



# 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 ABSENCE OF THE SENSE OF SIN, . . . . .                     | 245   |
| A SERMON. By the Rev. James S. Sinclair, John Knox's, Glasgow, | 248   |
| THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN. By Rev. J. R. Mackay, M.A.,      | 256   |
| AUSTRALIAN CHURCHES, . . . . .                                 | 263   |
| THE LATE MR. WILLIAM FORD PORTEOUS, VATTEN, SKYE, . . .        | 269   |
| BRIEF OBITUARIES, . . . . .                                    | 272   |
| DIOGHLUM O THEAGASG NAN AITHRICHEAN, . . . . .                 | 274   |
| PROFESSOR W. M. ALEXANDER AND REVIVALS, . . . . .              | 279   |
| NOTES AND COMMENTS, . . . . .                                  | 281   |
| CHURCH NOTES, . . . . .  | 283   |
| THE MAGAZINE, . . . . .  | 284   |

N. ADSHEAD & SON,

Printers and Bookbinders,

11 and 92 UNION STREET, GLASGOW.



PRICE TWOPENCE.

THE

# Free Presbyterian Magazine

*And MONTHLY RECORD.*

---

VOL. XVI.

NOVEMBER, 1911.

No. 7.

## The Absence of the Sense of Sin.

MANY are the fundamental defects of the popular religion of the present day. Some of these are to be seen in the outward practice of its professors; others, in the inner frame of mind which characterises them and which does not fail to show itself. One of the latter defects, which is patent to the eye of the spiritual observer, is the absence of the sense of sin. There are no "sinners" nowadays, in the felt sense of the word, among the general class of supposed Christians. The explanation is that a generation of people have arisen who are "pure in their own eyes and yet are not washed from their filthiness."

1. Let us observe, in the first place, that there is the greatest possible difference between the committal of sin and the sense of sin. Sin itself is of the creature, but the sense of it is of God. It is necessary to make plain this distinction. Many ignorant people are found who cannot discriminate in the matter. When some such happen to hear a sincere child of God confessing his sins in prayer, they are ready to conclude that he must surely be a greater transgressor than others, or that he has committed some specially heinous iniquities. They do not understand that the enlightened conscience has a keener sense of sin and guilt than others, and sees sin and guilt where others see none. Another fact that is overlooked is that indulgence in sin, instead of awakening the sense of it, has entirely the opposite effect. Criminal indulgence has the direct tendency to stupefy and deaden the conscience. The conscience is rendered inactive and insensate. Thus it frequently happens that hardened sinners are in their own opinion the most innocent people in the world. All the miseries they bring upon themselves they attribute to the ill intentions of other people. On the other hand, where the true sense of sin is, there is a sense of its constant presence in thought and action, its evil and its guilt, and there is the disposition to

hate it and forsake it. Let it be clearly marked then that sin is of man and the devil, but the sense of it is the work of God in the soul.

2. It is to be noted more fully that the sense of sin is produced by the Holy Spirit in conversion, and is sustained by the same Spirit in sanctification. This is clearly the teaching of the Holy Scriptures on the subject.

As to the sense of sin in *conversion*, Christ Himself speaks in the sixteenth chapter of John, when He intimates that after He departs He will send forth the Spirit of truth, who "will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me." And this is illustrated by frequent examples in the Acts of the Apostles. Witness the thousands on the day of Pentecost, Saul of Tarsus, and the Philippian jailor. Similar has been the experience of Christians in subsequent times. Take the eminent examples of Augustine, Luther, John Bunyan, Owen, Halyburton, and others. True, cases can be found where the first stroke of the Spirit's power was the manifestation of love—the love of God—but the stroke left a sense of sin behind it. It is a sense of sin and unworthiness that makes the love of God in Christ so inexpressibly wonderful and precious in the eyes of the soul. The one is the complement of the other in saving experience, though in cases where the sense of love far exceeded the sense of sin, the latter was swallowed up in the former, and, to the soul's consciousness, hardly seemed there at all. It is usually, however, the cry of the publican—"God be merciful to me, a sinner"—that is the first experience of God's people under the Spirit's work in conversion.

As to the sense of sin in *sanctification*, the Psalmists in the Old Testament and the Apostle Paul in the New are outstanding inspired witnesses. The Psalms bear striking testimony to the sense of sin in the process of sanctification. David and the other heaven-taught writers are constantly sensible of being still sinners in heart and life. They confess their shortcomings and provocations with plaintive sorrow, and they seek with persevering earnestness that will not take denial, the forgiveness of their iniquities and the light of God's favourable countenance. The Apostle Paul in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans describes his own experience at and after conversion, and his testimony clearly is that the living soul finds evil present with him. "I delight in the law of God after the inward man (a thing no unconverted or merely awakened sinner can say); but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity with the law of sin which is in my members." Under an overwhelming sense of indwelling corruption, he cries, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" And yet in the same breath he adds, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Some modern interpreters who stand high in Presbyterian Churches,

hold that the Apostle is here describing his first convictions of sin only prior to conversion—a great mistake and delusion. It is the man of faith and hope who says, “I thank God through Jesus Christ,” that bemoans at the same time the weight of “the body of this death.” Again, the Apostle describes the case of his brethren in Christ in Galatians v. 17, “For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.” Here an inward conflict is described which undoubtedly involves a sense of indwelling sin.

Further, we remark that it stands to Christian commonsense, in meditating upon these things of God and the soul, that the case should be as it really is. Regeneration is not perfect sanctification. Regeneration is the creation of a new man—“a new heart and a right spirit”—but it is not the complete casting out of “the old man.” “The old man” is cast down, but not cast out. He is still alive and active, and though dethroned, seeks to regain the ascendancy that he has lost. All this underlies the manifold exhortations and warnings that the Apostle Paul and the other Apostles address to “the faithful in Christ Jesus,” in relation to dangers from sin—and sin clearly and unmistakably in their own breasts—lasciviousness, malice, wrath, unbelief, and such like. Where the new creation reigns, there must, of necessity, be a sense of the sin that remains, a consciousness of its depravity and guilt, a conflict with its workings, and intense longings for deliverance from it, root and branch. How conspicuous by its absence is such a sense of sin in the popular religion of the times in which we live! Weighed in the balances of the sanctuary, that religion is found entirely wanting.

Our further remarks on the subject must be (God willing) reserved for a future issue.

---

**“The Church Union Journal.”**—This Journal has as its mission the advocacy of the Union of the Churches in Scotland. Union may be a very good thing and it may be a very bad thing. Scotland has good reason to remember the last Union, and if the prospective or anticipated Union is to let loose on the land such a whirlwind of ill-feeling, we had better remain as we are. These are days when it is more usual to find men making compromises than standing resolutely by principles that have a sure foundation. Needless to say, we have no sympathy with the movement. It appears to be a pet scheme of the *Scotsman*, and what that paper blesses in religious or ecclesiastical matters is generally not what those who wish Zion’s prosperity would care to see coming to pass. Meantime the *Church Union Journal* advocates the cause, and if special pleading will accomplish it, the Union will take place.



## A Sermon.

BY THE REV. JAMES S. SINCLAIR, JOHN KNOX'S, GLASGOW.

~~~~~  
"There was a certain creditor which had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me therefore, which of them will love him most?"—LUKE vii. 41, 42.  
~~~~~

THIS parable was spoken by Jesus on a very touching occasion. He had been invited by one of the Pharisees, Simon to name, to eat with him, and had accepted the invitation. We are told that "he went into the Pharisee's house and sat down to meat." While he was seated there, a striking incident took place. "A woman in the city" who had been an open and notorious sinner, came with "an alabaster box of ointment and stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head." She also "kissed his feet and anointed them with the ointment." These marks of sorrow and affection evidently showed the character of a sincere penitent. She had been a great sinner, but she had heard with power, the words of grace and truth from the lips of the great Saviour, and her heart was broken for the sin of her past life. She had evidently got a view of the infinite excellency and preciousness of Christ "as fairer than the children of men," for she did not hesitate, in the most humble and affecting manner, to express the all-absorbing love and reverence which she had begun to cherish for His adorable person. These things would have been plain to an unbiassed on-looker, but they were not so to the proud self-righteous Pharisee. He could see nothing but the fact that the woman was a sinner, and "spake within himself saying, This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him: for she is a sinner." Observing that Christ did not repel the poor woman's attentions, he does not draw a conclusion in favour of His condescension and grace, but expresses within himself the doubt whether Christ was a prophet at all, seeing that He allowed "a sinner" to touch Him. What ignorance of Christ and His work of mercy, these thoughts revealed! The omniscient Redeemer saw what was going on in the heart of Simon, and spake the parable of the creditor and the two debtors with a view to teach him and others present, a lesson in gospel truth, which they should not readily have forgotten. The parable was spoken by way of reproof. The grace of God, set forth in it, is a reproof to the pride and self-righteousness of the fallen heart which would hold fast the principle of salvation by works. But on the other hand, no parable can afford more encouragement to the poor sinner who is willing to be an entire debtor to the free mercy of God in

Christ, and whose cry is "For thy name's sake, O Lord, pardon mine iniquity; for it is great" (Psalms xxv. 11). In considering, then, the words before us, in dependence upon the Spirit of truth, let us observe:

I.—The Creditor; "a certain creditor";

II.—The two debtors who owed, one "five hundred pence, and the other fifty";

III.—The inability of the debtors: "they had nothing to pay"; and

IV.—The Creditor's forgiveness.

I.—Let us notice that *God is the creditor* to which Christ refers. He is employing figurative language to set forth a certain relation in which the Most High stands to His creatures. A creditor among men is one who gives goods or money to others for a time on the condition of payment or return. God is the creditor of His creatures in the sense that He has given them many privileges in all ages, for which He expects some return at their hands, that shall be honourable to themselves and glorifying to Him. This return, alas, He has not received from fallen sinners of Adam's race. Let us here observe briefly the two chief aspects in which God stands in the relation of creditor to us.

