thereunto belonging, or any part of the same, or to have, use, or exercise any Royal Power, Authority, or Jurisdiction within the same ; and in all and every such Case or Cases the people of these Realms shall be and are hereby absolved of their Allegiance, and the said Crown and Government shall from time to time descend to and be enjoyed by such Person or Persons being Protestants, as should have inherited and enjoyed the same in case the said Person or Persons so reconciled, holding Communion, or professing, or marrying as aforesaid, were naturally dead." (1 W. & M., Ses. II. Cap. 2.)

THE ESSENTIAL FEATURES OF ROMANISM.

These instruments are good in their own place, but they do not serve, nor were they, according to the Act of Settlement, intended to serve the purposes of the Royal Protestant Declaration. For you will observe that not in the Coronation Oath, nor yet in the Bill of Rights, is Romanism in its essential features defined, nor a single central Roman doctrine specified. The fact is that if you do away with the Royal Protestant Declaration the British Sovereign will in no place define the essential features of the Romanism which he is supposed to disown, will in no place aver

his disbelief of a single Roman Catholic doctrine. And that is what makes this matter so vital to Romanists and to us. Roman Catholics do not feel much annoyed when Protestants simply disown Romanism in a general way. But let the Roman Catholic system be defined in its essential features, and let that system be denounced, and that will arouse their ire very much.

UTTERLY USELESS AS A SAFEGUARD.

Now it is not because we have any pleasure in seeing the feelings of fellow sinners hurt that we show our dissatisfaction with Asquith's new Accession Declaration and our satisfaction with what is yet the Royal Protestant Declaration of this country. We are dissatisfied with the new Accession Declaration because it is utterly useless for the purposes for which the Royal Protestant Declaration was intended. It is not really like the present Declaration, a declaration of the Sovereign's personal belief on essential Roman Catholic doctrines. Now that is a deadly flaw. For the question now in debate is not as to whether the British Sovereign shall *de jure* (by right) be Protestant. The Bill of Rights, as long as it is left us, secures that. But the question is as to whether the British Sovereign shall *de facto* (actually) be Protestant. The new Accession Declaration is then in this regard quite useless. We, on the other hand, prize the old Declaration for such reasons as these:—(1) It effectively serves a very necessary purpose. What is that purpose? That the law of the land in regard to the Protestant succession to the throne shall not be a dead letter. Good laws are often treated as a dead letter, but we are, through the grace of God, determined to do all in our power in order that the law concerning the Protestant succession to the throne of Great Britain shall not be a dead letter. It is the law of the land at the present moment that the Jesuits should not remain in the kingdom except under certain restrictions and penalties, but that law, as everybody knows, is treated as a dead letter. And it is because it is our conviction that Asquith's new legislation tends to make the law bearing on the Protestant succession to the throne a dead letter that we wish to oppose it with all our might. For as has been said, the law as stated within the Bill of Rights in regard to the Protestant succession to the throne is good, but it concerns us to know that each successive Sovereign shall, in truth and fact, be by personal conviction a Protestant. How can this assurance be given us? The Royal Protestant Declaration, as it now is, as an instrument secures it. For, on the one hand, no one at heart a Romanist will publicly deny Transubstantiation, denounce the Mass and Mariolatry, and disown Papal Dispensations. And, on the other hand, to disown, after this fashion, Roman doctrine, constitutes, in the judgment of the Church of Rome, the unpardonable sin of "apostasy." A secret Romanist might call himself Protestant, and might in general terms disown Roman Catholicism, and might have the

Pope's sanction for all this, as the case of Charles II. proves, but not for Charles II. nor for any other could a dispensation be discovered if he publicly disowned Romanism as every British Sovereign since the time of William Prince of Orange has, in virtue of the Royal Protestant Declaration, disowned it.

(2) Further, we prize the Royal Protestant Declaration because it is truth. That Transubstantiation, the adoration of the Virgin Mary, and the Sacrament of the Mass are essential Roman Catholic doctrines no one will deny. British history conclusively shows that the Pope of Rome considered himself vested with powers whereby to dispense absolutions to kings from their most solemn oaths.

THE PAPACY AND THE ENGLISH PARLIAMENT.

Take the following from Mr. W. P. Upton :—"When we wrung Magna Charta out of base John, Pope Innocent III. annulled the Charter, absolved the King from his oaths, excommunicated his enemies, and plunged England into the horrors of a cruel civil war and devastation by foreign mercenaries. Half a century later, when the patriotic Barons and Commons redressed the grievances of the nation, and laid the foundations of a free Parliament, Pope Alexander IV. annulled the 'Provisions of Oxford,' as they were called, and dispensed Henry III. from his oaths. Then Simon de Montfort championed the cause of the people, and forced the King to submit; but when de Montfort fell Rome was ready once again to 'dispense' the repeated oaths. Had it not been for the nobility of character displayed by the Prince, 'Edward Longshanks,' who kept his father to his obligations, the Papacy would have strangled the English Parliament in its cradle."

ADORATION OF THE VIRGIN.

But granting that the adoration of the Virgin, the Sacrament of the Mass, and Transubstantiation are central Roman Catholic doctrines, are these doctrines deserving of being denounced as superstitious, idolatrous, untrue? That to speak of them thus is not to use extravagant or even uncharitable language, will appear self-evident to a people trained in the Scriptures as soon as they realise what Mariolatry and Transubstantiation, with its complement, the Mass, mean in the Roman Catholic Church. As regards the Virgin Mary, what can be thought of the following quotations from the "Glories of Mary," a work of St. Liguori, of whose writings the Church of Rome has declared that they are absolutely free from error? On page 478 of the edition of this work printed by Burnes, Oates & Co., you will read, "Mary so loved the world as to give her only begotten son"; and on page 479, "Jesus Himself said, Were it not for the prayers of my mother, there would be no hope of mercy"; and on page 14, "The eternal Father gave the office of Judge and Avenger to the Son, and that

of mercy and relieving the necessities to the mother"; and on page 215, "Those who do not serve Mary will not be saved"; and on page 98, "If God is angry with a sinner, and Mary takes him under her protection, she withholds the avenging arm of her son and saves him." If that is not idolatry, I would like to know what is; and if you are not yet convinced of the truth of the accusation, what shall be thought of the almost incredible blasphemy of Cardinal Bonaventura, who, in the fifteenth century, took each of the Psalms, and so altered them as to make them addressed not to Jehovah but to Mary! And this form of devotion, translated into Italian, was published at Rome in 1840. And again, are not Transubstantiation and the Sacrament of the Mass denounced in mild terms when, in this connection, the Church of Rome can expatiate on the dignity of the priesthood in language like this—

