



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 SHORTER CATECHISM AND THE WORD OF GOD, - - -	41
A SERMON. By the Rev. Christopher Love, - - -	45
THE ALLEGED SUPREMACY OF PETER. By the Rev. D. Beaton, Wick, -	55
EXPOSITORY NOTE. By the Rev. John R. Mackay, M.A., Inverness, -	65
RECOLLECTIONS OF BETSY LINDSAY, - - - - -	67
AN GUNNART A THA ANN AN DAIL, - - - - -	71
PROTESTANT NOTES, - - - - -	74
NOTES AND COMMENTS, - - - - -	75
CHURCH NOTES, - - - - -	78
THE MAGAZINE, - - - - -	79

N. ADSHEAD & SON,

Printers and Bookbinders,

11 and 92 UNION STREET, GLASGOW.



PRICE TWOPENCE.

THE

Free Presbyterian Magazine

And MONTHLY RECORD.

VOL. XVI.

JUNE, 1911.

No. 2.

The Shorter Catechism and the Word of God.

MANY of those men in Presbyterian Churches who have adopted in recent times the unbelieving theory of partial inspiration—that the Scriptures are partly inspired of God and partly not—have been exceedingly anxious to find some expression in the ancient documents of the Church, such as the Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, that would afford apparent support to their view. Apparent, we say, for it is impossible to find in documents whose authors were, beyond contradiction, thorough believers in the verbal inspiration of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, anything that was really designed to uphold a contrary opinion. Misconstruction, however, is a weapon that unjust controversialists have made use of in all ages, and it has been freely employed by modern errorists in regard to one or two passages in the subordinate standards of faith and practice drawn up by the Westminster divines.

The case of misconstruction to be presently noticed has reference to the Shorter Catechism and God's Word. The second Question and Answer of this well-known and highly-esteemed compendium of sound doctrine run as follows: "What rule hath God given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him? A. The word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him." "Now," say those who hold that the Bible is only partly inspired, "there is a distinction here recognised between the Scriptures and the word of God 'contained' therein. The word of God is *in* the Scriptures, but the whole Scriptures are not the word of God." This is the unjustifiable inference they draw from the use of the expression; "contained in," and they throw out their own misconstruction as if the framers of the Catechism held the view expressed in it, when nothing—as we shall see—can be farther from the truth in the matter.

In ascertaining the precise meaning of any particular sentence in a book or other document, it is always essential, first, to study the context in which the sentence occurs. A sentence, wrenched from its context, may be sometimes made to convey ideas entirely alien to the author's meaning. It is, secondly, desirable to study other books or documents, if such there be, that are directly related to the work in question, and are capable of casting light upon its contents. In the present case both these rules may be used with advantage.

Let us, first, observe the context of the Question, consisting of the proof-text taken from Scripture on the point at issue, and found in Catechisms with proofs at the foot of the page. It is as follows: "2 Tim. iii. 16—All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." "All Scripture" is here declared to be given by divine inspiration. It is perfectly plain, therefore, from the proof-text that the writers of the Catechism did not use the words "contained in" in any sense that implied that any part of the Scriptures was not divinely inspired. They believed, upon infallible testimony, that all, from first to last, was the word of God.

Let us, secondly, notice the statements of the Confession of Faith and the Larger Catechism, as relative documents composed by the same divines. These prove beyond doubt that they believed that the Scriptures are throughout the word of God, and that they consequently employed the expression, "the word of God which is contained in the Scriptures," in a sense entirely harmonious with this belief. (1) The Confession of Faith. See first chapter, section 4, "The Holy Scripture . . . is the word of God"; section 5, "The Holy Scripture . . . doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God." All the books of the Old and New Testaments, as we have them in our version, are included, and "the books commonly called Apocrypha" are expressly excluded. (2) The Larger Catechism, of which the Shorter Catechism is a brief summary. See Question 3, "What is the word of God? Answer, The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the word of God, the only rule of faith and obedience." Nothing can be more explicit on the point than this. The word of God is not merely in the Scriptures; the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God. It stands to reason and common sense that the Shorter Catechism, which is a brief compendium of the larger work by the same hands, ought to be viewed in the light of the fuller and more explanatory document when any doubtful question is raised. The conclusion in the present case is unmistakable.

The question may now be asked as to why this particular phrase, "contained in," capable of a double meaning, was used at all. To this it may be answered:—

(1) The expression was suitable in itself to set forth the fact

that "the word of God," which had been communicated to the prophets and apostles, was embodied and comprehended in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments—and not also in the Church or councils, as Papists say.

(2) It is impossible for the wisest of men to foresee all the misconstructions that subsequent generations may put on their words. The Bible itself, given by infinite wisdom, is misinterpreted by thousands of people. It was very far, no doubt, from the minds of the Westminster divines to think that any would ever credit them here with the opinion that any part of Scripture was not "the word of God," seeing they had given most definite expression in other collateral documents of their conviction that the whole Bible was the word of God.

(3) These divines, in the Confession of Faith, use the word "contained" in a case directly connected with that under notice, and one where it is impossible to suggest that there is something more "contained" than is actually mentioned. (See chapter i., section 2.) "Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the word of God written, are now *contained* all the books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these"; and here follows a list of the books as they stand in our version. It is thus stated that these books are "contained," or as it might be expressed, comprehended, "under the name of Holy Scripture, or the word of God written," but no one can possibly infer that some other books are also contained under these names. Such an inference would be in direct contradiction to what is explicitly affirmed. Still the inference, however absurd, might be made if the unwarrantable mode of reasoning inflicted on the Shorter Catechism were applied to this case. The use, therefore, of the expressions "contained in" or "under" does not necessarily imply that something else is also contained. It may mean absolutely nothing of the kind.

(4) In addition to all this we make bold to say that, although the expression in the Shorter Catechism—"the word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only rule to direct us," etc.—should refer to a part and not the whole of the Scriptures, it does not necessarily follow that it implies that the remaining part is not, in the strict sense, "the word of God." The only conceivable view under which the framers of the Shorter Catechism might, in this particular question, be referring only to certain parts of God's Word, is that the question is not "What is the word of God?"—(Question 3 in Larger Catechism)—but "What *rule* hath God given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him?" Now, it is admitted and held by all sound divines that, while the Holy Scriptures, from Genesis to Revelation, are the Word of God—an inspired and infallible account of all God has been pleased to put on record—yet that everything that has been recorded is not a positive rule as to how we may glorify and enjoy Him. The ceremonial law in all its details is certainly as much a part of "the Word of God

written" as the Sermon on the Mount, but it is not a "rule" for us now under the new dispensation. The sayings and doings of wicked men and devils form a part of the infallible record of God's Word, but they are not a "rule" for us to follow. The present writer does not affirm that the Westminster divines had this point in view in the second Question of the Shorter Catechism, for it may be asserted, on the other hand, that the whole Bible, taken in the mutual connection of its parts, forms a rule for us how we may glorify and enjoy God—instructing and warning where it does not positively direct. All that he contends for is that, although the above should be proved to be the meaning of the expression, "the word of God contained in the Scriptures," it by no means carries the inference of modern errorists that some parts of Scripture are not "the word of God," and so are marked by mistakes and errors.

The Confession of Faith and the Larger Catechism definitely settle this question as against the new theologians, and the whole discussion only shows how unscholarly, unscientific, and unjust these men can be, notwithstanding their boast of superior learning and enlightenment, in the interpretation of historic documents, when it suits their own unworthy purposes.

Important Antiquarian Discoveries at Jerusalem.—Reuter's Agency has received further details of the discoveries made in Jerusalem by the British expedition which has been working there for two seasons. Archæological experts in Jerusalem consider them the most important ever made. During the whole period of operations Mount Ophel has been the objective, this being regarded as the site of ancient Zion. The object of the excavations was to discover the burial places of David and Solomon. The first season did not yield anything very important, but last season's work was more fruitful. The expedition established its headquarters in a native house in the village of Siloam, near the site of the excavations, and the usual plan was for the British leaders to set off every morning accompanied by their English gangers and to work until sunset. Before the tunnels had been driven very far under the hill, the expedition discovered a number of natural caves, situated at a slightly higher level than the tunnel itself, and after a quantity of *debris* had been removed human bodies were found lying on natural shelves of rock. These were clearly the remains of the Jebusites who had been buried before Jerusalem was taken by King David, and were probably of the date of 3000 B.C. There were indications that the bodies had merely been laid on their rock slabs without any covering except a few stones. This was probably one of the earliest forms of burial discovered. In an adjoining cavern the excavators found Jebusite pottery of the same period, which gave evidence of a very high state of civilisation, quite equal to that of the Israelites of perhaps 2000 years later.

A Sermon.

BY THE REV. CHRISTOPHER LOVE,
One of the Presbyterian Ministers of London in the
Seventeenth Century.*

~~~~~  
"But rather fear him who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell."  
MATTHEW x. 38.  
~~~~~

BELOVED, you may remember I have preached ten sermons upon the glorified condition of the saints in heaven. It is now in my thoughts to speak of the tormented condition of the damned in hell, that if the former sermons about glory have not gained your affections, this of hell might startle your consciences. Ministers, as having a mixed people, must mix their doctrine, somehow with comfort and sometimes with terror. You have heard ten sermons upon the former text; you may haply hear so many more upon this subject. Before I can give you the sense of the text I must give you the scope of the chapter, which lies thus: Jesus Christ, having called his twelve disciples together, and given them a commission to preach the Gospel throughout the regions of Judea and (as a confirmation of their doctrine) to work all manner of miracles, and cure all manner of diseases, and dispossess devils, yet knowing (verse 16) "that they must go as silly sheep among ravenous wolves," and what persecution and opposition you should meet with in the world in carrying on the great work of promoting the Gospel, therefore labours to prop up the hearts of His people by four several arguments in this chapter.

1. The first argument is in verses 19 and 20: "They shall bring you before governors for my name's sake; but take no thought what you shall say, for it shall be given you in the same hour." As if Christ should say, you shall be called before courts of judicature for my name's sake for preaching my Gospel, but do not study what you shall plead for yourselves, for my Spirit shall dictate to you what you shall say; and so (Luke xxi. 15) you have the same phrase—"They should have a mouth and wisdom given them" to make their defence, and to vindicate the Gospel in their hands.

* "Christopher Love was successively minister of St. Anne's, Aldersgate, and St. Lawrence, Jewry, in London. He was a man of fervent piety, eloquent and popular as a preacher, and respected and beloved for his excellent Christian character. He is the author of various works on practical divinity." See sketch of his wife, by the Rev. James Anderson, in "Memorable Women of the Puritan Times." Mr. Love seems to have been a vigorous preacher of the terrors of the law as well as of the grace of the Gospel. The present discourse is the first of a series which he preached with a view to awaken consciences at ease in Zion, and to preserve God's people from carnal security.—ED.

2. Another argument He brings is this, that though they should meet with troubles in the flesh, yet Christ should save their souls (verse 22); if they do suffer in their bodies, their soul shall be saved; "for he that endures to the end shall be saved."

3. That before they had preached in every city Christ promised them to come in the blessing of His Spirit to make their spirit efficacious for the conversion of souls (Matt. xvi. 28). Some say it is meant till Jerusalem be destroyed, but Calvin understands it of His giving the Spirit (verse 23).

4. He bears them up with this comfort—that Jesus Christ was partner with them in suffering. Now, they must not expect to be above Christ—above their Master (verse 24). "The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord;" it is enough to be as he is. As if He should say: Do not be discouraged; I, your Lord and Master, suffered and must suffer more; I must suffer death. Therefore be not discouraged, for the disciple is not above his Lord.

5. And then another argument is in my text. Be not afraid, because the power of your enemies is limited. All your enemies can do shall only reach the body but never hurt your souls. Fear not him that can kill the body but not kill the soul; so telling them whom they should and whom they should not fear. "But fear him who is able to cast both body and soul into hell."

Thus I have brought you to the words, I shall now give you the sense.

"But rather fear him."—This word, rather, is not to be taken in a comparative sense—you may fear men, but you must fear God more; but is an adversative particle—you are not to fear men at all, but God alone.

"But rather fear him that can kill both body and soul." "Kill" in this place is not to be taken for the annihilation or destroying of the body, but for a continual tormenting of body and soul under the wrath of God to all eternity. And so is expounded by Luke (xii. 5). "Who is able to cast both body and soul into hell," that is, to destroy both soul and body. It were well for the damned if the soul and body, in that sense, should be destroyed so as to be annihilated; and the reason why both body and soul are mentioned is because the body hath been the partner with the soul in sin, and therefore shall be sharer with it in punishment.