1. He is our creditor in the administration of the covenant of works. He created man in His own image at the beginning, and gave him a holy soul and body that he might employ these in the service of his Maker. He placed our first parents in a beautiful garden, where they walked in all outward comfort as well as enjoyed the favour and converse of God Himself. Still more, He entered into a covenant of life with Adam, as the natural head of the race, the substance of which engagement was a promise of everlasting life to him and his posterity on condition of his perfect obedience, and a threatening of everlasting death as the penalty of disobedience. The Most High thus bestowed upon us many advantages in the First Adam; He gave us a rich stock of goods, and the ability to employ them for his glory. He became our creditor in a high and important sense, and we became His highly favoured debtors, under every obligation to make a suitable return for His kindness. But, sad to say, the covenant was violated. Man broke it by disobedience, and thus abused and cast away all the valuable blessings which he had received, making himself obnoxious to the penalty of eternal death. Here, however, transpired an inexpressible wonder. God, in the riches of His goodness, became our creditor again in the unfolding of a new covenant, designed to meet the desperate case of these ruined debtors. "He restored that which he took not away." This leads us to notice:

2. He is our creditor in the administration of the covenant of grace. The first intimation of the provision of this covenant was made in the promise that the seed of the woman would bruise the head of the serpent. The main substance of this covenant, as

unfolded through the length and breadth of the Scriptures, is that God entered into an engagement with His only-begotten and eternal Son that He would become, in the fulness of the time, the seed of the woman by the assumption to Himself of a true but holy humanity; that He would enter into conflict with and overcome the old serpent; and that by His holy and steadfast obedience and sufferings unto death, He would obtain eternal redemption from sin, Satan, and the curse, on behalf of an innumerable company of our race. Further, it was arranged that the Holy Spirit would apply this redemption with power to the souls of men. The first part of this covenant, in a way of purchase, was fulfilled in due time by the Lord Jesus Christ, and the second, in a way of application, is now in process of being accomplished.

Let us now observe that God has become our creditor again, in bestowing upon us the various means of grace whereby He communicates the benefits of this great redemption. These means He expects sinners to employ with a view to their salvation and His glory. They are privileges bestowed upon men, which, if rightly improved by divine help, will bring a revenue of praise to God. He gave much in this way to the Jews of the Old Dispensation, but He has given more to us under the New. He has sent us the whole Bible—the completed canon of divine revelation—and every sinner in a Gospel land has now the opportunity of becoming acquainted with its precious contents. He has provided us with a preached Gospel, and has sent forth His Spirit in His powerful operations to convince, quicken, and renew. He has set up His Sabbath in our midst as a sacred day of rest and worship. To some He has given godly relatives and friends, whose word and example are fitted to bring the realities of eternity and salvation near. Our heavenly Creditor has bestowed upon us much valuable goods, and He looks for spiritual revenue to be returned to Him.

It is vain for any to imagine that privileges do not entail responsibilities, and that, because they cannot save themselves, they are not to be diligent in seeking to improve their privileges. It is in connection with the use of means that God blesses and saves His people, and glorifies His name, and those who cast these behind their back, deliberately chose to dishonour God and destroy themselves, to the utmost of their ability. We shall have to give an account of our stewardship at death and the judgment seat.

II.—Let us next observe “the two debtors,” who owe, one five hundred pence, and the other fifty. It is plain that Jesus has here immediately in view the woman and Simon. She had been a great transgressor, and she owed five hundred pence; the Pharisee had been moral and upright in his life, and he owed only fifty.

The Saviour here recognises a distinction which runs through all His teaching that some sinners of the race involve themselves

in greater guilt than others. "There is none righteous, no not one." All sinned and fell in Adam, and all possess a sinful corrupt heart, but some plunge themselves by their actual transgressions into deeper debt to divine justice than others. At the same time, it is not so easy, as it may at first sight appear, to determine who are always the most guilty parties. So much has to be taken into account, that God alone can infallibly determine the exact proportion of guilt in every individual case. He has, however, given us in this parable and elsewhere in Scripture some general rules designed for our guidance and admonition in the matter.

Let us notice, first, the guilt of people possessed of *equal privileges*. To this class the woman and Simon seem to belong. They were both, to begin with, members of the commonwealth of Israel, and had all the privileges of this favoured people. But the woman had trampled upon all outward restraints, and had run riot in the ways of sin and death, while Simon had lived a strict and careful life and had walked in a measure answerable to his light and knowledge. Her guilt was much greater than his, though he was a sinner also in many things, a fact that he does not seem to recognise. Christ allows that the woman is a greater transgressor than Simon, but He does not fail to remind him that he is a transgressor also. Thus, it is the case, my friends, still. We see many brought up in favourable surroundings, but some of these despising their advantages and going headlong into all the vanities and follies of the world, while others appreciate to a certain extent their privileges and are circumspect in their walk and conversation. Let not the former reason in carnal fashion that, because all men are sinners, their course of life does not imply any added guilt, and that it makes no difference how men live, if they are still unregenerate. They may find out something different when they come to die. The impenitent debtor who deliberately accumulates his debt of five hundred pence and refuses to accept the pardon of the gospel, will find out at last that he has chosen for himself a deeper and more dreadful place in hell than his more careful neighbour, although it is an awful thing to go there in any circumstances. The Apostle Paul bears testimony to this in respect of the unbelieving and persecuting Jews who violently opposed the gospel, when he declares that "the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." (1 Thess. ii. 16.)

Let us, secondly, notice the guilt of people possessed of *unequal privileges*. Those who have been under the sound of the true gospel from their childhood are in deeper debt to God than the heathen who never heard the gospel, or than those who have had only a semblance of it. Let us be assured of this, that the first of these classes is owing the five hundred pence—the others lesser sums in proportion to their peculiar circumstances. Gospel neglecters and despisers are far greater transgressors in God's sight, however fair their moral character may be, than many in

heathen lands who live lives of degradation. It will be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for the Capernaum sinners of Great Britain who have been exalted to heaven with outward privileges, and who shall, if they repent not, be thrust down to the depths of hell. "And that servant which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes, but he that knew not and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required." (Luke xii. 47, 48.) And you, who have been accustomed to sound doctrine from your youth, and have had solemn warnings and gracious invitations addressed to you from Sabbath to Sabbath will have much more to account for at last than those who have been brought up in ignorance of these advantages. You are five hundred pence debtors, and stand in unspeakable need of a free forgiveness for abused mercies. O seek it now in the day of mercy, ere it be too late (Isaiah lv. 6, 7).

III.—The third point in the parable that falls to be noticed is the inability of the debtors; "they had nothing to pay." This was the case with both parties. The five hundred pence debtor was in irretrievable debt, and the fifty pence debtor was in no better case, for, although he had less to pay, he was equally helpless to meet the just demands of the creditor.

There may be different degrees of guilt, as we have shown, among men in general, but here is a point where they are all on an equal footing: they have "nothing to pay," nothing to meet the requirements of God's justice. His justice calls for satisfaction in two special particulars: obedience to divine precepts in all those respects, where there has been disobedience, and satisfaction by suffering for transgression committed. "The wages of sin is death." Now, where is the sinner that can meet these demands? The disobedient sinner has rendered himself incapable of ever giving the perfect obedience which God's revealed will justly requires. "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself." "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." The best works that the natural man can perform are rotten at the heart. "God made man upright" at the beginning in heart and action, and in justice, He cannot accept anything less now. Poor fallen sinners have therefore nothing to pay by way of obedience to the precept of the law. "By the deeds of the law (the deeds of corrupt sinners and there are no other) no flesh shall be justified in His sight."

Still more, we have "nothing to pay" in a way of satisfaction to the penalty of disobedience. The sufferings of unholy creatures can never satisfy the holy justice that has been offended. All the sufferings of the lost in hell are never able to satisfy the requirements of divine justice, and so these sufferings never come to an end. Justice requires willing suffering—holy suffering—before its



perfect demands can be met, and this is what no fallen sinner can render. "Nothing to pay," therefore, is the verdict that has to be passed upon every member of our lost race, whatever men may think of themselves or not.

Multitudes in the Church of Rome—yes, and in Protestant Churches also—imagine they can pay their debt to God's justice; they are working night and day at a thousand labours, supposing that they will make themselves acceptable in His sight. But theirs is a vain delusion. The Apostle Paul, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, solemnly declares that "as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse," and in so declaring, condemns such legalists, root and branch.

The great difficulty, however, is to get sinners to believe that they have nothing wherewith to pay. None but the Spirit of God can convince them of this, and it is a great mercy when a poor sinner is brought to see that he is guilty of having destroyed himself, that he is utterly destitute of all ability to keep the precept, or satisfy the penalty of the divine law, and that he is justly under the sentence of eternal death. It is usually in this spot that sinners are made willing debtors to the mercy of God in Christ who has magnified the law and made it honourable in the room of all His people. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth." (Rom. x. 4.)

IV.—We now come to the fourth and most wonderful point in this parable—the Creditor's forgiveness. "And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both." May the Most High be for ever adored that these words and such as these, have been spoken and written for the benefit of the guilty sons of men!

1. Let us observe first, that it is the Creditor Himself, and not another, that forgives. It is He whose goodness was abused and dishonoured, who had an absolutely perfect sense of what was due to His just requirements, who was under no inherent obligation to show mercy, and who might have, in all righteousness, cast His ungrateful debtors into an eternal prison, that frankly cancels their debts and sets them free. Sometimes, among men, when the handling of such things as debts falls into the hand of another than the creditor himself, the other has no scruple in exercising an unjust liberality towards the debtors. Such kindness is worthy of small esteem. But here, the soul, whose conscience has been awakened to a sense of righteousness, has the unspeakable satisfaction of knowing that it is the very Divine Creditor whom he has robbed and dishonoured by his sins, that finds it possible in consistency with all the perfections of His character to bestow forgiveness. This greatly enhances the sweetness of the gift. The Holy One of Israel is also a sin-pardoning God. "Who is a God like unto thee that pardoneth iniquity?"

2. Let us notice next the character of the forgiveness bestowed. "He *frankly* forgave them both." There is much wrapped up in the frankness with which the Lord forgives.

(1) It is a *sovereign* forgiveness. He was under no absolute necessity to forgive. He chose to do so of His good pleasure. It is the forgiveness of a King who is under no obligation to pardon. The Lord said, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy," and His counsel stands sure for ever.

(2) It is a *gracious* forgiveness. "The Lord is merciful and gracious: who forgiveth all thine iniquities." Forgiveness is of the free grace of God through Jesus Christ. Sinners do not deserve pardon: they justly merit eternal condemnation; and under this condemnation the whole guilty race would have remained, if God did not, in the abundance of His mercy, purpose to forgive. He now bestows the forgiveness of sins, "according to the riches of his grace"; and He forgives the greatest transgressors as freely as the least through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (Ephes. i. 7).

(3) It is a *righteous* forgiveness. He that forgives frankly forgives with his whole heart and soul. This is the manner in which the Lord forgives: He forgives with the consent of His righteousness as well as of His other attributes. His righteousness is well pleased with the obedience and death of Christ who obeyed and suffered in the room of sinners, and satisfied all the claims of law and justice on their behalf. Forgiveness thus flows through a righteous channel to the guilty. It is an eminent part of justification, and God is just, when He is "the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus." (Rom. iii. 25-26.)