"He is a man who every day, when he pleases, opens the gates of heaven, and addressing himself to the Son of the Eternal—to the Monarch of the worlds—says to him, 'Descend from your throne; come.' Docile at the voice of this man, the Word of God—He by whom all things were made—instantly descends from the seat of His glory, and incarnates Himself in the hands of this man, more powerful than kings, than the angels, than the august Mary. And this man says to him, 'Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee; thou art my victim.' And He lets Himself be immolated by this man, placed where He wills, given to whom he chooses: this man is the priest."—"Catechisme de Perseverance." Abbe Gramme. Vol. iv., page 288.)

PAPAL CLAIMS.

I assure you the Royal Protestant Declaration uses but the language of truth and of great soberness when it speaks of the Sacrament of the Mass, and the worship of the Virgin as superstitious and idolatrous doctrines.

(3) But we are strongly opposed to any alteration in the Royal Protestant Declaration, not only because it serves a necessary and useful end, and because it is truth, but also because (a) we know what the nature of the Papal Claims is; (b) we have had experience of Popish Kings, and (c) we know the unmitigated cruelty of the Court of Rome. Let me expand these three arguments a little. As concerns Papal Claims: When Dr. Isaac Barrow, about the very time that the first Test Act of Charles II.'s reign was found a necessity, wrote his great work on the Pope's supremacy, he acknowledged that he found it difficult to come to a decision as to how the subject was to be tackled by him, inasmuch as at that time the extent of the Pope's supremacy was a matter in debate in the Church of Rome itself. But we are no longer in that predicament. The Papal Infallibility Bull of 1870 has put an end to all that. It means, to adopt the language of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the official organ of the Jesuits at Rome, an

organ of which Pope Pius IX., about the time when our quotation was published, said that "it had set forth and propagated the true doctrine"; it means, we repeat, that "the Pontiff is by God set in an absolute manner at the summit of all sovereignty as such. Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shalt be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. These words admit of no exceptions whatever, and express a jurisdiction universal and absolute. It comprehends everything." The realisation of this one idea is what the Papacy means when it speaks of Christian government, Christian law, Christian order, Christian civilisation. And although the truth of the matter does not always appear on the surface, we have no doubt that the effort to bring this conception of the supremacy of the Pope of Rome to realisation in Great Britain has been the real cause of all our troubles with the Papacy for the last 700 years, and is the real cause of our having so much trouble now with the Royal Protestant Declaration. Let us hope that to be forewarned is to be forearmed.

EXPERIENCE OF POPISH KINGS.

Again, as concerns our experience of Popish Kings: The wife of King James I. of England and VI. of Scotland was secretly a Papist. She influenced her own son Charles I., both directly in saturating his mind with so-called Catholic doctrines, and indirectly by bringing it about that Charles First's Queen was herself a Papist. It was no wonder that their children, Charles II. and James II., should have been Papists. What an amount of persecution in Scotland and in England that meant between the years 1625-1689, readers of history know. But, further, Great Britain, through Charles Second's conduct, narrowly escaped a visitation not less terrible than visited the Protestants of France on St. Bartholomew's Day. For in 1671 King Charles II. entered into a secret treaty with the Roman Catholic King of France, Louis XIV., of which treaty the first article ran thus:—

"Art. 1. The King of Great Britain being convinced of the truth of the Catholic religion, and resolved to 'declare' himself a Catholic, and to reconcile himself to the Church of Rome, thinks the assistance of His Most Christian Majesty may be necessary to the execution of his design. It is, therefore, agreed and concluded upon, that His Most Christian Majesty shall supply the King of England, before the said declaration, with the sum of £200,000 sterling, one-half to be paid in three months after the ratification of the present Treaty, and the other half in three months more; and further, that His Most Christian Majesty shall assist the King of England 'with troops and money,' as there may be occasion, 'in case the said King's subjects should not acquiesce in the said declaration and rebel against his said Britannic Majesty,' which is not thought likely."

SECRET TREATY IN CHARLES II.'S REIGN.

It is true that in the kind Providence of God Charles II. found it to the end of his days impossible to act in the sense of this treaty. But for that we have not to thank King or Pope, and I may say that rumours rising as vapours from this treaty during the reign of Charles II. were in my humble opinion the cause of all the disquiet which was felt in Great Britain on account of the Papacy in Charles's reign, and were the causes leading at length to legislation of which now the Royal Protestant Declaration forms part.

Finally, in this connection, as regards the cruelty of the Court of Rome: Lest I weary you, I shall content myself with one proof. Shortly before he died, Pope Leo XIII., who is generally regarded as one of the best and mildest of Popes, sanctioned the following from the pen of Professor Marianus de Luca:—

"The Church is a perfect Society. Then the right of the sword is a necessary and effective means to the attainment of its end. The Church at first dealt more leniently with heretics, excommunicating them, confiscating their property, till at last she was compelled to inflict the extreme penalty. There is no other remedy: for the Church gradually advanced and tried every means, first, excommunication alone, then a pecuniary fine was added, then exile, 'finally, she was compelled to fall back on death.' Heretics despise excommunication and say the bolt is powerless; if you threaten them with a pecuniary fine they neither fear God or respect men. . . . If you imprison them or send them into exile they corrupt with their words those near them. . . 'So the only remedy is to send them soon to their own place.'"

When you put all these considerations together, do you wonder that we highly prize the immunity which we have had from Papal intrigue and persecution for the last 200 years, or that we highly prize the instrument through which the throne of Britain was saved out of the entanglements of Papal schemes during all that time—I mean the Royal Protestant Declaration.

HONOUR OF THE HOUSE OF HANOVER.