"Fear him that can destroy both soul and body in hell." Hell, in Scripture, admits of a four-fold signification.

1. It is taken for the grave; (Psalm xvi. 10), "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, nor suffer thy Holy One to see corruption," that is, Christ should not lie and rot in the grave, but He should rise again. And so the Apostle Peter makes mention of this prophecy, that He should not see corruption nor be left in the grave (Acts ii. 31, 32). This he spake of His resurrection from the dead. Again,

2. Hell, in Scripture, is taken for the belly of the whale into

which Jonah was cast. So the phrase is (Jonah ii. 2), "Out of the belly of hell I cried unto the Lord, and he heard me." Out of the belly of hell! Jonah was never in hell, but the belly of the whale was called hell, because a dark place, as hell is. But you must not take it in this sense neither. But,

3. Hell, in Scripture, is taken for the devil himself or his malignant spirits. So (James iii. 6), "The tongue of man is set on fire by hell"—not hell as the place, but the devil in hell. The devil in hell doth kindle the fire of an enraged and passionate spirit. The tongue is set on fire by the devil of hell.

4. Hell is taken in Scripture for the place of the damned, where God doth torture and torment to all eternity the souls and bodies of all reprobate men in the world. In this sense it is frequent in Scripture, as Matthew v. 29, Luke xii. 5, and xvi. 23; and in this place it is thus taken. "Fear him that can cast both body and soul into hell," that is, into that place of torment which the Lord, to all eternity, reserves for the punishment and torment of all ungodly men and women. Thus I have opened the phrase, "into hell."

The word that is here rendered "hell" is from the Hebrew word *gehinnom*, which signifies the valley of Hinnon. It was a valley near Jerusalem, which was possessed by Hinnom or his son (Joshua xv. 8; Neh. xi. 30). Hell is called in Scripture after the name of this place, in allusion to it, because in this valley the idolatrous Jews set up an idol called Molech, which was made of brass in the form of a man, hollow within, wherein the Jews kindled a fire. Then the children were put within the bands of the idol and so burnt. The Jews thought that the father which delivered one of his children to this idol should have a blessing and a comfort of all his other children. Now, from hence the Greek word comes, and carries an allusion to this place, that as there was a continual fire in that idol, and continual shrieking and crying, so shall it be in those fiery torments of hell. The story is at large (2 Chron. xxxiii. 6; 2 Kings xvi. 3; 2 Chron. xxviii. 3; Jer. vii. 31; Jer. xxxii. 35; Levit. xviii. 21). Good King Josiah destroyed this place (2 Kings xxiii. 10). And thus, having laid open the words, nothing lies in my way but to give you the observations the text will bear. And there are two observations which I shall draw from these words.

First, from the context, "but rather fear him." Observe hence, *Doct. 1.*—That the fear of God doth fence the heart against the fear of man. The more you fear God, the less you will fear men; (Isaiah viii. 13), "Fear not their fear, but sanctify the Lord in your hearts; let him be your fear, and let him be your dread." But this point I pass, because I only intend, in the handling of this subject, to set before you the torments of the damned in hell, which haply may awaken some drowsy consciences, and I am sure may much heighten the joy of believers, that are delivered from these hellish torments. The observation therefore that will engross the sum and substance of this text is this,

Doct. 2.—That the consideration of this—that God has an absolute power over men and women, to cast their bodies and souls into hell—should work an awful fear of God in the hearts of His own people. This is the point, and a point that carries a great deal of dread and terror with it. Before, therefore, I shall come distinctly to handle the doctrine, I must necessarily lay down reasons why I preach upon this terrible subject, and then answer some objections that may be raised against the preaching of so dreadful a doctrine as this is.

First.—The reasons why I handle this are four.

(1) I handle it now because I have so largely handled the glory of the elect in heaven, for the comfort of the godly. Now I shall speak of the torments of hell for the punishment of the wicked, that so, if the glory of the elect have not allured your affections, the hearing of the torment of the damned in hell might startle your consciences and awaken you out of your security.

(2) I handle it lest any of you should grow secure and presumptuous in nourishing ungrounded hopes of glory, expecting to be in glory with Jesus Christ, upon the former sermons. Lest you should thus vainly hope, I deemed it meet to conjoin this subject with it, that so you might be equally poised from presumption on the one hand and despair on the other.

(3) Because it is a doctrine so little preached and so little writ of in these days. I know but only one book in English writ upon this subject, by Mr. Bolton, and very few in Latin. And therefore being so useful a subject—useful for the wicked and useful for the godly—and yet so little handled, and now-a-days much cried down and much cried against, this reason also put me upon this doctrine.

(4) I handle this doctrine because I am persuaded did many men know distinctly the torments of hell, they would never walk in a way of sin that leads to hell, so as they do. I do persuade myself were this doctrine of hell well studied and better known by the people, they would take more care to avoid hell and gain glory than they do. Did men but know that they who live and die unrepenting, and lie burning in their lusts, shall one day burn in fire; did they but know that they that can swallow bowls of wine, and drink to excess, shall one day drink draughts of brimstone in hell; did men but know that they that grind their teeth, through hatred and indignation, against the godly here, shall one day gnash their teeth in hell hereafter; did men but know that they that oppress the people of God by persecution, and hale them into prison now, shall one day be dragged into an everlasting prison, and haled by devils into hell; that those who could not endure the company of saints on earth should be with devils and damned spirits in hell—did men but know this doctrine well, they would not be so profane and sinfully wicked as they are now-a-days. But the want of the study of this point doth open a gap to the world of profaneness. And therefore for these reasons I resolved to treat a little upon this subject.

Secondly.—Now there are two objections why men should not preach upon such a subject as this is.

1. Some will say this is legal preaching. To cast flashes of hell fire about the congregation; this is not to preach the Gospel, but the law. To take off this, therefore, I shall speak four things by way of answer.

(1) Surely Jesus Christ was no legal preacher, yet He preached this doctrine, for these are Christ's own words; and therefore preaching of hell and the torments thereof cannot justly be called legal preaching, because Jesus Christ, the Minister of the new covenant, was the Person that most of all preached of hell. And it is observable that neither the apostles nor all the evangelists preached so much of hell as Jesus Christ did. Jesus Christ hath seven particular texts of hell and the torments of the damned, which the apostles never had. And therefore I say this is not legal preaching, seeing it is the doctrine of Jesus Christ Himself.

(2) It is the great policy of the devil touzzle men in security in their sins; to have all soul-searching preaching, and sin-reproving preaching, all conscience-awakening, duty-pressing preaching—to have all such doctrines as these called legal preaching. It is the great policy of the devil to put so bad a name on so good a work.

(3) If preaching of terror be legal preaching, then the law was more preached in the New Testament than ever it was under the Old. I make it appear thus. There are more terrible and dreadful doctrines scattered up and down in the New Testament than in the Old. It is a note of Chrysostom that in all the Old Testament the word "damnation" was never used, but is used thirteen times in the New. And it is observable further that, in the Old Testament, though the word "hell" is often used, yet it is most commonly used for the grave and not for the place of the damned; but in the New Testament, unless in two places, hell is altogether taken for the place of the damned. Therefore it is clear to every eye that the Gospel is more backed with terror and with the doctrines of hell and damnation than ever the law was. The preaching of the law hath only anathema, but the Gospel hath maranatha also. Therefore all they that are of the Antinomian error—that cry down pressing duty, as preaching the law—much deceive themselves; for Christ Himself and the apostles and the evangelists all preached more of terror than any of the prophets ever did.

(4) Whereas it is said that preaching of terror is legal preaching, I say this, that sermons of terror have done more good* upon unconverted souls than sermons of comfort ever have done; sermons of hell have kept many out of hell. I have read often of Mr. Throgmorton that he was converted by a sermon of terror

* We understand Mr. Love to mean "good" in a way of arresting and awakening—stopping sinners on the broad way to perdition.

upon that text: "How shall you escape the damnation to come?" I have heard of another famous divine that tells us he was converted by that text: "Christ preaching to the spirits in prison." I have heard of Mr. Greenham, a famous minister, that hearing a sermon of the last judgment, and the torments of the damned, proved his conversion and first call. I have read of other ancient authors. Hierom tells himself: "Whether I eat or drink," saith he, "I hear a voice sounding in my ears, Arise, arise, you dead, and come to judgment." And this very sound converted him, and so many more. Beloved, doctrines of terror God hath more sanctified for the conversion of souls than any other doctrine in the world. And therefore it is observable of John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, and that made way for Christ, that the first sermon that he preached was a sermon of terror and wrath to come—"Ye generation of vipers, who hath forewarned you to flee from the wrath to come?" And so this was the second sermon that ever Christ preached, and here He preaches a terrible sermon of hell. "Let us not flee sermons concerning hell," saith Gregory, "that we may flee hell."

2. But it may be some will object and say, "Indeed, preaching of hell is lawful, but preaching of Christ's love and preaching of free grace are more winning subjects, and they are doctrines more to be built upon; and the doctrines more to refresh and cheer the people of God. These doctrines do more gain upon men than such terrible doctrines do." To which objection likewise, I entreat you, take these five things by way of answer.

(1) It is true indeed, were all our hearers converted, doctrines of grace and doctrines of love and comfort might be most for edification; but seeing we have to deal with a mixed people our doctrines must be mixed also, else we shall never profit.

(2) It is true indeed, were all men's natures alike—that all men were of a soft and tender disposition—that all men were troubled in mind and under a sense of God's wrath—then we should preach only love and only grace, to bear up their heart; for *ingenium potius ducitur quam trahitur*.^{*} But when the Scripture tells us the tempers of men are different—some men of a soft disposition, others of a knotty and rough spirit—some will be won with mercy, others not without judgment. The Scripture telling us the tempers of men are various, our doctrines must be different also—sometimes of mercy, sometime of judgment—that as sermons of love will win upon soft hearts, so doctrines of terror must be for knotty spirits. (Jude 22, 23), "On some have compassion, making a difference; and others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating the garment spotted with the flesh." Some, saith the apostle, you must show compassion to and preach love and kindness to, but others you must save with fire, that is, show them hell-fire, and terrify them with the fear of God's wrath. Some

* The mind is better led than driven.

men are more yielding and more tender; these must be dealt with in meekness. Others that are more stout-hearted sinners must be saved with fear, pulling them out of the fire of hell. That is my second answer. Some men's natures are rather led than driven, yet others are so stout and knotty that nothing but flashes of hell-fire will make their consciences startle.

(3) To those that plead so much for doctrines of free grace and strains of comfort, and must not have such points of terror preached unto them, I answer, man's nature is more apt to abuse doctrines of free grace (though these must be preached in their season) than they are to abuse these doctrines of terror and of wrath to come. This Jude tells us (Jude 3), "They turn the grace of God into wantonness." And the Apostle Paul raised the objection, "Shall we sin because grace abounds? God forbid"; implying that some men did make it their practice that, because grace did abound, they would abound in sin.

(4) How can a minister discharge his conscience to God that he hath preached to his people the whole counsel of God, if in the course of his ministry he shall run only upon strains of free grace and Christ's love and doctrines of comfort? What are doctrines of terror? Are they not the will of God, to be preached as well as comfort?

(5) Those men that have cried so much to have preaching upon strains of love and of free grace, I am sure, as some manage the matter, have hardened more souls than ever they have converted by those sermons. For my part, beloved, I know not one man that hath been converted by these new teachers that pretend more light than their brethren, and pretend to hold Christ more clearly forth than their brethren. I do not see holiness shining in their lives above others. Whereas I am sure those that did preach mixed doctrines—sometimes fear and sometimes love, sometimes strains of wrath, sometimes of grace—did most work upon the consciences of their hearers. I have read of Mr. Hildersham, a minister at Ashby-de-la-Zouch, a most terrible preacher, and it is said God gave him more success to his ministry for the conversion of souls than to all the ministers about the country besides. And when Paul preached a sermon of judgment to come, it made the heart of Felix to tremble; it made the great man's heart tremble to hear of judgment. And we find in Scripture that as God had His Barnabases (sons of consolation), so He had His Boanergeses (sons of thunder), to make the stout hearts of people to tremble. And thus, lest any seduced heart should be carried away to think all this legal, I deemed it meet to make this apology in entering upon this subject. Remember the doctrine—that the consideration of this, that God hath an absolute power over men and women, to cast both into hell, should work in God's own children an awful fear of God.