(4) It is a *loving* forgiveness. The creditor who frankly forgives, as we have said, does it with all his heart. And the heart of God is a heart of love towards a sinful people who are guilty debtors to His justice. If He forgives you your sins, He does it in the exercise of His infinite love. Godly King Hezekiah says in his prayer: "Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption; for thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back." (Isaiah xxviii. 17.)

(5) It is a *full* forgiveness. "All thine iniquities." The creditor does not forgive the debtors part of their debt; He cancels it all. The Lord bestows a complete forgiveness on those He pardons. He blots out all their sins, great and small, without exception. What a wonderful blessing this is! "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow, though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." (Isaiah i. 18.)

(6) It is an *unchangeable* forgiveness. "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance." He does not forgive to-day, and condemn to-morrow. No doubt, His people have not always a feeling sense of their forgiveness: they are afraid oftentimes that the Lord is still charging their past sins against them, and they cry with the Psalmist, "Remember not the sins of my youth nor my transgressions." But they are greatly mistaken if they think that the Lord has withdrawn the word of pardon that has gone out of His mouth. He saith, "I am the Lord; I change not."

He may chastise them on account of their sins past and present, but this is rather because He has forgiven than because He has not. "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth." Whom He forgives, He sanctifies; and their sanctification under His discipline is an evidence of their justification. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."

(7) Our last point here is that it is an *everlasting* forgiveness. "The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him." It is true indeed that the Lord's people come to "the throne of grace" constantly for the forgiveness of their daily sins, but this does not imply that their first forgiveness has come to an end; it only means that they seek an experimental realisation of what was contained in it suitable to their present case. The experimental realisation of what is in Christ for His people is something that can only be held by the Spirit's continued operation upon their souls, and the exercise of prayer at a throne of grace is one of the channels along which the Spirit works in producing repentance, confession of sin, cries for mercy, and the application of forgiveness. The divine pardon will stand sure at death, and at the judgment seat of Christ. Those who were pardoned and accepted in the Beloved in time, shall be openly acknowledged and acquitted before the whole world at the last day. They will hear the voice of the Judge, saying, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

The concluding point in our text, which we do not now fully handle, is the love that a free forgiveness produces, by the divine blessing, in the hearts of those who are pardoned. "Tell me, therefore, which of them will love him most?" The answer to this question was rightly given by Simon: "I suppose that he to whom He forgave most. And He said to him, Thou hast rightly judged." The greater the sense of forgiveness, the greater will be the love to the person of the Divine Forgiver. It was therefore entirely appropriate in the case of the poor woman who had been forgiven much, and deeply felt it to be so, that she should both feel and express greater love to Christ than others who had not had a similar experience. Simon treated Christ very coldly though he invited Him to his house. He was righteous in his own eyes. Possibly he owned that he had committed some small sins, and considered that he had obtained forgiveness for them. The Saviour took Simon at his own profession and weighed his practice. "To whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little," is Christ's sentence.

One other general remark. While Jesus in this parable allows that some persons are more guilty than others, yet He does not teach, here or elsewhere, that it is the disposition of truly penitent and forgiven sinners, however moral their outer life had been, to think that they were only small transgressors against the law of

God. He impresses upon all that they are sinners and lost, and recommends all to take "the lowest room," and such is the attitude of all truly gracious souls. The testimony of some of them, such as Paul, is, that while they might be more blameless, by the restraining mercy of God, in their general behaviour than others, yet that they had heart sins, secret sins, and sins against the gospel that placed them among the "chief of sinners," the five hundred pence debtors.

In conclusion, let each of us pause and consider, "Am I a forgiven sinner, or am I still under the burden of all my sins?" If we are still unforgiven, we are lying under a load that is more than sufficient to sink us down to hell. We have nothing wherewith to pay the demands of justice, and we may at any moment be seized hold of and thrust into the outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. The Lord Jesus is still exalted at the Father's right hand to bestow repentance and forgiveness of sins. Let any poor, guilty debtor, who feels himself under an overwhelming burden of sin and guilt, from which he can in nowise rescue himself, look to the exalted Saviour and commit himself entirely into His hands. He is ready to bestow a rich, free, and full forgiveness upon every heavy laden sinner who truly comes to the Father by Him, with the soul cry, "God be merciful to me a sinner." May the Lord bless to us His own Word!

## The Gospel According to John.

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

WITH a view to implement a promise made in the October Magazine, I mean now to inquire:—

I.—What may be learned concerning the authorship of our Fourth Gospel, (*a*) from that Gospel itself, and (*b*) from testimony external to the Gospel?

II.—What were the circumstances of the first readers of the Gospel? and

III.—What help do the facts established in answer to the two previous questions give to a better understanding of the Gospel in question?

I.—(*a*) If we keep in mind a few facts attested by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the fourth Gospel, on a fair examination, will not leave us in doubt as to its human authorship. For the fourth Gospel speaks plainly of its own authorship. Referring in chapter xxi. to an erroneous impression that had got abroad concerning "the disciple whom Jesus loved," that he should not die, the Gospel, at v. 24, goes on to say: "This—that is, the disciple whom Jesus loved—is the disciple that wrote these things." The human author, that is, of the fourth Gospel, according to the testimony of the Gospel itself, was "the disciple whom Jesus loved." Who, then, are we to understand by this

"disciple whom Jesus loved?" The manner in which this periphrase, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," is studiously made to serve as substitute for the author's proper name, and the manner in which this periphrase is coupled, say in xxiv. 20, and other places with Peter, a real proper name, are circumstances that lead us to the conclusion that the author's proper name has been avoided in the fourth Gospel. In xiii. 23, in xix. 26, in xx. 2, in xxi. 7, in xxi. 20, he is introduced as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." There can be little doubt that it is same person who is intended by "the other disciple that was known to the high priest" in xviii. 16; it is certain that it is the author that is meant by the periphrase "he that hath seen" in xix. 35; and I should say the same thing of the periphrase, "the other disciple," in xx. 3, 4, 8. The places now cited do not therefore yield us the author's proper name, but they do yield us the information that the author was one than whom none enjoyed more of Christ's fellowship, and that he was not Peter, nor indeed any Apostle who is mentioned within the fourth Gospel by his proper name.

Who then is he? The Apostles that are mentioned by name in this Gospel are Andrew, Peter, Philip, Nathanael, Thomas, Judas (not Iscariot), and Judas Iscariot. In other words, all the twelve Apostles, save James and John (the sons of Zebedee), and Matthew, and James (the son of Alphæus), and Simon Zelotes, occur by name in the fourth Gospel. Of the five that are not named, Matthew is excluded, among other reasons, as being the author of the first Gospel; and James, the son of Alphæus, and Simon Zelotes are excluded on the ground that in none of the four Gospels, nor yet in the earliest tradition, is there any special prominence among the Apostles assigned to any of the two. James and John, the sons of Zebedee, alone remain. These two, according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, were favoured by our Lord with a confidence towards Himself which Peter alone shared. Of the twelve Apostles, those three alone saw the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mark v. 27; Luke viii. 51). They alone were with Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1; Mark ix. 2; Luke ix. 28). They three had in Gethsemane a nearness to Christ which the other Apostles had not (Matt. xxvi. 37; Mark xiv. 33). It is thus a moral certainty that the author of the fourth Gospel, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," the disciple who leaned on His bosom at supper, was either James or John. But James we know, from Acts xii. 2, to have been put to death at a date so early that it is unimaginable that the fourth Gospel could have been written by him—a date, in fact, earlier than ever anyone assigned to the fourth Gospel. It remains that the author of the fourth Gospel was John, the son of Zebedee.

This conclusion is confirmed—if it needed confirmation—by the noteworthy circumstance that the fourth Gospel is the only one of the four Gospels where John the Baptist is invariably



styled simply John (i. 6, 15, 19, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35, 40; iii. 23-27; iv. 1; v. 33, 36; x. 40, 41. Contrast with this, Matt. iii. 1; Mark vi. 14; Luke vii. 20). Where the author of the fourth Gospel thinks ambiguity possible, he is careful to distinguish persons and places really differing but bearing the same name. Thus, in xiv. 22, he distinguishes Judas (the brother of James) from Judas Iscariot. But inasmuch as he is determined to introduce the Apostle John only by a periphrase, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," or some other periphrase, he reckons that there can be no ambiguity if he speaks of John the Baptist as simply John. Hence the usage in the matter of John the Baptist's name in the fourth Gospel. It was otherwise in the case of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. They had no intention of using a periphrase as a substitute for the Apostle John's proper name. There was therefore in their case need, to avoid ambiguity, to distinguish John, the son of Zacharias, from the Apostle John, and this is ordinarily done by calling the former John the Baptist.

I have often thought that the manner in which the Apostle John effaces almost entirely direct mention of himself and of his family, might be quoted as illustrative of what growth in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ means. There was a time (see Matt. xx. 20; Mark x. 35) when the sons of Zebedee, instigated, as it would seem, by their mother, manifested somewhat carnal notions of the nature of Christ's kingdom, and somewhat ambitious aspirations in connection with that kingdom. But more than half a century has intervened between the time that Salome (compare Matt. xxvii. 56, with Mark xv. 40) sought for John and James, her sons, the places next to Christ Himself in His kingdom, and the time that John wrote what we call the fourth Gospel. In that interval John gained in knowledge of the spirituality of Christ's kingdom, and with a deeper apprehension of the nature of the kingdom, came a corresponding growth in self-abasement. For what do we find in the matter of John's treatment of the things that concerned his own family in the Gospel he wrote? Not only is he himself not once mentioned by name, but neither is his brother, James, nor yet his mother, Salome. It would seem as though he sought to be avenged on that ambitious mind which as a family they once showed, and that he was determined that—from the family point of view—they should be as nothing. Only once does the father's name appear, and that in xxi. 2, where, as a periphrase for James and John, "the sons of Zebedee" are mentioned. The plan of the book rendered one such allusion almost necessary, lest it should be open to an adverse critic to say that the author of the fourth Gospel was not aware of the existence of the Apostles James and John at all.