For in conclusion, let me say that this is a matter that concerns not only the civil and religious liberty of the people of Great Britain, but it concerns most intimately the honour and dignity of the House of Hanover. For what is the decisive fact that determines the Crown of Great Britain for the present Royal House? It is not nearness of relationship to James I. of England and VI. of Scotland. There are others living still more nearly related by blood to James than they. But the decisive fact in their favour is their Protestantism. As long as the House of Hanover gives such an assurance of its Protestantism as the Royal Protestant Declaration, as it now is, guarantees, the House of Hanover may well afford to neglect and despise the claims put forward by the Legitimist party. But if any doubt arises as to the thoroughness of the Protestantism of the British Sovereign, we fear much disintegration of a serious nature will be the result.

An Leabhar-Cheist Protastanach, le Ian Dearbhadh o na Sgrìobtuiribh.

(Continued from page 115.)

RIARACHADH.

C. 173.—Cìod a tha eaglais na Ròimh a' ciallachadh le riarachadh?—F.—Peanasan àraid a tha duine 'deanamh air-féin, fo òrdugh an t-sagairt ann an obair na faosaid, mar nithe deadh-thoillteanach 'am fianuis Dé.

C. 174.—Cìod iad na peanasan a bhitheas na Pàpanaich a' deanamh orra-féin?—F.—Tha caochladh seòrsa dhiubh ann. Gle thrìc tha cuairt ùrnuighean air a deanamh mar riarachadh. Tha trasgadh, sgiùrsadh agus eadhon giùlan le salchar coluinn air am meas mar nithe a tha riarachadh ceartais Dhe airson peacaidh.

C. 175.—Cìod ì an t-sochair a gheibhear o na peanasaidh a thàtar ag òrduchadh mar sin?—F.—Thàtar a' smuaineachadh gu'm bheil iad a' maitheadh peanaidh aimsireil a' pheacaidh.

C. 176.—Co amhàin is urrainn peacadh a thoirt air falbh, no 'mhaitheadh?—F.—Crìosd; “ar n-amhuinneachd ghiùlain è agus ar doilghiosan dh'-iomchair è.”—Isaiah liii. 4.

C. 177.—Am bheil thu a' smuaineachadh gu'm bheil a' chathair-pheanaidh so mealltach, olc anns gach cùis?—F.—Thà mi; agus is uamhasach an innleachd ì 'an làimh eaglais na Ròimh gu bhi 'deanamh thràilleas de'n chinne-daoinne.

UNGADH-CRICHE—“'AN OLA BHASIS.”

C. 178.—Cìod a tha an Ròimh a' ciallachadh le *Ungadh-criche*?—F.—A bhi ag ùngadh, le ola, na muinntir a ta ri uchd a' bhais. Tha ì a teagasg gu'm bheil peacadh eutrom air a mhaithheadh leis an ùngadh so, no smal peacaidh air-bith a ta ceangailte ris an anam aig an àm.

C. 179.—Tha ì a' gabhail an Sgrìobtuir sin ann am Marcus vi. 13, mar dhearbhadh air ùngadh-criche. Cìod è seadh nam briathran sin?¹

F.—Cha n-ann idir air ùngadh-criche nam Pàpanach a tha na briathran sin a' labhairt. Tha an t-àrd easbuig Bellarmine, an deasbair mòr, ag aideachadh so, agus tha è 'toirt nan aobhar so a leanas air a' chùis.—(1) Buinidh an t-ùngadh le oladh, air am bheil Marcus a' labhairt, do leigheas a' *chuirp*; ach buinidh ùngadh-criche do'n *anam*. (2) Cha bu shagairt na h-Abstoil aig an àm ud, agus air an aobhar sin, cha b'urrainn iad ùngadh a

¹ Marc. vi. 13.—Agus thilg iad a mach mòran dheamhan, agus dh'ung iad le h-oladh mòran a bha tinn, agus leighis siad iad.

dheanamh air an dòigh a tha na Pàpanaich a' teagasg. (3) Dh'ùng na h-Abstoil mòran nach robh ann an cunnart bàis. Frithealar ùngadh-criche dhoibh-san a tha ann an cunnart bàis. Mar so, thàtar ag aideachadh leis na Pàpanaich a's ionnsuichte, nach faighear dearbhadh o na briathraibh sin air ùngadh-criche.—(*Faic Manual*, t. 38.)

C. 180.—Ciod a thàtar a' ciallachadh leis na briathraibh so ann an Litir an Abstoil Shéumais v. 14, 15?¹

F.—Cha n-ann idir air cleachdadh na Ròimh a tha iad sin a' labhairt. (1) Bha an t-ùngadh so air a dheanamh a chum slainte cuirp aiseag a-réir a' chleachdaidh a ta ann dùthchaibh na h-Aird-an-ear. Tha ùngadh na Ròimh air a dheanamh amhàin 'nuair a shaoilear gu'm bheil an neach a ta tinn ri uchd a' bhàis. (2) Buinidh an t-ùngadh so do'n chorp: ùngadh na Ròimh do'n anam *amhàin*. Tha an t-àrd easbuig Caiétan ag aideachadh nach 'eil dearbhadh anns na briathraibh sin air ùngadh nam Pàpanach.—(*Faic Manual*, t. 39.)

C. 181.—Ciod is nàdur do'n teagasg so?—F.—Gun teagamh is cuilbheart shàtanach a ta ànn, a chum am peacach bochd 'us è 'bàsachadh, a' thoirt gu earbsa a chur, aig a' mhionaid mu-dheireadh, ann an didean bréige, agus cha n-ann anns an t-Slànuighear amhàin.

FATHAMAS (INDULGENCE), AGUS CORR-OBAIR.

C. 182.—Ciod a tha an Ròimh a' teagasg mu fhàthamas, cead-peacachaidh, no comas maitheanas a' thoirt leis an t-sagart?—F.—Tha i ag radh gu'm bheil comas aig an eaglais peanas aimsireil a' pheacaidh a' mhaithheadh, eadhon an uair a tha am peacach anns a' phurgadair.—(*Créud Phiuis IV., EAR. 9.*)

C. 183.—Ciod air am bheil teagasg an fhàthamais so air a shuidheachadh?—F.—Air còrr-obair, agus a-réir sin, thàtar a' smuaineachadh gu'm bheil còrr thoillteanais Chrìosd agus nan Naomh air an gleidheadh ann an ionmhas na h-eaglais, fo làimh a' Phàp' agus a' chuid easbuigean.