In the handling of this dismal subject I have fifteen queries to go over: as (1) I shall inquire whether there be a hell or no; (2)

Why there must be a hell to receive the souls of wicked men ; (3) What this hell is ; (4) Whether there be degrees of torment in hell ; etc.

1. Whether there be a hell or no.—And to answer this I shall make it appear from the confession of heathens that had only the glimmerings of nature, and never saw the Bible ; and secondly from the testimony of Scripture.

(1) From the confession of heathens. Though they could not tell distinctly (as never being acquainted with the Word), yet by the glimmering light of nature, they had some fancies and apprehensions of this place of the damned. Virgil tells us, *Facilis descensus Averni*, etc. (*Æneid*, line 6).

Therefore they had one called Pluto (that was the chief person in hell) which chiefly did torment them that were most wicked. And they had their Charon's boats—a fancy that there was a man with a boat that ferried over wicked persons into hell ; and they had their *Ætna*, their burning mountains, which they fancied to be hell. And they fancied hell to be a continual rolling of stones upon dead bodies ; with many other fancies. And so Pluto had many footsteps of hell, that, saith he, if a man had no punishment after he is dead, he shall have somewhat of guiltiness in him to torture and torment him. All these were merely apprehensions of hell. But these I pass.

(2) As you have a testimony from heathen, so you have this truth clearly from Scripture also ; to name two or three texts—(Deut. iii. 2), “I will kindle a fire in mine anger, and it shall burn to the lowest hell.” (So Psalm ix. 18), “The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the people that forget God.” (So Psalm xi. 6), “Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire, and brimstone, and a horrible tempest.” (So Matt. xxiii. 33), “Ye serpents and generation of vipers, how can you escape the damnation of hell ?” (So Peter ii. 3, 4), “He cast them down to hell. They are locked up in chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment.” (So Jude 6), “They are reserved in everlasting chains of darkness to the judgment of the great day.” All which do plainly prove that there is a hell. But now,

2. Why there must be a hell.—It appears by these demonstrations.

(1) Because of the filthy nature of sin. Sin is against an infinite God, and the offence being infinite, the punishment must be infinite also. But the punishment cannot be infinite upon earth, because we stay here but a while, and our bodies rot in the grave ; therefore, of necessity, there must be a hell that must keep the bodies and souls of the wicked, that so they may receive proportionable punishment to the sins they committed here upon earth.

(2) Because else the justice of God could never be satisfied for the sins of the wicked men here done upon earth. And the reason is [1] Because Christ would not satisfy and suffer God's

wrath for wicked men; therefore they must bear it themselves. [2] Upon earth they cannot satisfy God's wrath. Why? Because sin being an infinite offence, their punishment here can be but finite, lasting for a time. Therefore all their sufferings here cannot satisfy God's wrath which is due to them for their sins; therefore, of necessity, there must be a hell to keep men to all eternity, that by their everlasting torments God's justice might be satisfied, which otherwise it could not be. (2 Thes. i. 5.)

(3) It appears there must be a hell by those horrors and terrors of conscience that are in wicked men when they are dying. Many a man in his health will "tush" at hell; he will scorn the fire and scoff at the flames. Many a man, when he is in his health, never thinks of hell, but he can drink one day, swear another day, play the adulterer the third day, and sin every day, and the thoughts of hell never trouble him. But now bring this man to his sick-bed, and what horrors and fears seize upon his soul! Should I appeal from a healthful drunkard to himself when dying—(as one said he would appeal from King Philip drunk to King Philip sober, who thereupon did repeal his act and did the man justice)—thou who by thy sinning hast spent thy strength and estate in drink, and dost not think of hell when thou art drunk, I would appeal to thee, a dying man, and tell me what wouldst thou say then? What wouldst thou then give for a Christ? What wouldst thou then give for a pardon, that thou mightest not be damned? The very horrors and wounds of conscience at thy dying day doth demonstrate that there is a time of torments to be endured by thee; else how could conscience be so terrible a vexation to the souls of men at that day, were there not such a thing as hell provided for them? What made the Roman emperors to be afraid of death, and when it thundered to run under their beds for fear of death? Only this, that the very workings of conscience showed them something was to come after this life. The very terrors of conscience declare there is a hell, a place of torment, provided for wicked men.

And thus having finished these queries, the use I shall make shall be for condemnation and astonishment.

1. It shall be for condemnation—a condemnation to all them that hold there is no such thing as hell. The Photinians hold there is no hell, but that which we call hell is the annihilation of the body; that man is brought to nothing, and no other. There are fifteen sorts of heretics, an author writes of, that deny a hell; and amongst the rest, one called Empecta was held by Barba, the wife of Sigismundus, the emperor, who gave her followers money to hold this opinion, that she might have their consciences seared up in sensuality and lustful pleasure. This truth condemns all them that have their consciences seared so as to deny there is a hell.

2. This is for astonishment. To whom? Why, to all you that add sin to sin, and drunkenness to thrift, and one provocation to

another, as if there were neither a heaven for the godly nor a hell for you. You that are like Sardanapalus, say, *Ede, bibe, lude, post mortem nulla voluptas*. "Eat, drink, and be merry, for after death there is no pleasure," and consequently no pain; and therefore, while men live, they should live as pleasurable and joyous as possible might be. (Isaiah xxviii. 19). O beloved, tremble if all these places alleged prove such a place to be. How should this astonish thy soul—that all the actions of thy life have been but a running race to these chambers of death? All the actions of thy life have been but a laying-up of treasure in this place of torment. How should this astonish you whose course only leads you to this doleful dungeon of hell? But,

3. Though this be a doctrine terrible and dreadful, yet you may suck forth consolation hence, who are the elect people of God. It is true indeed there is a hell, and wicked men shall unavoidably come to hell. As John says, "You serpents and generation of vipers, how shall you escape the damnation of hell?" But all you that are the elect of God, you are not only forewarned but you are forearmed also; you need not fear this place of hell. For, first, you need not fear the devil, that is, the torments of hell, because God shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly. Though he now goes about like a roaring lion, seeking his prey whom he may devour, yet then he shall be in chains and go abroad no more. And, secondly, you need not fear those torments the damned undergo. Though there be a worm that shall never die, a fire that shall never go out; though there be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth; though they lie under the wrath of an incensed God; yet lift up your heads with joy, ye elect of God, for Jesus Christ is your redemption and your life. "He hath destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." (Hebrews ii.) Hereupon (2 Thes. i.) you are by Jesus Christ delivered from wrath to come. Here, then, is matter of joy for you, though there be a hell and the wicked tormented night and day, yet by Jesus Christ you are delivered from this wrath to come.

Superstition in Inverness-shire in the Twentieth Century.—That there is yet much superstition in the Highlands will be readily acknowledged, but we were not quite prepared to learn that recently 1,000 persons visited one of the "holy" wells at Culloden on the Lord's Day. Those who drank the water dropped a coin in the well or attached a rag to the trees in the vicinity. This would be bad enough happening in priest-ridden Ireland, with all its superstition, but what are we to think of these pagan rites carried on in Scotland? No doubt, the devotees of the Romish Church would be largely represented at this desecration of the Lord's Day, but there are plenty of Protestants silly enough and superstitious enough to think that there is some virtue in these so-called holy wells.

The Alleged Supremacy of Peter.

BY THE REV. D. BEATON, WICK.*

TO the Romanist the supremacy of Peter is a doctrine of vital importance. It is impossible to conceive of Romanism robbed of those commanding prerogatives endowing him and his so-called successors with the plenitude of power. For upon this doctrine that colossal institution which has dominated the consciences of millions of the human race has been built up and established. And when it is further remembered that the Vatican decree of papal infallibility, with all its far-reaching consequences, is but the culmination of a process of reasoning that began with assuming the grant of such prerogatives, until the daring height of papal infallibility was reached, it will at once be recognised that we are confronted with an interesting and important problem in interpretation, and a question of vital moment in dogmatic theology and church polity. This lecture is an attempt to deal with the question on purely scriptural ground, with the purpose of showing that Christ made no such grant to Peter; that His words, rightly interpreted, in Matthew's Gospel give no foundation for such inferences as Romanists draw from them; and in proof of this position it will be shown that the Apostles were unconscious of such power having been granted to Peter. The closely-allied questions of Peter's alleged residence at Rome and his episcopate there, with that of the transmission of his prerogatives to a successor or successors, will be discussed from the scriptural standpoint, and from their special bearing on the leading theme discussed in this lecture.

At the outset it is but right to state that Protestants, while denying the supremacy and prerogatives claimed for Peter by Romanists, willingly and heartily acknowledge a certain pre-eminency to the Apostle. No one reading the Gospels can fail to escape the commanding presence of Peter; his intense love, his zeal (though misdirected, it is true, at times), and his devotion to the cause of Christ, all help to impress us with the fact that we have before us the record of a man of no ordinary powers and individuality. But granting this, and even a great deal more, for argument's sake, the fact remains that between all this and the claims of Rome there is a wide gulf. The pre-eminence that comes through outstanding ability and graces is an entirely different pre-eminence to that claimed by the Church of Rome. The one is *personal*, the other *official*; and this distinction, though finely drawn, is one of vast importance, and has a recognised place in the value we attach to the decisions of men. It need scarcely be recalled that at the election of the present Pope the

* Notes of a Lecture delivered to the Creich Protestant Association on 30th March, 1911.

were many in the College of Cardinals and in the Church of Rome who excelled him both in intellectual gifts and in the art of statesmanship, but his commanding position in the Vatican rests on none of these gifts, but on the prerogatives which have been granted to him by the suffrages of the Cardinals. It is such prerogatives as these that Rome claims from Peter—a pre-eminence coming not from any special gifts and graces but from the official position which he occupies. In support of this contention her apologists appeal to certain texts of Scripture, chief among which may be mentioned the remarkable confession of Peter and Christ's memorable words to him, as recorded by Matthew. This text, they say, is "by itself decisive" (Lyon's *Christianity and Infallibility*, page 122), and the L'Abbé Miel tells us "nothing can be more positive" (*The Pope and the Scriptures*, page 9). As the passage is of vast importance in this discussion it is here transcribed at length:—"When Jesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter (Greek, *Petros*), and upon this rock (Greek, *petra*) I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matthew xvi. 13-19).

From this text Romanists have drawn the most extraordinary inferences, and in order that it may be seen what these are, take the following sentences from a work by Dr. Murray, one of the Maynooth Professors:—"Peter," he says, "was thus established by our Lord as the means of imparting to the Church indefectibility and unity, and of permanently securing those properties to her. Peter was invested with supreme spiritual authority to legislate for the whole Church; to teach, to inspect, to judge, to proscribe erroneous doctrine or whatever would tend to the destruction of the Church; to appoint to offices or remove therefrom, or limit or extend the jurisdiction thereof, as the safety or welfare of the Church would require: in one word, to exercise, as supreme head and ruler and teacher and pastor, all spiritual functions whatever that are necessary for the well-being or existence of the Church." (Quoted in Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, page 333.) No one reading the words as given by Matthew would ever imagine that they were capable of lending themselves to such an extraordinary interpretation. "It takes

one's breath away," says Dr. Salmon, "to read a commentary which finds so much more in a text than lies on the surface of it." In discussing the Romish claims in connection with this text there are two incidents that should not be forgotten—(1) the words addressed to Peter by Christ and recorded in the same chapter, "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not of the things that be of God, but those that be of men" (verse 23); (2) the threefold denial of Christ by Peter. It would seem that the Holy Ghost has left these matters on record that men might not delude themselves, and as one ponders over them the conviction is brought home to us that *their* rock is not as our Rock, our enemies themselves being witnesses.

I.—In interpreting the text it strikes one as a matter of some significance that Christ, in addressing the Apostle, says, "Thou art *Petros* (Peter), and upon this *petra* (rock) will I build my church." Scholars have drawn a distinction between *petros*, a piece of rock, and *petra*, the solid rock itself; and while we do not wish to lay more weight on this point than it can bear, yet it does seem passing strange that if Christ meant Peter, that He should have used *another* word with a different and very significant shade of meaning. Would He not have said, "Thou art *Petros* (Peter), and upon this *petros* will I build my church"?