Of course, it will be said that the effacement of the Evangelist's name is not owing to reasons of humility, inasmuch as he almost invariably speaks of himself as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and the persons to whom the Gospel was first delivered knew well

who that disciple was. But in this connection one has to remember that it is not only his own name that the author effaces, but that there is an effacement of John's family, which quite distinguishes the fourth from the other three Gospels. And further, it may with very good reason be held that it was not at all with a view to self-aggrandisement that the author of the fourth Gospel speaks of himself as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." It is for the sake of the truth of the Gospel that this manner of speech is made use of, and the meaning to be attached to the phrase is that John wishes his readers to understand that not only was he an eye or ear witness of all that he relates, but that through Jesus' love to him he had almost unparalleled advantages of knowing the facts of the Gospel history. We may, on this account, well believe that John records nothing concerning the earthly life of Jesus Christ but what he himself immediately saw or heard, or what Christ personally narrated to him. This claim appears, in fact, to be made in so many words in the First Epistle of John, which some have regarded as a virtual postscript to the Gospel according to John. "That which we have seen and heard," says he (1 John i. 3), "declare we unto you."

I.—(b) The conclusion regarding the authorship of the fourth Gospel to which an examination of the statements made in the Gospel itself leads us, is corroborated by all the external evidence available. Until the rise of modern infidelity the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel was questioned by none in the whole history of the Church, if we except a few whimsical bodies known to antiquity by the name of Alogi. Irenæus (120-190 A.D.), Bishop (that is, Pastor) of Lyons in Gaul, in his Third Book against Heresies, and the first chapter thereof, after stating what he had received as truth concerning the authorship and composition of the Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, goes on to say: "Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also had leaned upon His breast, did himself publish a Gospel during his residence at Ephesus in Asia." Now, the testimony of Irenæus in this connection is extremely valuable, for Irenæus forms a link in a chain which reaches back to the days of Christ Himself. Eusebius (264-340 A.D.) has preserved, in his "Ecclesiastical History" (v. 20), part of a letter which Irenæus wrote to one Florinus, then a renegade from the faith, but of whom Irenæus once hoped better things. In the course of this letter Irenæus said: "I saw you when I was yet, as a boy, in Lower Asia with Polycarp. I could even now point out the place where the blessed Polycarp sat and spoke, and describe his going out and coming in, his manner of life, his personal appearance, the addresses he delivered to the multitude, how he spoke of his intercourse with John and with the others who had seen the Lord, and how he recalled their words. And everything that he had heard from them about the Lord, Polycarp told us, as one who had received it from those who had seen the Word of Life with their own eyes, and all this

in complete harmony with the Scriptures." "These," remarks Harnack, "are priceless words, for they establish a chain of tradition (Jesus, John, Polycarp, Irenæus) which is without a parallel in history." Irenæus elsewhere ("Ecclesiastical History," iii. 3) says: "Polycarp was not only instructed by Apostles, and conversed with many who had seen Christ, but was also, by Apostles in Asia, appointed Bishop of the Church in Symrna, whom I also saw in my early youth."

The evidence of Irenæus is unambiguous, and from the nature of it, is of itself sufficient, so far as external testimony is concerned, to establish the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel. But it does not stand alone. Justin Martyr (103-168 A.D.) was a younger contemporary of Polycarp who also, after he became a Christian, spent a few years in or about Ephesus. Now Justin does not expressly say—and this be it observed is what we have to prove—that the Apostle John wrote our fourth Gospel. He does expressly say that John wrote the book of Revelation. But we are at liberty to say of Justin (1) that he knew our fourth Gospel, and (2) that, while he does not expressly mention John as the author, all that he does say in that connection tallies perfectly with the Johannine authorship. In proof of the first of these statements—we shall here only point out that in his "First Apology" (chap. lxi.) in relating the manner of Christian baptism, Justin, *inter alia*, says: "In the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit they receive the washing with water. For Christ also said: '*Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of heaven.*' Now, that it is impossible for those who have once been born to enter into their mother's womb, is manifest to all." As we come across that quotation in our reading of Justin, we cannot avoid saying that our fourth Gospel—and it was composed, according to our date, less than a score of years before Justin's birth—was well known to Justin; and there are other considerations of a more general nature, but which we cannot here and now work out, which corroborate our view of Justin.

But (2) not only did Justin Martyr know our fourth Gospel, all that he has written in this connection tallies with the view that he regarded the Apostle John as the author not only of the Book of Revelation, but also of our fourth Gospel. Justin frequently speaks of written "Memoirs" concerning Jesus Christ, to which he refers as his authorities, and which can scarcely be any other than our four Gospels. Ordinarily they are quoted as "Memoirs" by Apostles, but in one place at least he is more discriminating, for he refers to those "Memoirs" as "drawn up by Christ's Apostles and those who followed them." (Dialogue, chap. ciii.) These "Memoirs" must therefore have had as authors at least two Apostles and two followers of Apostles. It need not be pointed out how exactly that tallies with our view that, in Justin's opinion, two Apostles—to wit, Matthew and John—and two followers of Apostles—to wit, Mark and Luke—were the authors of his "Memoirs."

This estimate of the nature of Justin's testimony is further corroborated by a reference to Tatian, who was for some time a pupil of Justin's. Tatian was the author of a "Harmony of the four Gospels." The work has come down to us in a somewhat incomplete form, but still with that completeness that puts it beyond doubt that just our four Gospels were also Tatian's, and the fourth Gospel is found in what remains to us of Tatian's "Harmony" almost entirely.

Now, if Tatian (as received) does not give us the names of the four Evangelists, that desideratum is the less felt because it is beyond dispute that in Tatian's time Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were, all the world over, known as the authors of the four Gospels. Not to mention Irenæus's testimony again, I shall—keeping in view here, however, only the fourth Gospel—refer to the testimony of (1) Clement of Alexandria, who flourished about 220 A.D., a man who travelled in Greece, Syria, and other places expressly for the purpose of collecting information about the apostolic tradition. Eusebius (H.E., vi. 14) quotes Clement to the following effect: "But last of all (*i.e.*, after Matthew, Luke, and Mark), John, perceiving that the external facts had been made plain (by his predecessors, that is), composed a spiritual Gospel." (2) Theophilus, who, according to Eusebius, became Bishop of Antioch in 168 A.D. He wrote a treatise to his heathen friend, Autolycus. In the course of the treatise these words occur (chap. xxii.): "The holy writings teach us, one of whom, John, says, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God.'"

To give quotations from authors later than Irenæus, Theophilus and Clement of Alexandria, bearing on the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel is a thing uncalled for, inasmuch as it is universally conceded that from the third century the said authorship was as fully recognised as it could have been, say, at the Reformation. How then, one may ask, does Dr. Moffatt get over this overwhelming testimony to the Apostle John's title to be regarded as the human author of the fourth Gospel? We answer: (1) He gets over the witness of the Gospel to its own authorship, by treating the claim of the author, although averred on oath (xix. 35), as fictitious! (2) He treats the external testimony with more respect, but still to as little purpose. At the outset he tries to belittle Irenæus's weighty testimony, but in a manner quite unfair. His criticism of Irenæus amounts virtually to this: Irenæus can be proved to be wrong in some other of his assertions, and we cannot therefore appeal to him here. Now, we do not quote Irenæus as though he were infallible. We quote him as an honest and capable Christian writer. The mere fact that he erred in his view, say of the duration of our Lord's earthly life (and that I suppose is the most serious charge in this respect that can be made against him), is no reason why we should not accept his testimony concerning a matter which he says he heard with his own ears Polycarp say.

Having thus vainly imagined that he had disposed of Irenæus's testimony for the Apostle John's title to be regarded as the author of our fourth Gospel, Moffatt goes on to give what he regards as positive reasons for concluding that the Apostle John was martyred early in life, and, inasmuch as everyone allows that the Gospel according to John belongs to a date later than, say 60 A.D., it, of course, follows that the Apostle John was not the author of our fourth Gospel. What are these positive reasons? I shall state them one by one, and as I go along show that his reasons are, for his purpose, no reasons at all.

(a) Moffatt claims that Matthew xx. 23 (Mark x. 39), implies that the two sons of Zebedee had suffered death by martyrdom. The conclusion is quite illegitimate; but even if it were legitimate it would not avail for Moffatt's purposes. For the Apostle John might have suffered martyrdom without his dying young. It is early martyrdom that Moffatt, and the infidel school that he follows, undertake to prove.

(b) Moffatt next quotes a worthless chronicler of the 9th century, George the Sinner, in the sense that Papias, a contemporary of Polycarp, had somewhere made the statement that the Apostle John died a martyr. But then George the Sinner himself says that Papias and Origen are his authorities for saying that the Apostle John lived at Ephesus as late as 96 A.D.!

(c) Moffatt next introduces the testimony of some ancient calendars or martyrologies, with a view to prove that John, as well as James, died a martyr. The calendars referred to are practically worthless as history; but even if they did prove that John died a martyr, they prove nothing at all as to an early martyrdom. If the three foregoing arguments made use of by Moffatt were brought forward simply to show that the Apostle John died a martyr, we should say that the grounds adduced are very worthless, and, in view of Eusebius's constant allusions to the Apostle John's death at Ephesus, not to be treated as serious history. But for Moffatt's purpose the grounds are simply non-existent.

(d) The only other substitute for argument that Moffatt can bring forward is the silence of Clement of Rome, of Ignatius, and of Hegesippus, on the Ephesian residence of the Apostle John. But Clement of Rome—one Epistle by whom is extant—and Ignatius—if we have any of his writings, which is doubtful—and Hegesippus—of whom we have only fragments—never once refer to the Apostle John in any connection. Are we, then, to quote Clement, Ignatius, and Hegesippus, to show that such an one as the Apostle John never existed? The thing is absurd. The argument from silence, because it proves too much, proves nothing at all.

Moffatt's reasons for rejecting the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel are worthy of infidelity! But it is really extraordinary that they should be brought forward in this twentieth century as reasons why we should abandon the excellently-attested faith of nearly two milleniums.