C. 184.—Ciod am féum gus am bheilear a' cur an ionmhais spioradail so?—F.—Maitheadh plantan a' phurgadair leis an achd ris an abrar "Fàthamas" (*indulgence*).

C. 185.—Cionnus a' gheibhear am fàthamas so?—F.—Gheibhear è, mar tha Leabhar-cheist Bhutleir ag ràdh, le "ùrnuigh, trasgadh, agus gnìomhran-déirce." A bhàrr orra sin, tha am Pàp o àm gu àm, ag ainmeachadh fhàthamas àraid a dh-fhaodar fhaotuinn, ma nìtear gnìomhran cràbhaidh sònruichte air an son.

¹ Séum. v. 14.—Am bheil neach sam bith tinn 'n'ur measg? cuireadh e fios air seanairibh na h-eaglais; agus deanadh iad ùrnuigh os a' cheann, 'g a' uingadh le h-oladh ann an ainm an Tighearna. R. 15, Agus slànuichidh ùrnuigh a' chreidimh an t-euslan, agus togaidh an Tighearn suas e; agus ma rinn è peacanna, maithear dhà iad.

C. 186.—Ciod ì do bharail air an teagasg ris an abrar *peanas aimsireil* a' pheacaidh?—F.—Gun teagamh, tha an Tighearn gu tric a' smachdachadh a phobuill féin; ach cha n-eil an smachdachadh so mar pheanas diolaidh, ni mò thàtar 'g a shineadh gu taobh thàll na h-uaigne, ach tha è chum naomhachadh a'chreidmhich.¹

C. 187.—Ciamar a dhearbhas tu nach 'eil na creidmhich air an smachdachadh anns a' bheatha a ta ri teachd?—F.—Tha an Sgriobtuir a' teagasg gu'm bheil iad a' dol a chum fois aig a' bhàs.²

C. 188.—Am bheil toillteanas anabarrach air-bith, no tuilleadh 's a' chòir de dh-airidheachd aig na Naoimh?—F.—Cha n-eil. Tha iad air an ainmeachadh, 's a' char a's feàrr, mar "sheirbhisich neo-tharbhach." Cha n-eil deadh thoillteanas idir aca.³

C. 189.—Cionnus a nis a chithear gur teagasg mealltach teagasg nam fàthamas so (*indulgences*)?—F.—Do bhrìgh gu'm bheil an dà bheachd air am bheil è air a shuidheachadh—eadhon, peanas aimsireil an-deigh a' bhàis, agus còrr-obair, calg-dhireach an aghaidh an Sgriobtuir. Air do'n bhunait (a' chlach-bhuinn) a bhi air a toirt air-falbh, tuitidh an aitreabh. Is mòr an eas-onoir so do Chrìod a rinn gach uile ni air ar son, ach tha an teagasg so ag ràdh, gu'm bheil sinn, ann an tomhas, 'g ar tèarnadh féin.

FIREANACHADH.

C. 190.—Ciod è beachd na Ròimh mu fhìreanachadh?—F. Tha a h-innleachd lùbach, dorch, ioma-shuaimeach an so. Tha ì a' teagasg gu'm bheil na sochairean a ta anns an réite a rinn Crìod, air an compàirteachadh ris a' pheacach anns a' bhaisteadh far am bheil, a-réir a beachd-sa, an t-anam air 'aiseag a dh-ionnsuidh an ionracais a bha aige roimh an leagadh. Ach gu'm faod staid shona sin an ionracais a bha air a compàirteachadh leis a' bhaisteadh, a bhi air a càll le peacadh bàsmhor, no air a lughdachadh le peacadh eutrom. Ach tha ullachadh air a dheanamh airson so. Thèid am peacach a dh-ionnsuidh na cathrach-peanais mu'n do labhair sinn cheana, ni è 'fhaosaid ris an t-sagart, agus gheibh è a shaoradh, agus aisigear è a dh-ionnsuidh na staid ionracais anns an robh è air a chur leis a' bhaisteadh, cho fad 's a tha gnothach aig peanas *siorruidh* a' pheacaidh ris a' chùis; ach faodaidh peanas

¹ Eabh. xii. 6.—Oir an ti a's ionmhuinn leis an Tighearn, smachdaichidh se e, agus sgiùrsaidh e gach mac ris an gabh e.

² Lùc. xxiii. 43.—Agus thubhairt Iosa ris, Gu deimhin a ta mi ag ràdh riut, gu'm bi thu maille rium-sa an diugh ann am pàrras. Taib. xiv. 13.—Agus chuala mi guth o nèamh ag ràdh rium, Sgrìobh, is beannaichte na mairbh a gheibh bàs 's an Tighearn d' so a mach: seadh a ta an Spiorad ag ràdh, chum gu'm faigh iad fois o'n saothair; agus leanaidh an oibre iad.

³ Isà. lxiv. 6.—Agus tha sinne uile mar ni truaillidh agus ar n-uile fhìreanachd mar luideig shalaich. Lùc. xvii. 10.—Mar sin sibhse, 'nuair a ni sibh na h-uile nithe a dh'àithneadh dhuibh, abraigb, Is seirbhisich *neo-tharbhach* sinn: oir rinn sinn a *mhàin* an ni bu dligheach dhuinn a dheanamh.

aimsireil a' pheacaidh a bhi roimhe fathast; agus a chum am peanas sin a thoirt air falbh, tha fàthamais air am moladh dha. Faodar peacadh eutrom a thoirt air-falbh a dh-easbhuidh faosaid, le deadh oibribh agus le ùngadh-crìche. Cho tric 's a nithear peacadh, teichidh am peacach gus a' chathair-pheanais agus aisgear è. Ma bhitheas peacadh eutrom, no peanas aimsireil ànn an-deigh a bhàis, bheirear air falbh è anns a' phurgadair! Sin a nis innleachd ioma-lùbach eaglais na Ròimh airson fireanachadh an anama.