II.—However, in the interpretation of this text we are at liberty to appeal to the Church of Rome's recognised canon of interpretation. In the Creed of Pius IV.—a creed which requires all those who subscribe it to "freely profess and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, *without which no one can be saved*"—it is stated in the second article: "I also admit the Holy Scripture according to that sense which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs, to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; *neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*" Let us now proceed to apply this rule, and what is the result? According to Launoy (a French Roman Catholic), seventeen of the Fathers interpret the *Rock* as referring to Peter; forty-four as referring to his faith expressed in the confession; sixteen interpret the *Rock* as Christ; and eight hold that the Church was built on all the Apostles. And lest any fault be found with Launoy for his Gallicanism, there is the testimony of the Jesuit Maldonatus, whose Romanism is above suspicion. "There are," he says, "among ancient authors some who interpret 'on this rock,' that is, 'on this faith' or 'on this confession of faith, in which thou hast called me the Son of the living God.'" (Quoted in Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, page 335.) No Romanist can possibly face these damaging facts with equanimity. The very canon of interpretation, which she considers so vital that without its acceptance no one can be saved, threatens to undermine the mighty fabric and lay it in a mass of ruins. Here are

the facts: out of ninety-five of the early Fathers only seventeen give an interpretation that can in any way be called favourable to Rome, but this is small comfort; for even these to make their interpretation of any value to Rome, it would be necessary to show that they held the honour which was granted to Peter *was also meant for his successor or successors*. Dr. Salmon has, in a very forcible way, presented the case in its true significance, and shown how Rome has come to disaster through the use of her own shield. "Here, surely," he says, "if anywhere, we shall find that unanimous consent of the Fathers of which the Council of Trent speaks. I have already said that I do not refuse to attribute a certain weight to tradition in the interpretation of Scripture. I have owned that an interpretation of any passage has a certain presumption against it if it is clearly new-fangled; if it derive from the text a doctrine which the Church of the earliest times never found there. The more important the doctrine, the greater the presumption that, if true, it would have been known from the first. But certainly here is a case where, if the Fathers were ever unanimous, they could not fail to be so, if the Roman theory be true. This is no obscure text—no passing remark of an inspired writer—but the great charter text which, for all time, fixed the constitution of the Christian Church. If, in these words, our Lord appointed a permanent ruler over His Church, the Church would from the first have looked to that authority for guidance and for the composing of all disputes, and there never would have been any hesitation to recognise the meaning of the charter on which the authority was founded. Yet I suppose there is not a text in the whole New Testament on which the opinion of the Fathers is so divided; and you have to come down late indeed before anyone finds the Bishop of Rome there."—(*Infallibility of the Church*, page 334.)

III.—Another point that merits our attention in connection with the great charter text is the fact that it is alone recorded in the Gospel according to Matthew. And it is to be carefully observed in this connection that it is not merely the absence of the text from the writings of the other Evangelists, but its absence notwithstanding the presence of the confession of Peter, from which it followed, and which is recorded in Mark and Luke and a similar one in the Gospel according to John. That is, while the Evangelists record the remarkable confession of Peter, they have not a word about the promise granting plenitude of power to him. To argue that this omission is to be accounted for by Peter's modesty or to a prudential reserve on the part of the Evangelists, is unworthy of being met with a serious answer. Neither can it be here argued, as it has been done by Roman Catholics, that it is a parallel case to the Sermon on the Mount, which is only recorded in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. The point to be emphasised here is that while the *confessions* are recorded by the four Evangelists, the *promise* is only recorded by one. The question naturally

arises: Why is it that four Evangelists, each guided by the Holy Spirit, should have set down for us the confession and only one make any mention of Peter's commission, "though that commission followed it and arose out of it, and was meant to change the face of Christendom, to constitute a world-wide and perpetual and infallible sovereignty in the body of Christ, and to make a 'brotherhood' an 'absolute monarchy'?"—(*Contemporary Review*, February, 1910, page 168.) For it is to be borne in mind that this text is of supreme importance to the Romanist. It is "the grant of a privilege; of dominion over the Apostles themselves; of a right to control the very thoughts of men; it concerned the very *esse* of the Church."

If the words of the text conveyed such power to Peter, we would naturally expect that the Apostles would be cognisant of the fact, for it was no ordinary privilege that was conferred upon him. It is as conceivable that the archbishops and bishops of the Church of Rome should be ignorant of the position and power of the Pope, as it is to conceive the Apostles to be ignorant of the power which Romanists say Christ bestowed upon Peter. What has Scripture to say to this aspect of the question? Let us turn to Mark ix. 33-37, and read: "He [*i.e.*, Jesus] came to Capernaum, and being in the house, he asked them, What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way? But they held their peace; for by the way they had disputed among themselves who should be the greatest. And he sat down and called the twelve, and saith unto them, If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all and servant of all. And he took a child and set him in the midst of them; and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name receiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me but him that sent me." But this was not the only dispute for primacy, for at the Last Supper, when Christ made the announcement that one of them was to betray Him, "they began to inquire which of them it was that should do this thing. And there was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest" (Luke xxii. 24). Here we have two particular occasions on which there was a contest for primacy among the Apostles—contests which appear inexplicable if Peter was the prince of the Apostles and endowed with plentitude of power; and if such commission had been given by Christ, how easily could He have silenced them by reminding the Apostles of the power and place He had given to Peter. Is it too much, therefore, to say that the Apostles were unaware of such power, and that Christ Himself, when the opportunity came of asserting these prerogatives, did not do so because they had never been bestowed?

Further, we are told by Mark that James and John, the sons of Zebedee, came unto Him, saying, "Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire. And he said unto

them, What would ye that I should do for you? They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand and the other on thy left hand in thy glory" (chap. x. 35). If James and John were conscious of Peter's pre-eminent position among the disciples would they have made such a request, and if Christ had bestowed such a position upon him, would He not have answered that He had already bestowed that privilege upon Peter?

Paul, also, seems to have been entirely unaware of any such privilege belonging to Peter, for in mentioning the "pillar" Apostles (James, Cephas, and John), Peter's name comes second. He further tells us that James, Peter, and John gave him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship when they perceived the grace that God had given unto them, and that it was agreed among them that the former would go unto the circumcision and the latter to the uncircumcision—an agreement that confined Peter's activities to a certain sphere. Then there is the incident at Antioch, when Paul withstood Peter to his face because he was to be blamed. "We hear a great deal," said the late Bishop Ryle, "of what Peter did at Rome, but very little of what he did at Antioch." Throughout the Acts of the Apostles the one great dominating figure is that of Paul—a fact scarcely in keeping with the claims made by the Church of Rome for Peter. In purposing to visit Rome, Paul, writing to the Christians there, says: "For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established" (Romans i. 11), words which seem strange if Rome was the peculiar province of Peter, and the place from which he exercised his power. In writing to the Corinthians he reminds them of his sufferings and labours, adding—"Besides those things that are without, that which cometh on me daily, the care of *all* the churches" (2 Cor. xi. 28). If the care of *all* the churches was Peter's, was Paul not incurring unnecessary trouble and interfering with matters in which he had no concern? When one considers his manifold labours, his high-souled devotion, his intense love to his Lord and Master, can we deny to him what he justly claimed for himself—that "he was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." The foregoing evidence seems to clearly establish the fact that Paul had no knowledge of any special prerogatives bestowed upon Peter.

At the Council of Jerusalem, when matters of serious moment to the early Church were to be decided, we find that the decrees were not issued in Peter's name, but in the name of the apostles, elders, and brethren (Acts xv. 23), a proceeding not in keeping with the position claimed for him by the Church of Rome.

But, strangest of all, it would appear that Peter himself had no knowledge of such supremacy as is claimed for him, for in the whole of the New Testament writings where his name is mentioned, he makes no such claim. On the other hand, he uses language that runs in the face of the exalted position claimed for

him. In his First Epistle he writes:—"The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder [lit., a fellow-elder, *sumpresbuteros*], and a witness of the sufferings of Christ" (chap. v. 1).

The evidence of this part of our argument leads us inevitably to the conclusion that the Apostles, including Paul and Peter, were entirely ignorant of any pre-eminency such as Rome claims for him. The evidence is cumulative in its effect; that is, taken as a whole, its testimony is most conclusive, and goes to prove that a doctrine of such vital importance to the Church of Rome was unknown to the early Church.

THE ALLEGED EPISCOPATE AT ROME.

"All the claims and pretensions of the Pope," says Professor Frohschammer, "rest, as is well known, upon the assertion that the Apostle Peter was invested by Christ with a precedence over all the other Apostles, and that as Prince of the Apostles, he has thus acquired a certain supremacy and authority over them; that Peter subsequently governed the Roman Church as its first bishop, and having as such suffered martyrdom, he transmitted all his authority and powers to his successors, the Bishops of Rome" (*Rock of Peter*, p. 2). It has already been shewn that Peter was not invested by Christ with a precedence over all the other Apostles. It now remains to be shewn that, as far as his residence or episcopate at Rome are concerned, that Scripture maintains an unaccountable silence. This matter, be it remembered, is of the highest importance to the Church of Rome, for if it can be proved that Peter was never at Rome, it would necessarily invalidate all the claims of the long line of so-called successors from Apostolic times to the present in the Roman pontificate. It is admitted that, from very early times there is a tradition that Peter was at Rome, that he exercised his episcopate there for the period of twenty-five years, and that he suffered martyrdom there by crucifixion. It is not our intention at present to deal with the historical question of the rise of this tradition, but to proceed by again making our appeal to the testimony of the Scripture.

1. In the famous charter text in which it is alleged Christ bestowed the pre-eminent prerogatives upon Peter, there is not a word about Rome; neither is there the slightest hint that Peter was "to establish there, the foundation of the whole Christian Church, or to rule it from that city as its centre." It is well that the importance of this question from the Romish standpoint should be duly and properly weighed. It is very forcibly stated by Professor Frohschammer. "From the Roman view of Christianity," he says, "this is so essential, that Christ could rather be supposed to have left out the enunciation of the love of God and our neighbour as the fundamental law of His religion, than to have left unmentioned the special function and authority claimed by Rome in His Church. For, according to the Papal doctrine,

the attempt to obey these commands avails man nothing, and is at the best but worthless Rationalism and Pelagianism without the priestly dispensation of grace, which has its source solely and exclusively in Rome; while, on the other hand, the non-fulfilment of these commands can be easily compensated for by the magical effect of a communication of grace through the Roman priest." What means this silence of the Son of God on a matter of such vital importance?

2. In the inspired accounts of the labours and journeys of the Apostles, there is not the slightest hint made by Luke of a journey by Peter to Rome, nor any account of his work in that place. He tells us of Paul's journey to Rome and his residence in the imperial city. But the Acts of the Apostles is by no means silent as to Peter's labours in other places. We find him in Jerusalem preaching on the ever-memorable day of Pentecost; at Lydda also, Joppa and Caesarea. He was present at the Council at Jerusalem (Acts xv.), and we know from Paul that he was at Antioch (Gal. ii.). Now, it seems passing strange that we should have references to his labours in different places covering a period of over twenty years, and never the faintest allusion to any journey to Rome or to his residence there. The arrival of Peter at Rome and his founding a Church there, was a matter he could not possibly have omitted had it been to him of such importance as it is to modern Romanists. When Paul reached Rome, he gathered together the chief Jews at Rome, and after intimating to them his intention for doing so, they say to him:—"We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against" (Acts xxviii. 22). It is to be remembered that Peter was the Apostle of the Circumcision as Paul was of the Uncircumcision, and how does it follow that these Jews should indicate their lack of knowledge concerning the new sect, except that everywhere it was spoken against, if Peter had been at Rome and exercising his apostolic gifts there? The fact that there is no mention of Peter when the brethren went as far as the Appian Forum and the Three Taverns to meet Paul, is further evidence of Peter's absence from Rome at this time.

3. It is further to be observed that in the speeches of Peter recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, there is no mention made by him of any journey to Rome or any of his labours there. This, taken in conjunction with the fact that he gave an account of his labours to the Council at Jerusalem, renders it all the more difficult to believe that he should have engaged in such epoch-making work at Rome without making any mention of it.