*(To be Continued.)*



## Australian Churches.

IN our July issue, we took occasion to make some critical remarks on the glowing report of a Free Church deputy to Australia, who visited the small Churches there that adhere in creed to the position of 1843. Our remarks with regard to these Churches were as follows: "The limited size of these bodies is not a wholly unfavourable mark in these backsliding times, but we have reason to know that, while there are some very worthy people amongst them, they are in a decayed and divided state. They adhere to the Psalms in public worship, but some of their congregations are ready to adopt modern methods in church work, bazaars and such like." These comments have elicited the following letter from the Rev. John Sinclair, Geelong, a minister of the Free Presbyterian Church in Australia, and editor of a magazine known as the *Free Church Quarterly* there:—

"SIR,—In your issue of July last, page 89, occurs a serious misrepresentation of the Free Presbyterian Churches of New South Wales and Victoria. A similar untrue charge was made in a previous issue by the Rev. Walter Scott. The charge is that 'some of their congregations are ready to adopt modern methods in church work, bazaars, and such like.' This, indeed, does not actually declare that such methods have been used. But, if I remember rightly, Mr. Scott, in your previous issue alluded to, asserted that they had been. I now challenge him to prove it. I have failed to find, after enquiry, any evidence of this; but have had indignant denial of it. My information, however, may supply the explanation. Yet if this be the foundation of Mr. Scott's opprobrious complaint, I do not envy his evidently keen desire to prejudice the Australian Free Churches in the minds of your readers. Let me state this case: Several ladies of the congregation at Maclean voluntarily agreed to meet, and make up materials received from storekeepers, and apply the money thus earned by payment made to them, by the storekeepers, to the maintenance of students. This, I am informed, Mr. Scott denounced as a sale of gifts, before he left Brushgrove. Yet he had no compunction in receiving the proceeds of the sale of a property bequeathed for church purposes, which was the sale of a gift, whilst miscalling the giving by ladies of their earnings for work done, 'a bazaar, or such like.'

The unkind reference to Australian Churches as being 'in a decayed and divided state,' is no doubt attributable to the same source, and has a specially ill look to those who know that no congregation in New South Wales was more like a wreck than his when he hastily left it, except that of a former ex-presbyter of his own who left the State before him. These two, by their departure, nearly ended the division which they had tried hard to maintain. —I am, Sir, yours sincerely,

FREE PRESBYTERIAN MANSE,  
GEELONG, VICTORIA, 10th August, 1911."

JOHN SINCLAIR.

It will be seen that our correspondent directs his remarks chiefly against the Rev. Walter Scott, our informant concerning the Australian Churches. In view of this, we thought it right to submit his letter to Mr. Scott, as one who perfectly understood the whole situation, and was able to give a satisfactory reply. Of course, we are personally responsible for the remarks condemned, and adhere to them in substance. The only concession we can grant our correspondent is that the expression "sales of work" would have been perhaps more strictly accurate than "bazaars." It is found, however, in Scotland that the tendency to adopt "sales of work" of any kind is a tendency that seldom stops short of the full-fledged "bazaar," and the society organised in Australia appears to us to be a laying the foundation for the same unscriptural system of making money as obtains in several congregations of the Free Church at home, and almost universally throughout the larger Presbyterian Churches. The following is Mr. Scott's reply, which supplies a complete answer:—

"DEAR MR. EDITOR,—You have kindly given me opportunity to make any observations called for by the foregoing letter from Geelong. A word of explanation seems necessary first.

For the writer of the letter I can have little respect. We were indeed in intimate fellowship. This, and such service as I had rendered him, he was good enough to acknowledge, and refer to, even in his periodical, as what he could hardly repay. It is otherwise now, however. And why? He has alleged no fault against me, except it be that I could not resile from the distinctive position to which I had become pledged at my latest induction in 1895. He himself chose to transfer his ecclesiastical sympathy to a separatist party, as, till then, he had regarded it, but with whom, from the first, I had declined to be in fellowship; and against whose backslidings and unconstitutional actings he, along with his Synod, had most solemnly protested. In this inconsistency on his part I could not follow him. And failing to induce or compel me, his attitude to me and my congregation thenceforward savoured of the hostility of Haman towards Mordecai and his people. This will account to your readers for the tone of his letter. Free Presbyterians at home, from their experience of brethren among themselves transferring their sympathies to the present Free Church, may understand the situation in Australia. It was practically the same. So much so that, when we were together in fellowship, your correspondent was with me in heartiest sympathy with Free Presbyterians in Scotland. When, however, he changed to the side of the stronger party in Australia he, along with them, became all for the Free Church. Yet they will tell us, as the writer of the above letter is so ready to do, that they have not changed!

Now for his letter. Although the remarks in your July issue complained of were not from me, I am made the object of attack. The writer quotes nothing to justify this, and gives nothing save a vague reference to permit of the public judging in the matter.

1. In giving an account to the Synod of the religious position in Australia, I indicated reasons why I could not there coalesce with the party now represented by your Geelong correspondent. That statement appeared in this Magazine. In a footnote the fact was instanced that, so far from becoming more evangelical, that party were learning the ways of surrounding churches 'in such matters as sales of work, socials,' etc. This remark (after nearly two years' interval) he now apparently challenges me to prove. Yet he does not say that in the particular congregation he mentions such modern methods have since ceased. His letter seems to suggest that they may have been modified. But from his palliative explanations, one is left in the dark as to how far he approves or disapproves of the practice itself. That however is, comparatively, a matter of minor consequence. It is of far more importance to notice here that, whilst your correspondent writes from Australia to question a point mentioned merely incidentally, on the other hand, to the main charges of unfaithfulness so prominent in the body of the statement referred to, he takes no exception whatever. This should be sufficiently significant. If, like the Pharisees, your correspondent has no conscience as regards such graver evils affecting the ecclesiastical position of himself and his friends, then it almost seems, like them, 'straining at a gnat,' to appear so concerned about a lesser detail. It, indeed, reminds one of the present Free Church becoming so excited over flowers in the Church, whilst remaining quite apathetic over the doctrine of inspiration itself so compromised by their present Moderator. Your allusion to the small bodies, for whom your correspondent pleads, as being 'in a decayed and divided state,' he dismisses as due to prejudice. Has he forgotten the toning down of his Church's testimony in relation to purity of worship, for instance, in deference to individual scruple? That can hardly be said to consist with being 'stedfast and immovable.' The resemblance is rather to 'a reed shaken with the wind.' Moreover, has he not insisted on allowing, in his editorial pages, the advocacy of views outside of the Confession of Faith or the recognised teaching and testimony of the Reformation Church? And did he not thereby alienate from his fellowship recognised friends of the truth? It is in grief that I thus write. Yet he compels me. And even these indications of decay and division are only illustrations by the way.

2. In these circumstances, and when the more serious charges involved are so indifferently regarded by your correspondent, I am the less concerned about his 'indignant denial' over the mention of sales of work. He acknowledges that while at Brushgrove I consistently exposed such evils on the spot, in the case of the neighbouring Maclean Congregation. That was the time to have repudiated my statement if such had been possible. That it was never publicly questioned, and that the present, years after, is the first attempted denial—a denial, moreover, that comes

not directly, but indirectly, and from another State altogether—is sufficiently suggestive. Your correspondent says the charge is ‘untrue.’ Does he mean now, or when it was first made?

But your correspondent says he has ‘failed to find, after inquiry, any evidence of the evil’ alleged. Now, my information was not at second-hand as with him. I had the congregation’s published account of the movement. Their lady adherents were formally organised: office-bearers were duly elected—the object being the making and selling of clothing in the interest of a Church fund. I might go further. More is known locally. I am only here satisfying your readers that it was no ‘serious misrepresentation’ to credit your correspondent’s friends in this particular with a tendency towards ‘modern methods in Church work.’ But what of your correspondent’s own misstatements?

3. Let the public judge for themselves of the reliability of this witness by the following example of how unscrupulously he mis-states facts to serve his purpose. In his letter he accuses me as having ‘had no compunction in receiving the proceeds of the sale of a property bequeathed for Church purposes, which (he says) was the sale of a gift.’ Now, the fact is that, in the case in question, there was no ‘property bequeathed for Church purposes’; there was no gift of property, as alleged. The proceeds of a property when realised, the testator (a communicant) directed his executors to hand over to a congregational fund as a bequest or legacy. I am quoting from the will. With the property itself the congregation never had anything to do. Here also, therefore, your correspondent is far astray with his alleged facts. But your readers may learn with astonishment that not only were he and his friends willing without ‘compunction’ to ‘receive the proceeds;’ but they did all in their power to deprive the rightful recipients thereof, in order to appropriate the amount; an attempt providentially frustrated.

4. In closing his letter the writer sadly betrays his real motive in the personal animus he exhibits against myself. In stating, however, that ‘no congregation in N.S.W. was more like a wreck than his when he hastily left it,’ he speaks at random, and as one with whom the wish is father to the thought. Certainly, he and those he now acts with, have done what they could to destroy the congregation in question, and its special testimony. The fact, however, that our last year, even financially, had been one of our best, shews that, by the time I left Brushgrove, they had not quite succeeded. But in the nearly three years’ interval, no sermon has been preached to them; no ordinary supply has been available: only fellowship meetings have been possible. Yet these have been regularly held, Sabbath and weekday. It is well known that the normal strength of a congregation rarely appears in such circumstances; yet, during those trying years, at least several families have continued together; three elders and other praying men have been conducting the exercises; they have

been sending home their annual Foreign Mission collection, and they have collected yearly a very considerable amount for the Trinitarian Bible Society, London. Be it remembered also that these devoted people are not just located around the church door, but come from distances of from three to nine miles each way. They have kept in communication with their wonted pastor in their trials; they may be faint, indeed, yet have they still been pursuing. In such circumstances, let your readers judge whether, what your correspondent has dared to write of them to Scotland, is not the doing of an enemy. Will it be believed that the man so writing has personally gone from end to end of the district sowing dissension to divide and scatter this pastorless flock? More than that, he has had them deprived of their most convenient Church building where they stately congregated. Do your readers ask: In what way? By forcing an entrance in opposition to a united Session acting for the people. 'He entereth not by the door into the sheep-fold, but climbeth up some other way.' Let me here point out that, such expulsion methods notwithstanding, he has to confess to having so far failed to end what he terms 'the division.' A compassionate Saviour has said, 'Fear not, little flock.' What your correspondent says of a former co-presbyter of mine may receive attention otherwise.—I am, faithfully yours,

WALTER SCOTT.

40 SHANDWICK PLACE,  
EDINBURGH, 22nd September, 1911.

*P.S.*—A later mail from Australia brings the information that, having forcibly occupied Woodford Dale Church against the faithful remnant there congregating, the party of your correspondent are proceeding further to take Brushgrove Church also—their only remaining place of worship. The party led by Dr. Rainy at home never acted with a higher hand or with greater injustice to the suffering minority, than this small prevailing party in Australia is doing at this moment. The object, too, is the same—'to extinguish the impracticable elements'—the phrase used by Dr. Rainy in 1893. In this case your correspondent's friends are endeavouring to simply appropriate what they have no shadow of claim to. The nations are, meantime, crying out against Italy's seizure of territory not her own: that is being done in the light; this in the dark, and by a professing Church against weaker brethren. And, on this occasion, the delegate of the present Free Church in Scotland, Rev. James Henry, now in Australia, is, it seems, mixed up with such unscrupulous actions.