C. 191.—Ainmich gach aon fa leth de na mearachdan air am bheil an teagasg so air a shuidheachadh.—F.—(1) Gu'm bheil am baisteadh a' fireanachadh agus ag aiseag an anama 'dh-ionnsuidh a' cheud ionracais. (2) Gu'm beil peacadh ànn nach 'eil bàsmhor, eadar-dhealaichte o pheacadh bàsmhor. (3) Gu'm bheil deadh oibrean an duine toillteanach air duais o Dhia, no 'deanamh rèite airson a chionta. (4) Gu'm faodar fireanachadh a chàll. (5) Gu'n toir fàthamas o'n t-sagart air falbh peanas aimsireil a' pheacaidh. (6) Gu'm bheil peanas aimsireil a' pheacaidh a' dol gu taobh thàll na h-uaigne, no air 'fhulang le neach an-deigh a' bhàis.

C. 192.—Cionnus a chithear nach 'eil am baisteadh a' fireanachadh?—F.—Is è tha an Sgriobtuir a' teagasg dhuinn gur ann tre chreidimh a tha fireanachadh.¹

C. 193.—Am bheil deadh oibrean toillteanach air duais o Dhia?—F.—Cha n'èil.² Is iad deadh oibrean toradh agus cha n-è màthair-aobhair fireanachaidh.³

C. 194.—Nach 'eil an t-Abstol Séumas (caib. ii. 20), ag ràdh gu'm bheil creidimh às éugmhais oibre marbh?—F.—Thà; agus cha n-urrainn an creidimh marbh sin tèarnadh. Thà na deamhain a' creidsinn mar-an-céudna, agus tha iad a criothnachadh. Séum. ii. 19. Is iad oibre maith an toradh a tha 'dearbhadh ionracais a' chreidimh. Ma thèir duine gu'm bheil creidimh aige, agus ma tha a chuid oibrean a' còrdadh ri sin, fireanaichidh a chuid oibrean 'aidmheil—tha iad a' dearbhadh a threibh-dhireis. Is ann mar sin a bha 'chùis a thaobh Abraham. Bha è air fhìreanachadh 'am fianuis dhaoine tre oibribh—'am fianuis Dé, tre chreidimh. Tha am peacach air a theàrnadh gu h-ìomlan tre Chrìosd.

¹ Ròm. v. 1.—Uime sin air dhuinne bhi air ar fireanachadh tre chreidimh, tha sìth againn ri Dia tre ar Tighearn Iosa Crìosd.

² Isà. lxi. 6.—Agus tha sinne uile mar nì truaillidh agus ar n-uile fhìreantachd mar luideig shalaich.

³ Mata vii. 20.—Air an aobhar sin is ann air an toraibh a dh'aithnicheas sibh iad. Ròm. xi. 6.—Agus ma's ann tre ghràs, cha'n ann o oibribh nì's mo; no cha ghràs gràs nì's mo. Ach ma's ann o oibribh, cha'n ann o ghràs á sin suas: no cha'n obair á sin suas obair. 2 Tim. i. 9.—A shaor sinne agus a ghairm sinn le gairm naomh, cha'n ann a réir ar n-oibre, ach a réir a rùin féin, agus a ghràis a thugadh dhuinne ann an Iosa Crìosd, roimh thoiseach an t-saoghail. Tit. iii. 5.—Cha'n ann o oibribh fireantachd a rinn sinne, ach a réir a thròcair féin shaor e sinn, tre ionnlad na h-ath-ghineamhuinn, agus athnuadhachadh an Spioraid naoimh.

C. 195.—An urrainnear fireanachadh a chäll?—F.—Cha n-urrainn. “Cha sgriosar am fìor chreidmheach am feasd.”¹

C. 196.—Cìod ì sligh na slainte matà?—F.—Tha ì amhàin agus gu h-ìomlan tre chreidimh ann an Crìosd a bhàsaich a chum rèite a dheanamh airson cionta. Thug è air-falbh ar peacaidhean. Dh’-ullaich è, le ’ùmhlaichd, fireantachd air ar son. Tha sinn air ar teàrnadh tre chreidimh ànn-san.²

C. 197.—Am bheil deadh thoillteanas ann an creidimh?—F.—Cha n’-eil. Is è tìodhlac Dhé è. Tha sinn air ar teàrnadh tre chreidimh, cha n-ànn air sgàth creidimh. Tha creidimh air a thabhairt duinn o Dhia, agus tha sinne, le làimh a’ chreidimh, a’ deanamh greim air teàrnadh. Is le Crìosd an deadh thoillteanas uile; dhà-san bitheadh a’ ghlòir uile.³

C. 198.—Cìod a’ chrìoch a tha aig ìnnleachd fhìreanachaidh na Ròimh?—F.—Ardachadh an t-sagairt a muigh ’s amach. Leis an ìnnleachd so bheirear air muinntir amharc air gach sochair mar shochair a tha ’tighinn d’an ionnsuidh tre ’n t-sagart amhàin.

(*Ri leantuinn.*)

The late Isabella Murchison, Drumbuie, Lochalsh.

IN the June issue of the Magazine the death of Isabella Murchison was noticed, and a promise given that a further notice would be published next month. We regret that we found it impossible to fulfil that promise then, and we feel that, in order to do anything like justice to the memory of such an eminently pious woman, some more competent hand should have been employed. It is, however, a labour of love on our part to put her name on permanent record.

Isabella Murchison was, like all the other daughters of fallen Eve, born in sin and shapen in iniquity, and she lived in her

¹ Eòin x. 28.—Agus bheir mi a’ bheatha mhaireannach dhoibh; agus cha sgriosar iad am feasd, nì mò a splonas neach air bith as mo làimh iad. R. 29, M’Athair a thug dhomh-sa iad, is mò e na h-uile; agus cha’n urrainn neach air bith an spionadh à làimh m’ Athar. Ròm. viii. 38.—Oir a ta dearbh-bheachd agam nach bi bàs, no beatha, no aingil, no uachdaranachda, no cumhachda, no nithe a ta làthair, no nithe a ta ri teachd. R. 39, No àirde, no doimhne, no creutair sam bith eile, comasach air sinne a sgaradh o ghràdh Dhé a ta ann an Iosa Crìosd ar Tighearn. Philip. i. 6.—Air dhomh bhi dearbhtha as an nì so féin, eadhon an ti a thòisich deadh obair annaibh, gu’n coimhlion e i gu là Iosa Crìosd.