4. When we turn to the Epistles of Paul we find him often referring to Peter. But when he "mentions Peter, he was not then at Rome, and wherever he speaks of Rome, he makes no mention of Peter." He mentions him as present at Jerusalem (Galatians i. 18), Antioch (Galatians ii. 11), and meets him again at Jerusalem

(Acts xv. 7). At the conclusion of his Epistle to the Romans, Paul sends salutations to a great number of believers at Rome, such as Priscilla, Aquila, Epænetus, Mary, Andronicus, Junia, Amplias, Urbane, Stachys, Apelles, Aristobulus' household, Herodion, Narcissus' household, Tryphena, Tryphosa, Persis, Rufus, Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, Philologus, Julia, Nereus and his sister, Olympas and all the saints which are with them (Romans xvi. 3-15). *But the name of Peter is not once mentioned*; an omission quite unaccountable, if he were at Rome and had the position of Prince of the Apostles. Then, again, not only did the Apostle send an Epistle to Rome, but he sent letters from thence during the period of his imprisonment. Among these Epistles of the Imprisonment are to be reckoned those addressed to Philemon and to the Colossians. In the concluding sentences of his letter to Philemon, he writes:—"There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus; Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-labourers," but not a word about Peter. Similarly in the conclusion of the Epistle to the Colossians a number of names are mentioned, but Peter's is again absent (Col. iv.). Finally in his second Epistle to Timothy, written it is generally supposed before his death, Paul exhorts him: "Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me: for Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica, Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia. Only Luke is with me. Take Mark and bring him with thee; for he is profitable to me for the ministry. . . . At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge" (2 Tim. iv. 9-16). These do not appear to be the words of a man conscious of the fact that Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, was in the city and governing the Church of Christ from that centre. In fact, the whole evidence produced under this head conclusively proves that Paul had no knowledge of Peter's presence at Rome.

5. But if his presence at Rome is of such vital importance, then it may be argued that, if anywhere, his own Epistles will be the likeliest place to have references to the same. We turn to these Epistles, and reading them carefully from beginning to end, there is not the slightest hint that the writer was resident at Rome, and that from thence he exercised the functions of his so-called pontificate. True, he says:—"The Church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, and so doth Marcus, my son" (1 Peter v. 13). Now, say Romanists, Babylon is the mystical name for Rome, and in this interpretation, they are followed by such distinguished authorities as Sir William Ramsay and Dr. Salmon; but, while it is not the purpose of this paper to review this opinion and the arguments brought forward in support of it, it may be said that there is nothing so formidable about them as to debar us from accepting the commonly-received

interpretation that Babylon is simply the Chaldaean city. So that even here, without laying undue stress on the interpretation adopted, the Church of Rome has very scanty ground for being dogmatic about Peter's episcopate at Rome.

The conclusion, then, of our argument from the Biblical evidence produced, is certainly directly in the face of the theory that Peter was at Rome and exercised his pontificate there. The closely related questions of the rise of the tradition which affirms that he lived at Rome, and other historical questions, do not enter into the scope of this essay: our purpose is to show that the Scripture makes no mention of Peter's residence in the imperial city, and in the preceding pages that evidence has been laid before the reader.

THE ALLEGED TRANSMISSION OF PETER'S PREROGATIVES.

Even though Romanists could prove that Christ granted the position of Prince of the Apostles to Peter, and that he lived at Rome and exercised his pontificate there, it would still remain for them, if they were not to be bereft of all the fruits of their labour, to show that Christ indicated that these extraordinary prerogatives which they say were granted to Peter were to be transmitted to his successors, and that no chain in the link between Peter and Pius X. is missing. This is a task of the first magnitude, and unless these points can be proved, it is of no avail how unique were the gifts bestowed upon Peter. When we examine Christ's words as recorded in the charter text, there is not the slightest hint that successors were in view, and that these successors should be at Rome. And it is further to be observed, that these prerogatives in question, if we allow them for arguments' sake, were intimately connected with the apostolic office, and it in the very nature of things was untransmissible. Then, how is it that the transmission refers to the prerogative of supremacy and not to the marvellous gift of inspiration, though in regard to the latter there is a near approach to it in the claim of infallibility for the Roman pontiffs?

The question discussed in this paper is not one which Protestants can afford to treat with indifference. Millions of the human race—some of them in the very front rank of intellectual endeavour and achievement—have accepted the doctrine of the supremacy of Peter, and resting upon this foundation, one of the mightiest institutions has cast its spell over the consciences of men; and the man must be apathetic indeed, who can contemplate this mystery without a heartfelt prayer that the God of all grace would break the bands that bind so many human beings in the chains of superstition. Romanism is a system, for which, if we believe the word of God, we need expect no reformation, but sure destruction. But while we say so, God is able to take from the Roman fold as he has done, and is doing, many precious souls who shall acknowledge with all their heart the priceless benefits of Christ's atoning sacrifice.

Expository Note.

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

~~~~~  
 "Let their table become a snare before them : and that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap. Let their eyes be darkened, that they see not ; and make their loins continually to shake. Pour out thine indignation upon them, and let thy wrathful anger take hold of them. Let their habitation be desolate, and let none dwell in their tents."—  
 PSALM lxi. 22-25.  
 ~~~~~

THIS is a part of one of those Psalms which are nowadays depreciatingly spoken of as Imprecatory. They are thought to be unworthy of a Christian audience. The reason for this depreciation is that David in such Psalms is supposed to be giving expression to his private grudges against his opponents. Well, it may be at once allowed that, if that were the real meaning of these imprecations, they would be unworthy of a Christian congregation. But, to suppose that such could be the meaning, were to miss the meaning of Scripture entirely. No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation or excitation. Those awful words, as we call them, which David uses in the sixty-ninth Psalm, did not come by the will of David at all, nor had they his private enemies as their object. He spake as he was moved by the Holy Ghost (2 Peter i. 20-21), and uttered only the pure judgments of God. We have no certainty how many, if any, of David's contemporaries were the objects of the imprecation implied in the verses quoted as our heading. We are certain that they had for their object some who did not live in David's days at all. The Apostles Peter and Paul look upon these words of imprecation as being the pure judgments of God, and interpret them as having a predictive aspect. Peter (Acts i. 20) understood David to speak in verse 25th of our Psalm, concerning Judas Iscariot. "This man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity, and, falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out. . . . For it is written in the Book of Psalms, 'Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein.'" Paul (Romans xi. 9-10) gives the words of our Psalm a still wider reference, taking them to be the declaration of God's judgment upon his ancient people, Israel, because of their contempt of the Messiah. These judgments of God are a great deep. He punishes sin by permitting the sinner to fall into deeper sins, and the result is a heaping up of wrath against the day of wrath. But if God's judgments are deep as floods, His justice in them is as mountains great.

It is from this point of view, then, that we must interpret the words of Psalm lxi. 22, 23, as well as many other passages like them throughout the Scriptures. If we imagine that they are only private animosities on the part of the Scripture writers, we simply

give the lie to Christ, and to His Apostles in their understanding of Holy Scripture, and we make it impossible to worship God in such portions of His Word as are now under consideration. But the true view is that of Christ and of His Apostles, who, in imprecations uttered by the writers of Scripture, understood no spleen on the part of Psalmist or Prophet, but the calm, deep, pure, awful judgment of God upon impenitent sinners. Taking the words under consideration in this sense, the spiritually minded will worship God in them. For an Apostle calls us to a beholding not alone of the kindness of God, but of the severity of God too (Romans xi. 22), and a Psalmist will lead us in singing not of mercy alone but of judgment also (Psalm ci.). We may surely suppose that the revelation which God will give of Himself on the great day of judgment is one in which the righteous will rejoice, and according to which they will worship Him. But according to Christ's teaching, the Judge will as assuredly that day say, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire," as He will say, "Come, ye blessed of my Father" (Matt. xxv. 34, 41).

The considerations already adduced ought, if rightly received, to tune our minds so as to adopt the words before us of the sixty-ninth Psalm, and others like them, in our worship not only reverently but even lovingly. For further help, however, in the same direction, consider that the fundamental speaker in the sixty-ninth Psalm is Christ Himself. In proof of that assertion, over and above the place cited in Acts i. and Romans xi., see also John ii. 17 and xix. 29. There may be some who take it upon themselves to speak concerning the severity and concerning the kindness of God, who themselves know little of one or the other of these perfections of God. Such was not the way with Christ. He had an experiential knowledge of the severity of God. The cup could not pass from Him without His drinking it. Because He would save others, Himself could not escape the sword. Thus in our present Psalm the guilt of those who are the objects of the imprecation under consideration is that they persecuted Him whom God had smitten, that they talked to the grief of God's wounded. Christ had a personal experiential knowledge of God's perfection as severity, for He was the object of the sword's awakening and smiting, of which we read in Zechariah xiii. 7. And yet, as one has put it, although it was damnation, Christ took it lovingly. Need it be pointed out that Christ had a profound experiential knowledge of the goodness or kindness of God. What other do we read of in Psalm xvi. 11, "Thou wilt show me the path of life; in thy presence is fulness of joy"? Or in our present Psalm: "I will praise the name of God with a song, and will magnify him with thanksgiving"?

Seeing, then, that the just judgments of God, which are declared in these imprecations to which we are now drawing attention, come from the heart of Christ, who had such a profound experiential knowledge of the severity and kindness of God, and, in fact,

rejoiced as none else could in these perfections of God, we ought not to be driven away from God or from His Word on account of them, but we ought to be afraid of hardening our heart against His fear, whilst, at the same time, we should have the assurance that His delight is in mercy, and that, in confessing our sins on the head of Him who had a perfect experiential knowledge of mercy and of judgment, we ourselves shall be delivered from the severity which we deserved, and made to experience a kindness which we did not deserve.

Recollections of Betsy Lindsay,

*A Godly Young Woman who passed through much tribulation,
and died at Edinburgh in 1839.*

BY THE LATE REV. FRANCIS M'BEAN, FREE CHURCH,
FORT-AUGUSTUS.

(Continued from page 20.)

LETTERS FROM BETSY LINDSAY.

THE following letters were addressed by Elizabeth Lindsay to various friends during her illness:—

“17 DALRYMPLE PLACE, 18th May, 1835.

DEAR C.,—I felt very sorry on Sabbath that we had so little conversation with each other, and as we have seldom an opportunity, I have taken it upon me to write a few lines to you. Oh, may the Lord give us both grace to feel that our strength is not in ourselves, but that our strength is perfect weakness! You, my dear, have lately come from the mount of ordinances, where I trust you got your faith strengthened. I hope you were there enabled to see, by the eye of faith, that you really had an interest in the Saviour, that He loved you and died for you, and that it was in commemoration of His dying love that you were sitting at His table. Oh, my dear C., what a mercy it was for us, that when we had broken all God's laws and covenants, and could not pay unto God a ransom, that Jesus stepped forward and said, ‘Deliver from going down to the pit, for I have found a ransom.’ Let us think much of the wonderful love of God to perishing sinners such as we are, that so we may be led to cry, ‘Oh, the breadth and the length of the love of God, for it passeth knowledge.’

I was very sorry to see you so cast down on Sabbath. Perhaps you did not get such a feast of joy as you expected; but oh, remember that it is in ourselves we are straitened and not in God, for He is not a man that He should lie. Hath He not said, ‘I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed’? May we therefore seek strength from God, that so

we may be able to guard against the awful sin of unbelief, for it is that sin which leads us into all others. Oh, may it therefore be our earnest prayer to God that He would kindle in our hearts a flame of holy love, that so we may be able at all times to draw water with joy 'out of the wells of salvation.'

It is now nineteen months since I was confined to bed; and under the varied ways in which God has seen meet to chasten me, what else could have supported me but His grace, and the sweet consolations which flow from His promises, such as these—'Fear not, for I am with thee; be not dismayed, for I am thy God,' etc. Oh, may our wills be centred in God's will, and may we follow Him with humility and self-denial through darkness and sunshine, through good and bad report; and may we ever remember our Saviour's own words to His disciples, 'Watch ye, and pray that ye enter not into temptation.' May we seek counsel from Him to direct us in every step, and be in earnest that He may ever keep our hearts in a praying frame, for we are in the enemy's country, and subject to many doubts and fears, to backslidings and temptations.

But I find I must now stop. Gladly would I have filled up the paper, but this clay tabernacle in which I am chained needs repose. Before leaving you I commend you unto the Shepherd of Israel, who slumbers not nor sleeps. May He never leave you nor forsake you, but watch over you in your going out and coming in; and that He may teach you in the way that you should go—even guide you with His eye—is the desire of your affectionate friend in the love of the everlasting Gospel,

ELIZABETH LINDSAY."

"17 DALRMYPLE PLACE, 24th July, 1835.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—. . . All the doctors who have ever seen me have given me up, saying they never had a case like mine, and that all has been done that man can do. But it is a great mercy that although earthly physicians may say they can do no more, Jesus, the good Physician, never says so. He is not 'an high priest which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.' I have now been twenty-one months confined to a low couch, and under the various ways in which God has seen meet to chasten me, nothing but the sweet consolations which flow from His most blessed Word could have supported me. It is a wonder to all that I have been so long in this world. Often has my mother watched over me, expecting every moment to be the last; but the Lord is still sparing me. Oh pray, my dear friend, that it may be for His glory! I suffer much from difficulty in breathing and acute pain in my breast, but 'I reckon the sufferings of this present time not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed.' . . . I dare say you will think I have

forgotten you all; but no, dearer to my heart are the friends of Jesus than to forget them. But I find I must stop. May the Lord bless thee and keep thee in all His ways, is the earnest desire of your friend in the Lord,
ELIZABETH LINDSAY."