The late Rev. A. Paul wrote to me that he had warned the present Free Church against entering into relations with the party so acting. It seems they are not particular. It will be seen from the following letters of Mr. Paul that my own experience is nothing singular at the hand of that party. Other ministers fared similarly. They have recently been eulogising the memory



of Mr. Paul in their periodical in Sydney. His letters, now appearing, will show how differently he estimated them. And, as they themselves allow, Mr. Paul was 'a prince, and a great man in Israel.' This might well lead the present Free Church to pause.

W. S."

*From Rev. ARTHUR PAUL, St. Kilda Free Presbyterian Manse, Melbourne, to Rev. WALTER SCOTT, Brushgrove, N.S.W.*

"ST. KILDA, 13th February, 1909.

MY DEAR SIR,—Your last letter greatly distresses me. I do not wonder that the pressures around you have become intolerable. Experience of the men you have to contend with renders it quite easy for me to understand what methods they are capable of pursuing. It is not easy, and for one's own peace of mind, it is hardly advisable, to speak of them as they deserve. For you as well as me, it will be best to leave them, and their religious professions, in the hands of Him who judgeth righteously. I have no doubt but that your refusal to 'join' with the Sutherland party stung them and accounts for much—perhaps most, if not all—that you have endured at their hands. They have their fraternizers in this colony, also, as you know, and these would willingly have driven me out of Australia, as they have meanwhile driven you. But I am heartily sorry for your leaving, although far from blaming it. With your departure, as I think, departs the last shred of Alexander M'Intyre's\* good work on the Clarence River. I have ceased to feel surprised at the sudden changes which come over our professing Free Church people. A too general decay of spiritual life among them accounts for it.

Notwithstanding all this, I hope the voyage home and your visit to the old country will set you up in bodily health. If spared to your destination in safety, you will be refreshed by fellowship with ministers and people who are likeminded. You know it is the happiness of some that their youth is renewed as the eagle's. There are sad situations in the old country also, and fears for Britain in the near future may not be out of place; but there is still a remnant and an organisation, and a banner appearing for the truth. You will be seeing Mr. Cameron. Will you please tell him how greatly I appreciated the long and very kind letter he sent me? And if you see my old friend, Mr. Robertson, colleague to Mr. Cameron, will you please convey to him my very kindest remembrances?

It will be a trial to Mrs. Scott to break up the home in which you have lived together for so many years. But I feel sure she will be content with even that rather than you should compromise your public consistency.—Yours very truly,

(Signed) ARTHUR PAUL."

---

\* This is the highly honoured Rev. Alexander M'Intyre, of Strontian, Argyllshire, who spent his last years in Australia. See Memoir of Rev. D. Macdonald, Shieldaig, pp. 6-8.—ED.

*Farewell letter from* Rev. ARTHUR PAUL *to* Rev. W. SCOTT.

“88 ALMA STREET,  
ST. KILDA, 18th March, 1909.

DEAR MR. SCOTT,—I write this hoping to bid you good-bye in person. But I wish to tell you in this way how deeply I grieve at the unworthy treatment which has been shown you by some who are nominally at least Free Church ministers. Your absence will be a distinct loss to the Free Presbyterian interest in Australia, and the spirit which has forced you out of the vineyard for a time is not one to be envied. For myself I hold such proceedings in abhorrence. No doubt all will be over-ruled to you for good, and I hope that the voyage back to the old country will result in a restoration of your health, and a reviving of your energies.—Yours very truly,

(Signed) ARTHUR PAUL.”

## The late Mr. William Ford Porteous, Vatten, Skye.

IT is with regret that another obituary notice, which we feel justified in putting on record, has to be inserted in these pages. It is in certain respects a sorrowful task devolving from time to time on ministers throughout the Church, to have to put on record the removal by death of such as were of considerable help and use in their congregations. It is the hand of the Most High, and to it we, as a Church, must bow, and it we must acknowledge. The subject of this notice is Mr. William F. Porteous, whose death happened with startling suddenness on the 31st July last at Strathpeffer. He had just gone there a few weeks prior to his death for the benefit of his health. This he was in the habit of doing every summer for many years past, and he usually felt the better of the change and of the drinking of the Strathpeffer waters. But for the most part of this year he was, through a serious relapse and consequent physical weakness, confined to his bed. He had therefore grown so weak that the effect of travelling from his home proved too much for his broken frame.

Mr. Porteous was a native of the south and was born in Glasgow. His parents were in very good circumstances and possessed of considerable means. He was deprived of his mother, who, we understand, was a worthy woman, when he was but six years old. And young though he then was, he never failed to retain vivid recollections of her. The loss of his mother was, no doubt, a great loss to him, and a loss which affected more or less his modes and habits of life as he grew up. But notwithstanding that he wanted his mother at this tender age, his upbringing was carefully attended to by his father. In this way he possessed the

privileges which, sad to relate, are very much despised and abused in this generation, of having a good deal of Bible truth and Bible knowledge instilled into his mind. He realised in after years—though he did not at that time—how great a benefit and blessing it was to have had those early instructions.

His early ambitions were directed towards seafaring life, and while yet a mere youth he was sent, in accordance with his own wishes, to training at sea. He sailed round the world several times, and spent many years in the East Indies and other parts of the world. It was the climate of the tropics that affected his general health at first, for soon he was laid up with an attack of the raging fevers which are so common to the tropics. He had repeated attacks of fever, until at last, on account of the dregs and seeds which they had left and sown in his bodily constitution, his health became permanently injured. Hence the bodily weaknesses and sufferings under which he laboured, and which were particularly intensified in the closing years of his life. He was latterly deprived to a large extent of the use of his voice. In the midst of all this physical suffering and uneasiness he exhibited a beautiful and exemplary spirit. He was never heard to murmur or complain against his afflictions as coming from the hand of God. He was conscious that it was a cross and trial laid on him by the Most High, and he bore his sufferings all through with fortitude, with Christian resignation, and in a noble spirit to the end. He was courteous and social in manner, cheerful in disposition, buoyant but chastened in spirit, and his nature remained unsoured throughout.

After he retired from the sea and ended his somewhat varied yet none the less interesting life, he came to live in Skye. There were other factors in the situation and other circumstances in his case which influenced him in deciding to come to reside in Skye. These, however, are not necessary to be enumerated here. His greatest desire at this time, we may be sure, was the recovery of his health. But his recuperating powers were not such as permitted him realising this recovery. It is thirty-two years ago since he came to take up his permanent abode in Skye. He came to love Skye and Skye people, and being free of all assumed superiority, he made himself as one of them. A usual phrase of his was—"What a fine race the Skye men are!"

But during all this time he was still ignorant of the God of salvation. He lived till now, in common with others, as one who had no hope, and without God in the world—under the sentence of condemnation. But when God's time came that he should be called by His grace, the change in his whole life and conduct was very marked. It was while attending on the ministry of the late Rev. Mr. Ross, Bracadale—a pious man and a savoury preacher of the Gospel—that this gracious change was effected in his soul. The truth which the Holy Spirit applied to him with power was—"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I

will give you rest." Deeds rather than words proclaimed his Christianity. He was not one who was readily disposed to speak about his inward experiences to others. He felt and thought of divine themes deeply and solemnly, and therefore did not talk lightly concerning them. He was most just and fair in his personal dealings, whatsoever form these dealings assumed. Gentleness, meekness, sincerity, and straightforwardness were also marked features of his character. He was respected and esteemed by all with whom he came in contact; and those traits of character one could easily discern in him when a little time in his company.

Mr. Porteous remained in communion with the Free Church until that Church, as represented by the Rainyite party, legislated in favour of drastic changes in fundamental principles and doctrine. This legislation, as is well known, took the form of a Declaratory Act, and it was carried into effect in 1893 in the usual high-handed fashion which was characteristic of that party within her pale. This gave the signal to Mr. Porteous to adopt that course of independent action whereby he unhesitatingly associated himself with those who formed the Free Presbyterian Church. When he saw that the principles of the Free Church and the truths of God were being compromised by this legislative action, no line of argument, however plausible, could prevail to dissuade him from obeying the voice and dictates of conscience. Fearlessly would he assert his convictions and maintain his position with a lucidity and precision that made impression—with a force and reasonableness that proved irresistible. This, indeed, was characteristic of the man. He was whole-heartedly devoted to the Free Presbyterian cause, and its prosperity rejoiced his heart. The things which promoted the cause of truth and the glory of God were dearest to him.

When the Communion season came round at Vatten, he felt like a renewed man. He looked forward to it with great delight and with glowing heart. His house was open to all the people of God who came from far and near. All who came to his house came to it with a consciousness that they were welcome. The welcome which he extended made them feel quite at home. They knew his hospitality and kindliness. The gathering of God's people in his house was most refreshing and enlivening to him. He valued this all the more that he himself was physically unable to be present at the services. He delighted to be in their company and to enjoy their fellowship. As he could not understand the Gaelic language he felt himself at a disadvantage, and often did he feel keen regret that he could not understand that language. He supported the hands of such as denounced the prevailing sins of the times. On one occasion a gentleman called to see him on the Sabbath day. He, with his usual courtesy, told him "he would be pleased to see him any other day but not on the Sabbath day." In his younger days when he visited London he

went to hear the late Mr. Spurgeon preach. He cherished the greatest regard for that renowned preacher of the metropolis, and told us more than once that he had the pleasure of knowing him personally.

The death of this amiable man, it is needless to say, has caused a great breach in the congregation of Duirinish as a whole, and no one outside of his own family circle feels this blank more than the writer. He was very useful to the congregation in his own quiet and private sphere. He was a Treasurer of the Vatten portion of the congregation, and as such he was remarkable for his devotion to accuracy and exactness. In this respect he cannot be replaced. Such men as are useful and helpful in their own way and in their own place among us, are being rapidly removed from the scenes of time to the scenes of eternity. But the Word says: "Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not" (Job xiv. 1, 2).

To his bereaved widow and family we tender our sincere sympathy and condolence.

M. M.

### **Brief Obituaries.**

MR. DUNCAN MACKAY, ARDRISHAIG.