² Gnìomh. xvi. 31.—Agus thubhairt ladsan, Creid anns an Tighearn Iosa Crìosd agus teàrnar thu-féin, agus do thigh. Ròm. iii. 28.—Tha sinn uime sin a’ meas gu’m bheil duine air ’fhìreanachadh tre chreidimh as eugmhaìs oibre an lagha. Ròm. v. 1.—Uime sin air dhuinne bhi air ar fireanachadh tre chreidimh, tha sìth againn ri Dia tre ar Tighearn Iosa Crìosd. Ephes. ii. 8.—Oir is ann le gràs a ta sibh air bhuir teàrnadh, tre chreidimh: agus sin cha’n ann uaibh féin: is e tìodhlac Dhé e. R. 9, Cha’n ann o oibribh, chum nach deanadh neach air bith uail.

³ Taisb. vii. 10.—Agus ghlaodh iad le guth àrd, ag ràdh, Slàinte do ar Dia-ne a ta ’n a shuidhe air an rìgh-chaithir, agus do’n Uan.

early years without God and without hope in the world. Being possessed of a very social disposition and full of carnal mirth, she lived in forgetfulness of her immortal soul's great and everlasting interests. A relation of hers lived some time in the farm called the "Castle," on the north-east side of the island of Raasay. She went to visit him. On a certain Sabbath day a minister came to preach to the south end of the island, and several of the people from the north end went to hear him. When they came to the "Castle," Isabella was not ready to go along with them, but they told her that a Catechist was to address a meeting in the extreme north of the island that day. Thither she went, and during that address the Lord opened her heart, so that she gave heed to the things which were spoken. It proved to have been the day of her espousals to Christ. Ever after that day she became a companion of them who follow Christ through evil and good report. She did not attain to twenty years at this time.

Some time after this never-to-be-forgotten day in her history she heard a sermon preached by Rev. Francis M'Bean from the text, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands." This discourse made an abiding impression on her mind. She told us that she never, before nor after, felt heaven and earth so near each other as she did that day. She told us that she heard another sermon from him about that time also on the text, "For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee." This discourse impressed on her mind the unchangeableness of the covenant of grace, and the Lord's inviolate faithfulness in keeping His promise to the poor sinner that trusts his all to it. Her powerful intellect, savingly enlightened by the Holy Spirit, enabled her to grasp the unchangeableness and faithfulness of God in covenant, so that, like David, she held Him by faith as her strong habitation, whereunto she continually resorted.

She was a great admirer of the Rev. Dr. Kennedy, late of Dingwall, and of the Rev. A. MacColl, late of Lochalsh. Mr. MacColl esteemed her very highly, and took her to be one of his most intimate friends. Indeed, she was considered an outstanding mother in Israel by all the pious ministers, men, and women of discernment in the north during the last fifty years. She was looked up to as a woman of great prudence, both in spiritual and temporal affairs. Her knowledge of the Word of God was comprehensive, accurate, and clear, and she made good use of it. She was not easily imposed upon, for her keen discernment of character enabled her to walk prudently toward them that she considered pious or graceless. The Lord's people had a very warm nook in her affections and prayers, while poor sinners had a large room in her pity and also in her prayers. We have not made the acquaintance of many who had a better understanding of the doctrines and principles of the Free Church of Scotland

than she had, and her faith in them was not based on the words of any man, but on the truth of the living God. Her sagacity in dealing with the godly when Satan's temptations overwhelmed them, was one of her strongest graces. A striking instance occurs to us. A pious man in the parish of Lochcarron had a son who studied for the ministry. At the first General Assembly of the Free Church which he attended he voted for Dr. Rainy's party in the matters that were then rending that Church. When his father heard of it, he took to his bed and became seriously ill. Isabella, hearing of her dear friend's sickness, went a long distance to see him. When she arrived she asked him what was the nature of his trouble. He told her: "I was sure that I had a promise from the Lord that my son would build His house, but I see now that I was deceived, and consequently I was deceived in the promise upon which I rested the salvation of my soul; for I thought I was as sure of the one as of the other." She answered him: "Did the Lord say to you that it would be that son that should build His house? Haven't you other sons?" He answered, "Yes, I have other sons, and the Lord may fulfil His promise to me in one of them." The tempter was vanquished, and the man arose. The Lord did fulfil His promise by raising up another of the man's sons to build His house.

In the year 1893 she was among the first to cast in her lot with Revs. D. Macfarlane and D. Macdonald in forming the Free Presbyterian Church. That deliverance from the heresies and corruption which Dr. Rainy and his followers brought into the Free Church was to her, and to many others, like life from the dead. They rejoiced that they could hold Church fellowship and worship God, in accordance with Christ's institution, set forth in the Scriptures of truth, in a Church freed from Rainy's corruptions. She was present at Raasay the day that congregation decided to adhere to the Rev. D. Macfarlane in having separated from the Declaratory Act Church, in order to maintain the Free Church in all her interests. On the evening of that day one asked her, "What do you think of the position Mr. Macfarlane and this congregation took up to-day?" "I think," she said, "that they have done what was right, and what was their duty. If I were a *man* I would be away to the hill to cut divots in order to build a house for Mr. Macfarlane." She said that to prepare their minds for the eviction out of church and manse which she perceived was sure to follow, for she knew from God's Word that the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel.

In the year 1897 (so far as we can remember) she came south to attend Communion at Glasgow, Greenock, and Kames. This trip to the south extended her knowledge of the Lord's people in these places, and she always asked after their welfare up to the very last. At that time she was lame owing to rheumatism in one of her legs. It worked its way to the small of her back, and left her so helpless that she could hardly go from her bed to a chair.

She suffered a great deal of pain in her back and limbs, but she was fully resigned to the Lord's will. Even in this afflicted condition she came out to Communion Services, and on other occasions by being wheeled in a bath chair, and by making use of two crutches in moving from the chair into the Church. A friend called to see her one morning before she got up, and when he saw the great difficulty with which she passed from her bedroom to her chair, he said to her, "I am very sorry to see you suffer so severely, Isabella." After she got seated on the chair, she said, "I justify the Lord in taking from me the use of my legs on account of the wicked use I made of them in dancing in my young days." Her friend felt such sincerity, contrition, and abhorrence of the sin confessed in her words that he concluded in his own mind that she had reached the bottom of that affliction. So it happened; for the next time he saw her she required neither bath-chair nor crutches—only a light walking staff. She went several times to Communions to Dingwall and Portree after that.