"17 DALRYMPLE PLACE, 24th February, 1836.

DEAR AND LOVING FRIEND,—Having a desire to write to you I have now taken the pen in my hand, but He who is the wise Sovereign-ruler and disposer of all things only knows whether I may be able to finish it. I have several times attempted to answer your most kind and affectionate letter, but through weakness I had always to lay it aside. But the Lord 'giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might he increaseth strength.' Glory be to His great name, He has given me to feel that in Him only I have righteousness and strength. I am weakness itself, but He is strength itself; by nature I am darkness, but He is light, for with Him there is no darkness at all. Oh, to have a glimpse of His glory! The apostle, speaking of it, says, 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.' . . . Oh, may we be much at a throne of grace! May we learn to be wrestlers with God there for the outpouring of His Spirit, for there is a great withdrawing of the Spirit at this day. There is much declension in true religion; and until the Spirit be poured out from on high nothing shall come up upon the heritage of the Lord but briars and thorns. Oh, for the happy time when all shall know the Lord, when the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea! Then shall the Church be like unto Christ's seamless garment—all in one.

I was much obliged to you for your kindness in desiring your friend, Mr. K., to call on me. I found much pleasure in his company. Well does it become me to say, 'Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits'; but my heart is so hard, and my affections so cold, that I too often make idols of the gifts and forget the Giver. . . . Write to me soon, and tell me if religion flourishes among you. Tell me if there be any asking their way to Zion, with their faces thitherward.—Yours affectionately in the bonds of the Gospel,
ELIZABETH LINDSAY."

"17 DALRYMPLE PLACE, 15th July, 1836.

DEAR AND LOVING FRIEND,—I hope you are all enjoying good health; but if not so, we know that it is well. Afflictions, if sanctified, become the greatest covenant blessings. I have found them to be so in my sweet experience; and oh, never let any one think for a moment that I regret being excluded from the world, and stretched upon a bed of languishing. No; I rejoice that God, for Christ's sake, did not count me unworthy of correcting love. I have to regret that my life has been so useless, and that

so little of my time was devoted to the glory of God while I had any little strength. Oh, my dear friend, may Jesus give you grace to be active for His glory, that so, by your good example, you may encourage others to be active in His service also. Though the way in this howling wilderness be often a wearisome one—often dark and stormy, and through much trouble and perplexity—still the yoke of Jesus—the longer it is borne—becomes the more sweet and easy because He gives strength to bear it. ‘They go from strength to strength; every one of them in Zion appeareth before God.’ And oh, what a glorious and fair company will that be when all the redeemed shall meet around the throne of God, having their robes washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb! They wonder here that God should make such vile, sinful worms sharers of such boundless love; but there they will wonder far more, when they get to the full fruition. It will tend to heighten the song throughout eternity—‘Worthy is the Lamb that was slain; and has washed us from our sins in his own blood and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever.’ There no distance shall separate them from one another; and what is far better, no clouds of unbelief shall ever arise to come between Jesus and their souls. . . . There was a beautiful statement in the letter I received from you, which has often given me comfort when under clouds and darkness. It was this—‘We have nothing to give for the blessings of salvation, and nothing is asked.’ Oh, the wonderful love of God in giving up His only and well-beloved Son to the ignominious death of the Cross, that we might be saved! But He foresaw from all eternity that there was no other way of escape; therefore His eye pitied us and His arm brought salvation. Oh, to be enabled to draw all our joys from the covenant relation in which we stand to God through Christ Jesus! He is a fountain that never fails, even when all creature-comforts are dried up. . . . May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit; and may the presence of Him who dwelt in the bush, and the love of Him who died on the Cross, be ever with you.—From your very affectionate but unworthy friend,

ELIZABETH LINDSAY.”

(To be Continued.)

“**Select Letters by Rev. W. Romaine.**”—Messrs. Farncombe & Son have secured a number of copies, practically new, of these valuable Letters by Mr. Romaine, one of the most worthy and honoured servants of Christ that ever adorned the Church of England. The volume is “a feast of fat things, of wine on the lees, well refined,” fitted to edify, strengthen, and comfort those whose entire dependence is upon a once-crucified but now risen and ascended Redeemer. The letters number about 150, and the book is to be had in neat, fresh binding at 1/-; postage, 3d. extra; three or more copies post free. The print is large and attractive.

An Gunnart a tha ann an Dail.

“MO chlann,” ars’ an sean-duine, “éisdibh ri briathraibh deirionnach bhur n’ athar-cha bhi iad ach tearc: ‘Se mo mhiann gu’n drùigheadh iad oirbh.” An sin dheirich e air uilinn anns an leabaidh, mar gum faigheadh e neart ùr; agus chaidh e air aghaidh mar so. “Nuair bha ’ur n’ athair òg cha robh e na choigreach do shochairan prìseil an t-soisgeil: cha’ne sin, ach bha e tuilleadh is aon uair fo mhòr iomguinn mu staid anama, gu h-àraid nuair bha e ’dol na shea-bliadhna-deug: Arleam gu robh guth an comhnuidh ag ràdh rium, *Iarr an Tighearna a nis*. Cha robh sìth no socair agam; dh’ fhalbh an toilinntinn a bàbhaist dhomh fhaotainn ann an cluich agus sùgradh; ach air a shon so cha robh mi toileach dealachadh riu gu h-uile agus umhlachd a thoirt do’n ghuth. Tha cuimhne agam, aon là an dèigh moran beachd-smuaineach, gu’n do bhòidich mi do Dhia cho luath sa rachadh maduinn na h-oige seachad gu’n toisichinn ri bhi ’m dhuine cràbhach. Dh’ fhoghainn so san àm—dh’ fhag gach iomguinn mi a thiota—phill mi gum’ làn-aighir, agus cha b’ fhada bha cuimhne air ni air bìth de na thachair!

Nuair ’rainig mi cuig-bliadhna-fichead chuir mo choinnseas mo ghealladh sòluimnte do Dhia ’n ’am chuimhne, agus thòisich i ’rìs ri sparradh orm cho cudthromach sa tha na nithe a bhuineas do’n t-saoghal shiorruidh. Ged dhi-chuimhnich mi mo ghealladh fad iomadh bliadhna, gidheadh, b’ fheudar aideachadh gu’n robh a leithid ann, ach a cho-ghealladh no choilìonadh a nis cha robh e do reir choltais a leth cho furasda sa bha e naoi bliadhna roimhe! Bhòidich mi, an dara h-uair agus le barrachd dùrachd na rinn mi riamh nuair rachadh cùram teaghlaich òig an lughad gu’n tugainn gun ag mi fèin suas do chràbhadh.

‘Mach a thug mi ’rìs a chothachadh an t-saoghail, agus cha b’ fhada gus an deach’ gach giorag adhlac mar nach biodh bòid no guth-coinneas riamh ann! Aig leth-cheud, nuair bha sibhse, mo chlann, cha’ n ann a’ cur ri m’ churam, ach a’ togail uallach an t-saoghail dhiom, bha ni eigin a’ sparradh orm an comhnuidh, “*coimhlion do ghealladh—Iarr Dia a nis*.” Bha fhios aig mo chridhe gun tug mi a leithid do bhòid ach cha robh mi toilichte gu’n deach’ iarraidh orm a h-iocadh cho tràth. Bha mi doilich gu’n do chuir mi dàil idir ’s an obair, a dh’ aindeoin ùpraid an t-saoghail. Bha mi nis fo mhòr imcheist agus iomguinn inntinn, ach an dèigh mòran beachd-smuaineach’ fhuair m’ inntinn fois le bòid a dheanamh do Dhia, *an treas uair*, ’nuair rachadh cùram an t-saoghail seachad nach tugadh ni air bith m’ aire bhar ullachadh a dheanamh arson siorruidheachd.

Cha luaithe ’rùnaich mi so na dh’ fhalbh gach cùram gus an tainig eùslain: Ach, a nis, ged bu mhiann leam a bhi cràbhach cha b’ urrainn domh! Tha cràbhadh a nis dhomh cho làn dùibhre agus uamhais ’s gur th-ann tha e ’cur gairsinn air m’ anam! Tha mi faireachadh gu bheil mi air mo threigsinn le Dia,

ach cha'n 'eil e 'cur gluasad orm—cha'n 'eil gràdh do Dhia 'nam chridhe, no tur fhuath do pheacadh—cha'n 'eil mi faicinn ach eù-dochas romham 's am dhèigh!

Anns an staid inntinn so tha bhuir n' athair a nis air starsaich siorruidheachd. Oh! mo chlann! gabhaibh rabhadh! Mar math leibh siorruidheachd a chaitheamh ann an staid truaighe toisichibh a nis—na cuiribh dàil ann an saorsa an anama gus an'—cha chluinnte a chuid eile—cha'n fhaicte ach a' bhilean a gluasad—dh' fhailnich a' neart e—thuit e air 'adhart taobh a chuill, agus le ràn mar gum b' e toiseach nam piantaibh air nach tig crìoch e, ghabh an spiorad neo-bhàsmhor a chead de'n chollainn, a dhàitiche dlùth do cheithir fichead bliadhna!

'Sann bho odha de'n t-seann duine, bho mhinistir, a bha ri taobh na leapach san àm, a fhuair mìn cunntas so. Be'n sealladh uamhasach so bu meadhon e féin agus iomadh eile de shliochd an t-seann duine iompachadh gu Dia agus nuadhachd caithe-beatha. Trì bliadhna mu'n do dhèug an seann duine bha dùsgadh mòr anns a choimhearsnachd, agus a' measg chàich rinn an Spiorad greim air a mhac leis an robh e 'fuireach. Rinn an seann duine na burrainn dha gu grabadh a chur air cràbhadh a mhic, agus fhad 'sa bha comas gluasaid aige cha 'n fhanadh e 'san t-seòmar an àm ùrnuigh teaghlaich, 's cha mho, gu latha bhàis, a dh' iarr e riamh ùrnuigh 'chur suas air as a leith!

Bho'n eachdraidh aithghearr agus mhladaich so fèudaidh sinn a thional. 'Sa *cheud aite*—gur h-i'n òige an t-aon àm gus an Tighearna iarraidh. Tha so soilleir bho *thuigse nadurra*; oir tha gach bliadhna a chaitheas sinn ann an cleachdanna peacach a neartachadh an cumbachd osceann ar n'anama, a' togail a bhalla ni 's àirde, a ta eadar sinn agus neamh, agus ga fhàgail ni 's neò-chinntiche co ac' a theid no nach teid sinn gu bràth a steach air geataibh na h-Ierusalem nuadh! Tha so soilleir bho na scribe-turaibh naomh. Tha anntasan geallaidhean sonraichte, agus aitheantan sonraichte do'n ògraidh—"Cuimhnich a nis do Chruith 'fhear, ann an làithibh d' òige, m'an tig na droch làithean, agus m' an dlùthaich na bliadhnaibh anns an abair thu cha' n 'eil tlachd agam anna"—"Iadsan a dhiarras mi gu *moch*, gheibh iad mi."

Tha, mar an ceudna, *fradharc ar sùl* ga dhearbhadh. Chunnaic fear-scriòbhaidh an leabhrair so iomadh neach a chaidh a dhùsgadh le Spiorad Dhia, agus 's eigin da fianuis a thogail gur h-ann 'nan òige a dhùisgeadh a chuid gu mòr bu mho dhiu. Cha 'n 'e so, ach thubhairt ministir eile ris—ministir leis an robh mòr shoirbheachadh anns an fhìon lios—nach b' aithne dha barrachd is *aon san t-seachd* a chaidh iompachadh an dèigh dhoibh madainn na h-òige 'fhàgail! 'Sin òige, uime sin, am feadh a ta an cridhe agus na h-aighnidhean maoth, an t-àm an Tighearna iarraidh.