WE regret to record this month the death of Mr. Duncan Mackay, Ardrishaig, who passed away on 2nd September. The deceased was a very worthy member of our Lochgilphead congregation, and one of those who engaged in prayer at the Gaelic meetings there. His exercises were of a very edifying character, and his removal has created a great blank. An esteemed friend thus writes of him: "He was a man who feared God above many. He lived an uncommonly blameless life, and kept himself outwardly unspotted from the world. When any friend called on him in the evenings he would find him with his Bible on the table and such books as Boston's Sermons, Dr. Owen, M'Cheyne, and Rutherford. I have been told that since he was nine years of age he had a love for the Bible, and that ever since he went to work he never left the house—it mattered not how early in the morning—without reading a portion of God's word and engaging in worship. He was equally careful at night. He was a staunch Free Churchman from his early years, and when the Declaratory Act was passed, he immediately joined those who formed the Free Presbyterian Church. He warned his friends of the solemn realities of eternal things. During his last illness, he kept praying as long as he had strength to do so. His last words were, 'Come, Lord Jesus.' He was unmarried, and sixty-four years of age. This is the second breach among the praying men in our small congregation. Some time ago there died Dugald Orr, one of

three blind brothers who are regular in attendance. May the Lord bless these warnings to us all." We extend our deepest sympathy to his surviving relatives.

---

MR. LACHLAN MACLEAN, INVERNESS.

WE regret to record this month the death of Mr. Lachlan Maclean, contractor, one of the elders of the Free Presbyterian Congregation, Inverness, who passed away at his house, Holly Villa, Cawdor Road, there, on Saturday the 30th September. Mr. Maclean, who was in his seventy-ninth year, was well known and esteemed by many throughout the Church, being prominently identified with it from the beginning in 1893. We look forward to a fuller notice in a future issue. Meantime, we extend our deepest sympathy to his family and relatives in the great loss that has been sustained.

---

DEATHS IN THE CONGREGATION OF HALKIRK, CAITHNESS.

DURING the past month the congregation of Halkirk, Caithness, has had several losses by death, of which the minister, Rev. Norman Matheson, sends us a few particulars.

One of these was the passing away of a young girl, named *Mabel Douglas*, who gave evidence of being a God-fearing child. It is said that when some of her school companions would be asking her to play with them, she would often answer, "O, if I would get Jesus before I die." She grieved when she saw people breaking the Lord's Day, no matter what station in life they occupied, or how kind they might be to herself personally. During her last illness she often asked her mother to read and sing to her. Her last words were, "Lord Jesus, come quickly." Much sympathy is felt for her parents, to whom this is the ninth family bereavement. A short, interesting notice of another child, Kenneth, appeared in the Magazine eight years ago—October, 1903. May the Lord bless the voice to young and old!

*Janet Ross, Spittal*.—The deceased was an aged, humble, praying woman, one of the hidden meek ones of the earth. Such are now becoming so few among us that we cannot omit mentioning her removal.

A notice of another worthy person in this congregation—Miss Mary Sutherland, Harpsdale, who died on 17th October—will (D.V.) appear in next issue.

---

DEATH is very busy here and there throughout the Church. Some very sudden calls are taking place among us at this season. We deeply sympathise with all our bereaved people. The voice is, "Be ye ready: for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh."



## Dioghlum o Theagasg nan Aithrichean.

(Continued from page 241.)

URNUIGH AGUS EARAIL ROIMH THABHAIRT SEACHAD NAN COMH-  
ARRAIDHEAN AIR DIARDAOIN AN ORDUIGH, LE MAIGHSTIR  
LACHLANN M'COINNICH.

A THIGHEARNA, cha 'n 'eil fios againn ciod e air am bheil rìghrean, no Parlamaid, no daoine mòra a' smuaineachadh; ach air aon nì tha fios againn—gu 'm bheil an Tighearna a' smuaineachadh air a phobull. A Thighearna, tha eagal air do phobull bochd nach 'eil thu smuaineachadh orra. Thoir comharradh dhoibh air gu 'm bheil, thu smuaineachadh orra. Cuir *stamp* na naomhachd orra. Tha fios agad féin nach 'eil nì eile ann a riaraicheas do phobull bochd, ach thu a chur *stamp* na naomhachd orra. Cuir *stamp* na naomhachd oirnn, a Thighearn, oir tha fios agad féin nach 'eil nì eile a riaraicheas sinn. Blàthaich do phobull bochd, a Thighearna; blàthaich iad le d' ghaol, oir tha fios agad féin nach 'eil nì eile a bhlàthaicheas iad ach do ghaol. Blàthaich sinn, O Thighearna, le d' ghaol, oir tha fios agad féin nach 'eil nì eile a bhlàthaicheas sinn ach do ghaol. Tha fios agad féin gu 'm bheil e cur eagail air do phobull bochd, 'n uair a ta iad a' cliunntinn mur 'eil nì eile a bhlàthaicheas sinn ach do ghaol. Tha fios agad féin gu 'm bheil e cur eagail air do phobull bochd, 'n uair a ta iad a' cliunntinn mur 'eil Spiorad Chrìosd aig neach nach buin e do Chrìosd. Tha Pol ag ràdh sin, ach tha Slànuighear mòr beannaichte nam peacach ag ràdh, mar an ceudna, gu 'm faigh na h-uile a Spiorad a dh' iarras air e. Tha eagal air do phobull bochd, nach 'eil do Spiorad aca; ach nan cliuinneadh iad muinntir eile ag ràdh gu 'n robh eagal orra nach robh an Spiorad aca, ghabhadh iad sin mar chomharradh air gu 'n robh e aca, ach cha ghabh iad dhoibh féin e.

Mhill sibh an là an diugh oirbh féin, agus mhill sibh e, mar an ceudna, orm féin. Their sibh, an uair a bhitheas sinn ag ràdh a leithid so, gur h-ann a' trod a bhitheas sinn, agus gu 'm bheil sin mi-eileanach. Ach is fheudar duinn an fhìrinn innseadh mar aig an la mhòr. Is fheudar do 'n mhinistear e féin a shaoradh o fhuil a' phobuill. Dia gu 'n gabh truas rium leibh! Rinn sibh mo chlaoidh! O Dhé! is aithne dhuitse gu 'n d' rinn. Dh' fhag sibh mi neo-fheumail agus mi-bhuannachdail anns an fhìonain. Ah Dhé! is aithne dhuitse nach b' e sud mo mhiann, ach bhi feumail agus buannachdail ann.

Tha e air 'innseadh dhomhsa gu 'm bheil muinntir a' faighinn comharraidh a bha an raor ag iasgach an sgadain agus gu 'm bheil muinntir a' faighinn comharraidh nach 'eil a' gleidheadh aoraidh 'n a teaghlaich. Chunnaic sinn leanabh, agus an uair a gheibheadh e nì bheireadh e d' a athair e gu 'ghleidheadh.

Fhuair thusa Diardaoin an Orduigh, agus cha d'thug thu e do Dhia gu 'ghleidheadh; ach thubhairt thu ris an diabhlul: "Trobbhad an so, a dhiabhuil, tha gnothuch agam riut." "Ciod an gnothuch a ta agad rium an trath so?" ars' an diabhlul. "Tha gnothuch agam riut; so dhuit Diardaoin an Orduigh. Tha ceithir làithean eile ann, agus nach foghainn iad sin do 'n Orduigh?" Bha bean uasal shìos ann am Muireadh,\* agus ars' ise ri bean-mhuinntir a bh' aice: "Gabh do bhiadh, agus dean do ghnìomh, agus mur dean thu do ghnìomh, gu ma h-olc a ni do bhiadh dhuit!" Agus mar tha sinn ag radh ris na h-uile neach a faighinn comharraidh, agus nach 'eil a' coimhead Diardaoin on Orduigh, agus nach 'eil a' gleidheadh aoraidh 'n a theaghlaich.

Bha mhinisteir shìos air a' mhachair, agus bu mhinisteir prìseil le Criosd e. Thàinig duine mòr gus an tigh aige oidhche, agus fhuair an t-eagal tràilleil buaidh air. Leig e dheth an ùrnuigh theaghlaich, agus thainig an diabhlul gu follaiseach a dh' ionnsuidh an tighe aige air son sud. Cha 'n innis mi cò b' e, ach bu mhinisteir prìseil le Criosd e.

Cha 'n fhead sinn comharradh a chumail o neach air bith a dh' iarras e, ma bhios e stuama; ach feumaidh sinn an fhìrinn innseadh, mar aig an là mhòr. Feumaidh am ministear e féin a shaoradh o fhuil a' phobuill, ach cuimhnich thusa gur h-ann an lorg a' ghreama chaidh an diabhlul ann an Iudas, agus gurr h-ann as déigh na suipeir bhrath e mhaighstir. Tha iad a smuaineachadh nach 'eil ùghdarras air bith againne a th' air a Ghàidh-ealtachd. Leigidh sinn ris dìobh gu 'm bheil òrdugh againn o Shéanadh Ghlinn-Eilg gun chomharradh a thoirt do neach air bith nach 'eil a' coimhead Diardaoin an Orduigh, agus nach 'eil a' gleidheadh aoraidh 'n a theaghlaich; agus feumaidh sinn bhi umhal do chomhairle nam bràithrean.

Bha duine shìos air a' mhachair, agus rinn a leanabh ni a bha fada as an rathad. Thug e steach do shabhal e, agus ghabh e an t-slat dha; agus chaidh e an sin a dh' ùrnuigh air a shon tri chuairt. Agus b' i an ùrnuigh 'bu mhò a rinn do dhrùghadh air an leanabh na 'n t-slat. Mar sin tha sinn a nis ag ùrnuigh an déigh bhì gabhail oirbhse leis an an lagh, gu 'm bi an sgiùrsadh so air a bheannachadh dhuibh.

---

DIOGLUM O THRAGASG MHAIGHSTIR LACHLAINN  
M'CHOINNICH. EARAIL AIG RIARACHADH A' BHUIRD.

Ciod air am bheil thusa smuaineachadh? Tha mise smuaineachadh air a' ghiullan a dh' fhàg mi aig a' bhaile. Agus ciod air am bheil thusa smuaineachadh? "Tha mise smuaineachadh air na th' agam do chaoraich agus do ghabhair." Cha 'n 'eil agaibh-sa cuid no crannchur 's a' chùis so; cha 'n 'eil 'ur cridhe ceart. Ach ciod air am bheil thusa smuaineachadh! "Tha mise smuaineachadh air nach 'eil fios agam am bheil no nach

---

\* Moray.