For many years she kept a prayer meeting in her own house, exclusively for women. She continued this meeting as long as she was able to do so. A few of the women in her neighbourhood attended, and they feel now that a precious fountain in the valley has dried up. She never allowed any man to be present at these meetings, for she held with religious care the place God assigns to women in His Church. Her religious convictions and her womanly modesty caused her to abhor the masculine boldness with which women go out of their place to address a meeting of men in the house of God.

She believed that the second Commandment forbids photographs and pictures of men, and consequently she would have none of them. She was asked on one occasion in our presence—"Would you not like to have in your possession the likeness of Dr. Kennedy?" She replied, "I have his likeness in my heart." This may be considered by some to have arisen from ignorance, but we would prefer to place it to the account of a tender conscience. We find that there were such in the Church in the days of the Apostles, and we have an injunction concerning them:—"We, then, that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." The only consideration some would grant to a weak conscience is, "They ought to be educated"; but we think Paul was an excellent teacher, nevertheless; he urged forbearance on the part of the strong.

A small pimple grew on her lip about twelve years ago. At first it did not cause much pain, but year after year it became worse and caused more pain. At last it began to dawn on her own mind and that of others that it might be cancer. During the last three or four years of her life, it became quite evident that it was cancer. She suffered very much with it the last year, but especially toward the end the pain was almost unbearable. But

right through, her resignation to the will of God was very exemplary. It was all in accordance with the Lord's promise—"I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: they shall call on my name, and I will hear them: I will say, It is my people: and they shall say, The Lord is my God." It was the messenger sent to pull down her earthly tabernacle; but she had an house not made with hands eternal in the heavens. To that house she has departed. The breach made is painfully felt by all the Lord's people who knew her, and not only the Church but the world also is much colder after her, for much of the spirit of grace and supplication has been withdrawn from the earth by her removal.

She was one of the truest and most steady friends we have had the privilege of being acquainted with in our day, and in an evil time when iniquity abounds and the love of many waxing cold, she will be sorely missed. She departed this life on Sabbath morning the eighth day of May, and was laid to rest in Balmacarra Churchyard on Tuesday following. Her age would be about eighty-four years. Her body rests there to await the day "in the which all that are in the graves shall hear Christ's voice and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." "But go thou thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of days." N. C.

Letters by the late Donald Mackay, Student, Strathly.

WE expect to publish a series of letters by this godly young man of esteemed memory, who died at the Free Presbyterian Manse, Inverness, on the 2nd August, 1900, and of whom a notice appeared in September of that year.

I.

STRATHLY POINT, 27th December, 1894.

We received your kind and welcome letter yesterday, and were glad to hear from you. What the Lord did in D—— is a cause of thankfulness to all the Church of God in the Highlands. Where the Lord works, who can hinder? How beautiful would the Church be if the Lord would grant her ministers and people to be filled with the Holy Ghost, as they were in the time of the Apostles! I have a little desire just now in prayer for the Church—that the glory of the latter house would be greater than the glory of the former. But O! my coldness of love to Jesus, who was made a curse for His people, that He might redeem them from the curse of the law. May the Lord have mercy on His Church at large, and on us as individuals, and deal with us according to

His riches of mercy in Christ! O that He would send His Holy Spirit, whose office it is to take of the things of Christ and reveal them to His poor people. Then and then only will His people rejoice. Sometimes I feel as if one part of me were drawing heaven-wards, and the other part drawing hell-wards, though often to my sorrow there is little, if any, drawing after holiness.

Now, try and forgive my shortcomings, and pray for me in reality. Christ is precious wherever He is; but no one can know Him but as the Holy Ghost reveals Him, either in His people, in His cause, or in His truth. . . . May you and all the faithful servants of Christ get more and more out of the fulness that is in Him, and when you are getting do not forget a poor sinner. Though this place is poor as to our constraining Christ, spiritually and outwardly, yet a few are showing more sympathy than they were at first doing. Be sure and write soon. We are all in the usual health. Donald Polson was up here the Sabbath before last. He spoke twice in the school, and went to see Murdoch (*the late godly Murdoch Mackay, elder*) at night.

With love.—I am, etc.,

DONALD MACKAY.

Notes and Comments.

The Pope's Encyclical.—The Pope's Encyclical Letter of 26th May, says the *Protestant Alliance Magazine*, has raised a storm of indignation throughout Protestant Germany. Count von Moltke, leader of the Imperial Conservatives, will ask the Government what action it intends to take to prevent a repetition of the Encyclicals of this character so insulting to the Reformation, the reformers, and the Protestant faith, and jeopardising the peace of the country. It is significant of the attitude of the Government that the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* gives great prominence to a hot protest against the Encyclical, characterising the Papal letter as filled with hatred of Protestantism, and marked by gross ignorance of History and of the essence of the German Reformation. The *Deutsche Evangelische Correspondent* (says Reuter) declares that the Pope's reference to "the most degenerate princes and peoples" is an attack upon the ancestors of a Hohenzollern Emperor and upon the German peoples who began the Reformation.

The Power of the Priest in the Sacrifice of the Mass.—Liguori, a Doctor of the Church, and one of Rome's saints, in referring to the power of the priest in the Mass, says:—"But our wonder should be far greater when we find in obedience to the words of the priest, *Hoc est Corpus meum* (This is my body) God Himself descends on the altar, that He comes whenever they call Him, and as often as they call Him, and places himself in their hands even though they should be His enemies. And after having once come He remains entirely at their disposal." Again, Abbe Gaume says of the priest:—"He is a man who, every day,

when he pleases, opens the gates of heaven, and addressing himself to the Son of the Eternal, to the Messiah of the worlds, says to Him: 'Descend from your throne, come!' Docile at the voice of this man, the Word of God, He by whom all things were made, instantly descends from the seat of His glory and incarnates Himself in the hands of this man, and the man says to Him: 'Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee, Thou art my victim,' and he lets himself be immolated by this man, placed where he wills, given to whom he chooses."