'*San dara h-àite*—Tha 'leithid do staid ann 's neach a bhi air a thoirt thairis do chruas cridhe, agus air a chaomhnadh amhàin gus "tomhas aingidheachd a' lionadh suas." Agus fuiling thusa

dhomh, a leughadair ionmhuinn, ma tha thu fathast gun fhios agad ciod e dùsgadh spioradail, gum feud gu bheil thusa ni 's faigse do'n staid so na tha duil agad! Theagamh nach robh dùsgadh mòr agus farsuing riamh nach robh cuid diubh a rainig an staid eagallach so—muinntir, an deigh a bhi fo mhòr imcheist, a thuit air an ais—a' diultadh gach rabhadh—ga'n cruadhachadh fein ann an neo-shuim, 's an olc, agus a suidhe sìos deich uairean ni 's measa na bha iad riamh! Cha mhòr, a theagamh, a chi, an taobh so de shiorruidheachd, mar a sgrios iad an anama mar chunnaic an seann duine mu'n robh mi 'g innse: ach 'sann aigesan a ransaicheas an cridhe tha fios cia lìon iad, eadhon ann an tìr so an t-soisgeil, ris an abair *Dia na Tròcair*, "Gairmaidh iad orm, ach cha fhreagair mise; iarraidh iad mi—ach cha'n fhaigh iad mi!" Nam faiceadh tusa an duine 'chunnaic ceithir-fichead geamhradh, 's e 'criothnachadh le an-dochas, 'nuair thainig teachdairè gruamach a bhàis a thoirt air falbh 'anama a dheoin no dh' ain deoin, a dh, fhaotainn a bhinn, chitheadh tu cho cud-thromach sa tha focal so na Firinn a tha' gràdh, "Mo thruaighe iad 'nuair dhìbreas mise iad."

Thusa 'òganaich ionmhuinn, a lèugh an eachdraidh aighearr so, an robh riabh imcheist ortsa mu shiorruidheachd? Ma bha fuilingidh tu focal no dha bho charaid d' anama. Na abair, "eisdidh mi riut 'nuair thig sean aois," air eagal 'nuair thig sean aois gu'n dean eu-dòchas greim ort—air eagal gu'n abair Dia, "Tha e ceangailte ri' iodhalaibh, leig leis."

Thusa a leugh an leabhran so, an seann duine thu? Ma se fuiling dhomh a charaid aosda focal no dha a ràdh mu staid d' anama ma' fosgail uamhasan an t-saoghail shiorruidh ort.

'S cuimhne leatsa cuideachd an làtha 'nuair bha thu fo agradh coinnseis—'nuair bha thu fo imcheist mu shlighe na beatha agus mu shlainnte an anama. An d' fhalbh an latha so? Ma dh' fhalbh c' àit an d' fhuair d' anam fois? No am bheil thu 's do cheann liath a' d' sheasamh air starsaich na shiorruidheachd gun eagal gun churam? An àm codail so? Dh' fhalbh an t-àm a 'b' fhearr gus an Tighearna iarraidh—dh' fhalbh 's gu bràth cha pill e; cha'n eil àm idir a nis ann ach *beagan làithean*, ma tha sin féin ann!

Mar h-e cheana marbhantas a bhàis spioradail so a rug air d' anam cha'n 'fhada gus an tionndaidh e gu bàs spioradail! Oh! na cuir dàil nis faide! Na h-abair "cha 'n 'eil comas air—ciod a ni mi?" "Cha 'n 'eil neach an taobh a mach de dhòchas ach iadsan *leis nach àill* tighinn gu Crìosd chum gum biodh beatha aca. "An ti a thig do'm 'ionnsuidhsa," ars' Esan, "cha tilg mi air chor air bith a mach e." Gu'n tugadh Dia dhuit fhaicinn cia cunnartach an ni dàil a chur ann an aithreachas.—Amen.

Opening of Assemblies.—The Assemblies of the Established, United Free, and Free Churches were opened on Tuesday, 23rd May, Principal Stewart, St. Andrews; Dr. Wells, Pollokshields; and Professor Alexander, Edinburgh, the Moderators, presiding.

Protestant Notes.

The Veto Bill and the Protestant Succession.—A meeting of the Presbytery of Glasgow was held on 2nd May in the Presbytery Hall, Trongate. The following motion was submitted by the Rev. Mr. Rankine, of Titwood Parish:—"That the Presbytery solemnly protest against the refusal of His Majesty's Government to exempt from the operations of the Parliament Bill now before the House of Commons, 'Any Bill which alters or repeals any enactment affecting the Protestant Succession to the Throne'; and that intimation of this protest be sent to the members of Parliament representing the constituencies within the bounds of the Presbytery, and to the Prime Minister." Mr. Rankine said he was not prompted by anything of a political party spirit in the matter. He was not to be understood as making an attack upon the Parliament Bill. But that was a different thing from saying that they were going to be ready to trust any House of Commons to unrestrained legislation, or to submit questions of our religious liberties to the chance coalition of parties there. The tampering with the Constitution in such a way as to make it possible that one party in Parliament might one day make the repeal of these Acts the price of their support of the Government was, he thought, absolutely intolerable. The Roman Church in this land had had removed one after another of the political disabilities under which they laboured. They did not blame them for endeavouring to have these removed. He did not know that any were now left except the Premiership and the Throne. He felt that the Government was not true to the history of this country when it refused to exempt the Acts affecting the Protestant Succession from the operations of this Bill. The Rev. Dr. Macmillan seconded. The Rev. Mr. Gunson moved that the motion be not approved. The amendment was seconded, and the motion was adopted.

Good Work by a Converted Romanist.—There resides in Stranraer, Scotland, a young Italian, named Mr. Guiseppe Bonugli, who has recently become a convert to Protestantism. He owns four shops in the town, and has now closed them on Sabbath. Hitherto they have been open for the sale of ice creams and confectionery. He took his stand on Biblical principles, and now he states that he has gained, through his Sabbath rest, physically, morally, and spiritually. There are 20 shops in Stranraer open on the Lord's day, but this Italian convert from Rome is the first Italian there who has closed his places of business on the sacred day of rest.

Rome and the Bible.—*The Quarterly Record* of the Trinitarian Bible Society (says *The Vanguard*) is always a welcome visitor to us, and we wish all our readers would write the Secretary asking for literature that would be gladly sent to any address.

Owing to the fact that the British and Foreign Bible Society persist in scattering corrupted editions of the Holy Scriptures, we consider the Trinitarian Bible Society is an absolute necessity, and should be supported by all who value the unadulterated Word of God. Popery is bad enough anywhere, but when it is sandwiched between the texts of the inspired Word, this is intolerable. We quote the following from a capital article which appears in the last issue of the above-mentioned report in hopes that many will write to 7 Bury Street, Bloomsbury, London, W.C., and secure the April issue:—"Rome had kept the Bible from the people for fifteen centuries, and, when the Reformers began to make translations, Rome answered by setting up the tortures of the Inquisition, and lighting the fires of the stake. She burnt the books, burnt the translators, and burnt the readers of the Bible. To-day she turns round and says: 'The Church gave you the Bible.'

"Ritualists echo Rome's claim. But the fact is that we have the Bible in spite of the Church. If the Church had had its way or its will, the people would never have had a Bible at all. This is evidenced by the position of the Bible to-day in all Roman Catholic countries.

"When Rome found it her policy, she made translations; she made them, but not before she was obliged so to do; she made them under what she called compulsion, and not because she wished the people to know what God had written for them. This was why she fenced them round with every imaginable obstacle. She made them, moreover, not from the Hebrew and Greek originals, but from her own 'Authorised' Version—the Latin Vulgate, already declared to be her 'Authentic Version' by the Council of Trent."

Notes and Comments.

Caring for the Children.—Some interesting details concerning the work of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children were issued recently from the Society's head offices at 40 Leicester Square, London. The inspectors engaged on the work of protecting children throughout the country number 250, whilst the number of cases needing investigation by the Society average 500 per day. Over 54,000 cases were dealt with in the last year of the Society's records, and these involved the needless suffering of over 158,000 children, many of them babies. Prosecution is the last argument of the Society, and in only 2,000 of the cases dealt with last year was it found necessary to prosecute; and in the overwhelming majority of these the Courts approved of the Society's action. Of the cases in last year's record, only 8 per cent. were discovered by the inspectors. Of the rest, 55 per cent. were brought to the Society's notice by members of the public, the remainder by public officials.

A Luther Letter.—Leipzig despatches announce, says the *Glasgow Herald*, that Mr. Pierpont Morgan has acquired by auction there to-day an autograph letter from Martin Luther to the Emperor Charles V. of the Holy Roman Empire, dated 28th April, 1521, for £5,100. The letter, which is in Latin, is still in a state of excellent preservation. It is described as the most important letter Luther ever wrote. It is the communication he sent to Charles V. after escaping from the Diet at Worms, where the fate of the Reformation was sealed, and it recapitulates the Diet proceedings and his actions there. The letter, however, never reached the Emperor, as Luther had in the meantime been incarcerated at the Castle of Wartburg; and no one dared to deliver the message from the heretic into the hands of the Emperor. One wonders what Luther's thoughts would be in connection with this affair. There were times in his life when poverty stared him in the face and when the tenth of the above would have appeared as a princely fortune.

The Theatre Disaster in Edinburgh.—Now and again the pleasure-seekers of this country have been rudely awakened from their dreams and confronted with the stern reality of death in terrible forms. The recent catastrophe in an Edinburgh theatre has made a profound impression on the country, not so much from the number of lives lost—though that was large enough—but from the thought that hundreds instead of tens might have been destroyed by one of the most terrible elements that man has to face. To serious-minded persons the passing of men and women from a theatre, with its vanities and giddy pleasures, into the presence of the great God, is unspeakably solemn. This theatre where the fire occurred was to be the scene of a command performance, which was to have the presence of the King during his stay in Edinburgh. This part of the Royal programme is now cancelled.

What Did It Mean?—An extraordinary incident connected with the above was the burning of "The Great Lafayette," as he termed himself. A few days before, a favourite dog of his died, and from the following cutting the reader may gather for himself some idea of the grossness of mind possessed by this poor mortal. "It had become widely known (says the *Glasgow Herald*) throughout Edinburgh that last week 'Beauty,' a female Virginian hound which had been Lafayette's companion and assistant in his performances for over 16 years, had died, and since then those who were coming in personal contact with Lafayette were conscious that the loss of his pet had been preying heavily on his mind. He appeared to be almost broken-hearted, and was heard to express a wish that he was being buried with the dog. His intense love for the dog was evidenced by the fact that some years ago he took out American citizenship papers for her, and that on the door-plate of his London house is inscribed 'The Great Lafayette and

Beauty.' The dog lay embalmed in the Caledonian Station Hotel, where Lafayette was staying, and upon her pillow was a collar adorned with silver plates bearing the names of places all over the world to which she had accompanied her master. At the time of the dog's death Lafayette was so upset that he at first refused to go through with his performance. The remains of the dog were interred yesterday. Orders had been given for the building of a vault in Piershill Cemetery, where he had bought a lair valued at £60. Lafayette was told that a dog could not be buried in consecrated ground, but he replied that the vault was for his ashes, and his dog would be buried with him. A magnificent tombstone was also ordered, and the whole burial cost about £300. The remains of the dog were placed in a little oak coffin. Several members of the deceased's company, including two negroes, attended. One of the wreaths bore a card with the inscription—'In loving remembrance of Dear Beauty, from Lafayette.'

Buried with a Dog.—The end of this deplorable business was that Lafayette's ashes were to be sooner in the grave than he anticipated. According to his instructions he was to be cremated, but, owing to mistaken identity, another man's body underwent that pagan process. Afterwards the body of Lafayette was discovered and cremated, the urn with the ashes being placed in the grave with his dog. We can understand affection for an animal, but the scenes enacted in Piershill Cemetery were revolting in the extreme, and well deserve the characterisation of a northern paper:—"One can scarcely imagine that such could be possible," it says, "anywhere in Scotland, let alone in the reputed centre of the culture and refinement of the nation. How painful to think that, some time before, in a prominent part of Piershill Cemetery, a costly vault had been built to receive the embalmed carcase of a dog. And then to read that the casket containing the cremated remains of its master, who had come to such a tragic end, had been placed in the same vault and in the same coffin as the dog, and between the animal's forepaws—surely such an interment constitutes the last word in the expression of a sickly and diseased sentimentalism. Even the matter-of-fact reporters described it as a weird spectacle, recalling rather some old pagan rite than anything within the domain of modern experience. In so far as the authorities share responsibility for an act of desecration in permitting the burial of the dog, they owe an apology to the Scottish public, and it is to be hoped the whole affair will be made the subject of full and careful investigation." We apologise to our readers for taking up so much of our space with this painful and degrading exhibition of the weakness of so-called cultured men and women, but it is worthy of being put on record as an event happening in Scotland in the twentieth century.