These are not the random utterances of irresponsible theologians, but of men high in the esteem of the Church of Rome. Neither are these sentiments in books that Rome does not acknowledge, but in those bearing her imprimatur. Surely the words of the Royal Declaration are not too strong when it describes the Mass, which raises the priesthood to such daringly blasphemous heights, as superstitious and idolatrous.

Acknowledgments.—Mr. Angus Clunas, 18 Ardconnel Terrace, Inverness, acknowledges, with thanks, 10/- from Mrs. Stewart, Latheron, for Sustentation Fund; and £3 3s. from Mrs. Gibb, Weston Super-Mare, for Foreign Mission Fund.

Memoir and Sermons by the late Rev. D. Macdonald, Shieldaig.—Copies of this interesting and spiritually instructive book are still to be had from the author, Rev. D. Macfarlane, F.P. Manse, Dingwall—price 2/-, postage 3d. extra.

Correction.—At foot of page 143 in August number, the words, "Faith does war after the flesh," should read, "Faith does not war," etc.

We regret to have to hold over till next month, "Recollections of Betsy Lindsay," a sketch of late Miss Manson, Wick, and other articles.

Church Notes.

Communion.—Ullapool (Ross), Stratherrick (Inverness), and Vatten (Skye), first Sabbath of September; Strathy (Sutherland), and Finsbay (Harris), second; Applecross (Ross), Stoer (Sutherland), and Tarbert (Harris), third; Laide (Ross), fourth. John Knox's, Glasgow (Hall, 2 Carlton Place, South-side), first Sabbath of October.

A Book Gift.—Rev. Alexander Robertson, D.D., Venice, has kindly sent a copy of his recent book, "The Papal Conquest," to the Church Library of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

Donation to the Sustentation Fund.—Mr. Angus Clunas, 18 Ardconnel Terrace, Inverness, General Treasurer of the Free Presbyterian Church, acknowledges with cordial thanks a donation of £100 by Alexander Ross, Esq., Ormskirk, England, who has contributed same with a view to supply the deficiency in the

salaries of ministers and missionaries at last Whitsunday, as stated in the Synod Report. The Church, we may add, is much indebted to Mr. Ross, under the Most High, for this generous gift.

License of Divinity Student.—Mr. Andrew Sutherland, divinity student, Dornoch, after examination, was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Western Presbytery, on Tuesday the 26th July.

Reply to Synod's Address to the King.—The loyal Address to the King, signed by the Moderator and Clerk of Synod, was forwarded, according to the usual order, to Lord Pentland, the Secretary of State for Scotland, and the following reply has been received by the Clerk:—

“SCOTTISH OFFICE,
WHITEHALL, 30th July, 1910.

SIR,—I am commanded by the King to convey to the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland His Majesty's thanks for the expressions of sympathy with His Majesty and the Royal Family on the occasion of the lamented death of His late Majesty, King Edward the Seventh, contained in their loyal and dutiful Address, which I have had the honour to lay before His Majesty. —I am, Sir, your obedient Servant, (Signed) PENTLAND.”

The Magazine.

Subscriptions Received for Magazine.—Rev. P. Clarkson, Aberfeldy, 2/6; M. Macleod, Achmelvich, Lochinver, 5/; J. Mackay, Milton, North Dakota, U.S.A., 2/6, and donation, 1/7; D. M'Donald, Glaster, Kilfinan, by Invergarry, 4/; Miss A. Macleod, Ayr, 2/6; J. Macleod, Lairg, 13/3; H. M'Kinnon, Seaforth Hd., Stornoway, 2/6; Miss K. Macleod, Cathcart, Glasgow, 2/6; N. Macdonald, M. Quarter, Lochmaddy, 5/; Miss Mackenzie, Castle Levan, Gourrock, 2/6; J. M'Cuish, 30 Northton, S. Harris, 2/6; Rev. D. Mackenzie, Gairloch, 3/11; J. Adamson, Helmsdale, 3/; Mrs. M'Lennan, Dallas, Forres, 5/; D. M'Dougall, Grantown-on-Spey, 5/6; J. Fraser, Carnoch, Strontian, 2/6, and donation, 4/; A. M'Donald, Scouriemore, 2/6; D. Mackay, Eigg, 2/6; A. Ross, Ormskirk, donation, 10/, and Free Circulation, 10/; A. Macleod, Achmelvich, Lochinver, 2/6; N. Shaw, Eilean Anabich, Harris, 2/6; Mrs. Urquhart, Cullicudden, Resolis, 2/6; G. Souter, Dingwall, 13/1½; F. M'Rae, Scourie, 2/6; D. Beaton, Tatu, Ongarue, New Zealand, 3/4; D. R. Niven, Wellington, New Zealand, 7/6; G. Fletcher, Lochgilphead, 2/6; Mrs. D. Maclean, Borve, Portree, 2/6; H. Livingstone, Kentra, Acharacle, 5/; W. M'Gillivray, Gorthlick, 23/3; Miss Mackay, Halkirk, 21/8; Sergt. M'Innes, Dunvegan, Skye, 2/6; Miss J. Nicolson, Dalmuir, 4/; K. Kemp, Cullicudden Schoolhouse, Canon Bridge, 2/6; Miss K. Mackenzie, Achdlochian, Achiltibuie, 2/6; M. Beaton, Dunhallin, Waternish, 2/5; Angus Beaton, Kelso Station, Saskatchewan, 4/, “to help Magazine”; H. Brown, Craw, Lochranza, 2/6; A. Macdougall, Bayhead, Lochmaddy, 5/; Mrs. Mackintosh, Tordarroch Mains, Daviot, 5/; D. M'Lennan, Laide, Ross, 2/6; Miss C. M'Leod, Inver, Lochinver, 2/6; Mrs. J. Graham, Lochinver, 2/6; K. M'Lean, Otangiwai, New Zealand, 3/; J. D. Kidd, Lawrence, Clarence River, N.S.W., 7/6; Miss M'Lachlan, Laurel Bank, Grafton, N.S.W., 5/; J. Mathers, Marton, New Zealand, 3/9; D. Macdonald, Virginia, U.S.A., bound vol., 3/4.

(*Notice of a few Subscriptions is held over till next month.*)