In Defence of the Sabbath.—We have before us two papers whose mission it is to promote the observance of the

Sabbath. The first is *The Lord's Day*, issued quarterly at the price of one penny, from the offices of The Lord's Day Observance Society, 18 Buckingham Street, Strand, London, W.C. This little quarterly lays stress on the obligation to keep the Sabbath in virtue of the Divine command. The other paper referred to is *The Sunday Guardian*, which is now in its second issue. It is also published at a penny, every two months, from the offices, at 10 Palace Chambers, 9 Bridge Street, Westminster, London, S.W. It takes a broader attitude than *The Lord's Day*, and is thus not quite so acceptable to us; but it is especially useful in giving an idea of the various movements in this country and on the Continent affecting the observance of the Lord's Day. Its almost invariable use of the pagan term "Sunday" is objectionable, and its discontinuance of this usage would be acceptable to many who have the cause of Sabbath observance deeply at heart.

Church Notes.

Communion.—Coigach, first Sabbath of June; Shildaig (Ross), second; Dornoch, Carrbridge (Inverness), and Bracadale (Skye), third; Inverness, and Gairloch, fourth. Lairg, Beaully, and Raasay, first Sabbath of July; Tain, and Tomatin (Moy), second; Daviot, Rogart (Sutherland), and Halkirk (Caithness), third.

Meeting of Synod.—The Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church will (God willing) meet at Inverness church on Tuesday after the first Sabbath of July—the fourth day of month. The Moderator, Rev. D. Graham, Shildaig, Lochcarron, is expected to preach at 11 a.m.

Protest Against Papal Marriage Law.—The Southern Presbytery has sent copies of the following protest to the Prime Minister, Mr. Balfour, and Mr. Scott Dickson:—"This Presbytery strongly protests against the audacious interference on the part of the Papacy with the marriage obligations contracted under the civil law of this Protestant nation. It appeals to the Government to take steps immediately to nullify this pernicious decree of the Pope, called *Ne Temere*, within the British Empire, and to make it penal for any man to interfere with parties who are married in accordance with the Protestant marriage laws of this realm. It also demands that justice shall be done to parties who have suffered already in their moral character and rights through the interference of Roman Catholic priests. This Presbytery warns Protestants of the danger of marrying Roman Catholics, as such marriages are very often a source of much misery and strife."

Addresses of Free Presbyterian Places of Worship.—It has come under our notice that strangers from the country have been at loss sometimes to discover the addresses of our places of worship in the towns, and that strangers from England, w

appreciate the old Gospel, have had difficulty to find out these places in town and country when they pay a visit in the summer season to Scotland. We have therefore taken the liberty of printing on the second page of the Magazine cover a number of addresses which may, to a certain extent, help to remove the difficulty. We cannot guarantee, however, that the ministers named will always be found in their own charges in the summer time.

"Recollections of Betsy Lindsay."—The Editor would be much obliged if any reader could kindly send him an additional copy of this interesting booklet, which is appearing in instalments in the Magazine. He would return it carefully after a short period.

Memoir and Sermons of Rev. D. Macdonald, Shieldaig.—Rev. D. Macfarlane, F. P. Manse, Dingwall, still has in hand about one hundred copies of this interesting memorial of the godly Mr. Macdonald of beloved memory. They may be had for two shillings each, postage threepence extra.

Acknowledgments.—Mr. Angus Clunas, Treasurer, 18 Ardconnel Terrace, Inverness, acknowledges, with thanks, the following donations:—*For Sustentation Fund*—20/- from Mr. Alexander Macfarlane, Tyneside, Ontario, and 2/6 from Miss Wilson, Hamilton Street, Larkhall, per Rev. J. S. Sinclair; 10/- from Mr. Alex. Macpherson, Strontian. *For Foreign Missions*—20/- from "Free Presbyterian," Kingussie. *For Kaffir Psalms*—20/- from "Queensland," per Rev. Neil Cameron. *For Missionaries and Catechists*—10/- from Mr. Donald Shaw, Manor Crescent, Gourrock; 2/6 from "A Friend," Glasgow; and 2/6 from "A Friend," Tarbert, Loch Fyne, per Rev. J. S. Sinclair. Rev. D. Beaton, Wick, acknowledges, with thanks, the sum of £6 15s. 7d. for Strathy Building Fund from "Friends in Canada," per Miss Mustard, Brucefield. Rev. N. Cameron acknowledges, with thanks, 10/- for Kaffir Bibles from "A Friend," Staffin. Rev. J. S. Sinclair acknowledges, with thanks, £1 from Mr. D. Sutherland, Castletown, for John Knox's Sustentation Fund.

The Magazine.

Notice to Subscribers.—We respectfully remind our readers that the month of April was the end of the Magazine year, and that payments due for past and future will now much oblige. Address to Rev. J. S. Sinclair, 248 Kenmure Street, Pollokshields, Glasgow.

Subscriptions Received for Magazine.—D. M'Rae, Isle Ewe, Aultbea, 2/6; Mrs. M'Kenzie, Achintee, Strathcarron, 2/6; R. Sutherland, Clatequoy, Thurso, 2/6; J. Ross, mason, Ullapool, 3/-; R. Macdonald, Strathcanaird, 3/9; Mrs. A. Macdonald, West Terrace, Ullapool, 2/6; D. Gordon, Kishorn, 2/6; R. Fraser, Kinlochbervie, 2/6; A. Mackay, Rogart, 27/-; C. Mackessack, Mains of Alves, 1/8; R. M'Lennan, Corrie, Ullapool, 2/6; Miss Fraser, Crask, Lairg, 2/6; A. Mackenzie, Newpark, Laide, 2/6; D. Crawford, Tarbert, Lochfyne, 2/6; G. Macleod, Clashfern, Scourie, 2/6; W.

Finlayson, Auchorne, Wick, 2/6; Miss Scott, Meadowpark St., Dennistoun, 2/6; Mrs. Porteous, Dunvegan, 28/; A. Macaulay, Fladda Lighthouse, Cullipool, 2/6; D. Mackay, shepherd, Heilam, Tongue, 2/6; Mrs. Maclean, Balemore, Lochmaddy, 5/; A. Mackay, missionary, Staffin, 15/9½; J. M'Donald, shoemaker, Annat, Torridon, 7/; Miss Maclean, Prestwick, 2/6; W. Sinclair, Winnipeg, 25/; Mrs. Taylor, Carman, Manitoba, 4/; A. M'Leish, Lamon, Ontario, 2/6; G. Mackay, Todholes, Thurso, 2/6; M. S. Fraser, Mound, 5/; J. Macdonald, joiner, Applecross, 2/6; J. Downie, Calder Street, Glasgow, 2/6; Mrs. Campbell, Kilcreggan, 2/6; K. M'Rae, Talladale, Loch Maree, 2/6; G. Matheson, Stoer, 1/3; M. Beaton, Waternish, 2/5; J. Adamson, Helmsdale, 6/5; Mrs. Campbell, bookseller, Oban, 13/1; J. Parker, Bridge-of-Allan, 7/6; D. Cameron, Menstrie, 2/6, and Free Circulation, 1/6; A. Fraser, for St. Jude's Collectors, 33/; Miss Blunt and Miss Way, Brighton, 5/; Miss P. Kerr, Clashnessie, Lochinver, 5/; Mrs. M'Lean, Shieldaig, Gairloch, 2/6; Mrs. Forbes, Lochinver, 2/6; D. Fraser, Farley, Beaully, 2/6; J. Macleod, Lairg, 13/3; W. Gray, Lochgilphead, 2/6; Mrs. J. Campbell, Golspie, 2/6; N. Munro, Whiteinch, 2/6; D. A. M'Corquodale, Paisley, 2/6; M. M'Kenzie, Townhead, 2/6; J. M'Lean, Partick, 3/; D. J. Mackay, Alsask, Saskatchewan, 4/1; Mrs. Miller, Port Dover, Ontario, 4/; A. Murray, Morness, Rogart, 2/6; Miss R. Kennedy, Kishorn, 2/6; J. Ross, Kimberley, Fearn, 2/6; A. Gunn, Morness, Rogart, 2/6; H. Morrison and A. M'Donald, Scourie, 2/6 each; Mrs. J. Sinclair, Westerdale, 2/6; P. Cameron, Aviemore, 5/6; Miss Lamont, Kensington Mansions, London, 2/6; Mrs. M. Macleod, S. Osaig, Raasay, 2/6; Mrs. Shaw, Detroit, U.S.A., 2/6; Miss M. Campbell, Soay Isle, 2/6; D. Cameron, Soay P.O., 2/6; Mrs. Sutherland, Culag Cottage, Lochinver, 2/6; D. Forbes, S. Clunes, Kirkhill, 2/6; S. F. Paul, Port Hall Street, Brighton, 2/6; J. Gordon, Newtonmore, 2/6; Miss Sasum and Miss Urquhart, Grosvenor Place, London, 2/6 each; J. Mackay, Lasswade, 2/6; J. Mackay, High Street, Thurso, 2/6; N. M'Rae, Achduart, Ullapool, 5/; Miss M'Gillivray, Saltcoats, 2/6; D. Macmaster, Corpach, 9/; Miss M'Iver, Westbourne Terrace, London, W., 2/6; Mrs. Sangster, Kingussie, 2/6; Miss M'Kenzie, Culkein, Lochinver, 2/6; Miss Murray, Shoemaker St., Brora, 2/6; Mrs. Robertson, Shields Road, Glasgow, 6/; Misses Urquhart, Invergordon, 6/3; Miss M'Killop, Catcol, 2/6; J. M'Leod, Balmeanach, Raasay, 2/6; Miss Gollan, St. John's Ter., Glasgow, 2/6; Miss Taylor, Middlesborough, 2/6; W. S. Munro, S. Dunn, Caithness, 2/6; A. M'Naughton, Glenmamie, 2/6; Miss M'Kenzie, Achdloch, Coigach, 2/6; D. M'Leod and D. M'Kenzie, Tarbert, Scourie, 2/6 each; Mrs. Lamont, Otter Ferry, 2/6; H. Sutherland, Balvraid, Dornoch, 2/6; W. Urquhart, Barlinnie, 3/9; Mrs. M'Kenzie, 3 Sutherland Street, Tain, 5/; C. Rodger, St. Rollox, 7/6; D. C. Urquhart, Garville, Ontario, 2/6; Mrs. Sayers, Stevenston, 2/6; A. Clunas, Inverness, 1/3; Mrs. D. Mackay, Ardineaskan, Lochcarron, 2/6; Miss Macmaster, Dowanhill, 5/; J. M'Iver, Renfrew Street, Glasgow, 2/6; Mrs. Stirling, Pollokshaws Road, 2/6; Miss Morrison, Bowmont Gardens, Kelvinside, 5/; D. Bethune, Tarbert, Harris, 16/; J. Hymers, Weydale, Thurso, 2/6; D. Hymers, Scotscladder, 2/6; H. M'Leod, Pandera Street, Vancouver, 3/; Miss M'Intosh, Mill Place, Raasay, 2/6; Mrs. Gunn, Brubster, Reay, 2/6; M. M'Dougall, Tarbert, Loch Fyne, 2/6; Miss M'Askill, Carbeth Guthrie, Blanefield, 2/6; G. G. Fraser, W. Birichen, Dornoch, 29/; Mrs. A. M'Leod, Struth, Harris, 2/6; Miss Williamson, Spittal, Caithness, 2/6; Mrs. J. Macrae, Inverkeithing, 2/6; A. Maclean, D. Gillies, and D. Mackay, Ardineaskan, Lochcarron, 2/6 each; D. Shaw, Gourrock, 2/6; S. M'G. Fraser, Inverness, 13/8; Mrs. M'Dougall, Milwaukee, U.S.A., 4/2; Miss E. Mackay, Halkirk, 10/10; Mrs. M'Kenzie, Elgin Street, Vancouver, 2/5; J. Shaw, Toloah, Kincaig, 2/6; J. Morrison, Ullapool, 1/3; W. M'Leod, Little Assynt, 2/6; Miss Martin, Kilfinan, Tighnabruaich, 2/6; Miss Finlayson, Garve, 7/6; Miss Wilson, Hamilton St., Larkhall, 3/; Mrs. Crawford, Buccleuch St., Glasgow, 2/6; Mrs. J. D. Campbell, Coldstream, Ontario, 4/.

(Some Magazine Subscriptions held over till next month.)