'eil gaol aig Crìosd domh." 'T aid do smuaintean-sa a 's fearr, ach cha smuaintean ro-sholasach iad fathast. Cha ruig thu a leas a bhi cur na ceiste sin: "Am bheil gaol aig Crìosd domh?" Bha bean shìos air a' mhachair d' am b' ainm Sìne Tàillear, agus ars' ise ri Maighstir Calldair (Calder)—athair a' Mhaighstir Chaldair so mu dheireadh a bh' againn—'n uair a bha e 'n a leanabh: "Mo leanabh féin, dearbh thusa Dia bhi trocaireach, agus dearbhaidh esan trocaireach dhuit." Dhearbh esan Dia bhi tròcaireach, agus dhearbha Dia tròcaireach dha. Ach is ann bhios tusa 'g innseadh do Dhia na rinn thu do nithibh grànda: "Rinn mi so, agus rinn mi sud." Rinn, rinn, ach ged rinn, is fearr le Dia thu bhi 'g innseadh nan nithe brèagha a rinn e féin na nan nithe grànda a rinn thusa. Cha 'n 'eil sinn ag iarraidh ort a bhi 'g innseadh dhuinne ciod a rinn thu. 'Se tha sinn ag ràdh riut: "Gabh an t-Sacramaid; is e Crìosd an t-Sacramaid." Tha sinn ag ràdh ris a' pheacach mhòr dhubh ud —ris a' pheacach air a' chnoc ud: "Gabh Crìosd; is e Crìosd an t-Sacramaid."

Bha ministear shìos am baile Inbhirnis, agus ghabh e là mar bhonn teagaisg: "Saor mi o chionta fola." 'Nuair a sguir e thàinig duin' uasal d' a ionnsuidh, agus thubhairt e ris: "Cò dh' innis dhuitse gu 'n d' rinn mise mortadh? Bithidh do bheatha agam leis an dag, no air a' bhiodaig so." "Tàmh! tàmh! ars' am ministear, gus an téid mi dh' ùrnuigh." Chaidh e dh' ùrnuigh aon uair; chaidh e dh' ùrnuigh da uair: chaidh e dh' ùrnuigh trì chuairt. An sin thubhairt am ministear ris an duine: "Cha 'n fhaca mise riamh roimhe thu, agus cha d' innis neach air bith dhomhsa mu d' thimchioll." Ars' an duine: "Bu mhac fear fearainn mise, agus bha fios agam gur h-e mo bhràthair 'bu shine a bhiodh 'n a oighre. Agus thachair sinn là leinn féin, agus rinn mi a thachdadh le tobha."\* Cha d' innis am ministear riamh air an duine, ach fhuair e an ni anns na paipearan aige an déigh a' bhàis. Mar sin innis thusa do Chrìosd na rinn thu do nithibh grànda, agus cha 'n innis Crìosd ort gu brath. Agus mar sin tha brìgh agus tairbhe ann an ùrnuighibh pobuill Dé. Ach tha thusa ag ràdh: "Is beag tha mise ag aithneachadh sin; is fad o 'n tha mise ag ùrnuigh, ach cha 'n 'eil mi faighinn freagraidh do m' ùrnuigh." Na smuainich thusa ni 's lugha de 'n ùrnuigh air son sin. Seall féin air a' chuibhrionn sin de ùrnuigh Dhaibhidh —"Lìonadh a ghloir gach uile thir"—nach d' fhuair fathast freagradh. Bu luaithe a chreidinn sa gu 'n géilleadh puist nam flaitheanas, agus gu 'n tuiteadh an iarmailt, agus gu 'm marbhadh i na h-eoin, na chreidinn gu 'm biodh ùrnuighean pobuill Dé gun fhreagairt. Mar is mò a chuireas tu dh' aigiod anns a' bhanc, agus mar is faide a bhios e ann, is anns a mo a bhitheas e an uair a thig e as. Agus ma leigeas tu leis fada ann, bithidh mòran agad. Cuir fichead *not* air a' bhliadhna: agus ma leigeas tu leis

\* Taod, a rope.

luidhe seachad fada, bithidh mòran agad. Mar is faide a bhitheas dàil air a cur ann am freagradh t' ùrnuighean, is ann is pailte am freagradh an uair a thig e. Ach tha thusa ag ràdh: "Is ann a bha a' bhrìgh agus an tairbhe ann an ùrnuighibh pobuill Dé a bh' ann roimhe so; ach cha 'n 'eil a' bhrìgh agus an tairbhe cheudna ann an ùrnuighibh pobuill Dé a th' ann an diugh." Tha a' bhrìgh agus an tairbhe ann an ùrnuighibh pobuill Dé, a th' ann an diugh a bha ann an ùrnuighibh pobuill Dé, a bh' ann roimhe so. (An so thug am ministear an t-aran do 'n mhuinntir a bh' aig a' bhord.) Bha mi a' labhairt mu ùrnuighibh pobuill Dé. Bha bean shìos air a' mhachair, agus bha i nì bu mhiosa na Merron\* a bhi oirre mar ainm. Shealbhaich an diabhul i eadar anam agus chorp. Thàinig ministear prìseil le Criosd 's an fheasgar a dh' ionnsuidh an tighe 's an robh i, agus *dusan* do phobull Dé maille ris. Chaith iad an oidhche ann an ùrnuigh, agus mochtthrath ghabh i a biadh-maidne maille ri u. An abair thusa nach 'eil brìgh no tairbhe ann an ùrnuighibh pobuill Dé a t' ann an diugh mar bha ann an ùrnuighibh pobuill Dé a bh' ann roimhe so.

Bha fear an sud agus thoisich e air an ùrnuigh, ach thug e thairis i. Thug e thairis an ùrnuigh uaigneach, agus, mar an ceudna, an ùrnuigh theaghlaich. Dh' fhalbh an sin aon de na diabhulaibh a dh' ionnsuidh an àite 's an robh an diabhul mòr, agus ars' esan: "An e nach 'eil naidheachd agam dhuit!" "Ciod an naidheachd a th' agad an trath so dhomh?" ars' an diabhul mòr (agus e mar gu 'm bitheadh e feargach). "Tha naidheachd agam; tha fear an sud, agus bha eagal ort gu 'm bitheadh tu dh' easbhuiddh air; is tu nach ruigeadh a leas." "O!" ars' an diabhul mòr, "an e gu 'n creid mi thu." Feudaiddh tu mo chreidsinn; thug e thairis an ùrnuigh; thig féin agus faic. Thàinig an sin an diabhul mòr gu tigh an fhìr a thug thairis an ùrnuigh, agus bha sannt air taobh deas an t-simileir, agus an fheoil air an taobh chlì, a' mhisg air ceann a' bhuird, agus an cùl-chaineadh làimh rithe; agus bha nì bu mhiosa na sin uile ann, eadhon, an fhanoid air pobull Dé—"luchd nan eudainnean fada," agus "luchd nan ùrnuighean fada," mar their cuid. An aithne dhuitse cò iad "luchd nan eudainnean fada?" Innsidh mise dhuit cò iad. Is iad pobull Dé iad. Ach an cuala tusa neach riamh a' fanoid air ùrnuighibh pobuill Dé an àm a' chogaidh, no an àm an t-sàrachaidh? Cha chuala agus cha chluinn. Thàinig an sud neach do phobull Dé dh' ionnsuidh a thighe; chrìothuaich e; thàinig prasan ann diubh; fhuair iad a mach e, agus chosd e gu daor dhasan. (Na nithe so thubhairt e roimh thoirt seachad a' chupain.)

Bha bean riomhe so a' toirt *drama* do fhear, agus ars' ise ris: "Gu 'n deanadh sin duit mar rinn baine do mhàthar duit." Cuir thusa do bheul a nise ri taobh an t-Slanuighir, agus ol deoch

\* 'Se *Merron*, no *Marion* ainm mnatha, agus tha am focal *meirean* a' ciallachadh *cuthach*.

bhlàth de 'fhuil. Ach tha thusa ag ràdh: "Tha mise cho salach 's nach feud mi teachd am fagus do 'n t-Slanuighear." Na abair sin. Bha bean ann roimhe so, agus fhuair i mothachadh air peacadh, ach thug i droch altrum dha, agus chaill i e, agus thainig ceann ochd bliadhna deug mu 'n d' thainig e ris air ais.

Bha bean anns an sgìre so do 'm b' ainm Ceit Mhòr, agus thoilich an Tighearna atharrachadh nan gràs a thoirt oirre an déigh dhi bhi ceithir fichead bliadhna dh' aois; agus an uair a rachadh comhfurtachd a thairgse dhi theireadh i: "Tha mo dhà làmsa cho salach 's nach feud mi an cur timchioll an t-Slanuighir," oir bha i air a toirt do pheacadh na strìopachais ann an làithibh a h-oige. Ach cha ruig thusa leas a bhi ag ràdh mar sin. Cha 'n ionann do Chrìosd agus do dhroch dhuin' uasal a bha shìos air a' mhachair a bha 'pòsadh. Bha am ministeir an geall air *Spòrs* fhaotainn dha féin, agus ars' esan ris an duine an déigh do 'n bhoirionnach a bhi aige air làimh: "Nis ge salach i, agus ge rapach i, agus ge slatach riabhach i, agus ge dubh lachdainn i, is i do chuid-sa i, agus cha 'n 'eil feum duit ann an cur 'n a h-aghaidh." Thug esan na mionnan mora ma bha i mar sin, nach b'e cnaimh di a chuid-sa, agus dh' fhàg e an sud i. Ach cha b'ionann sud agus Crìosd. Cha d' fhàg Crìosd an Eaglais, ged bu shalach rapach i; agus ged bu shlatach, riabhach, dubh, lachdainn i, cha d' fhàg Crìosd i. 'Se so am feum a bha Aonghas Moristan a' faotainn de 'n *spòrs*—nach d' fhàg Crìosd an Eaglais ged bu shalach i, agus ged bu rapach i, agus ged bu shlatach riabhach i, agus ged bu dubh lachdainn i. Agus bha i mar sin, oir bu bhean dhubh, dhubb dhasan i. B' éigin da na h-uile boinne de 'fhuil a dhòrtadh a chum a saoradh. Chuir Daibhidh a bheatha féin an cunnart a chosnadh nighinn Shauil air son ceud roimh-chroicinn Philisteach; ach thug Crìosd a bheatha féin air son na h-Eaglais.

Is ann tha sinne 'n ar seasamh a' *racruitigeadh*\*—a' gairm pheacach mhòra, dhubha, gu Crìosd. Nan rachadh duine do no Innseachan Shìos a dh' iarraidh *réisimeid* do dhaoineibh geala, cha 'n fhaigheadh e neach diubh an sin. Ach nan rachadh a ràdh: Tha tobar an sud—Fuaran Cath-an-rididh, eadar so agus Gearrloch agus Lochbhraoin—agus, neach air bith a ni e féin a nigheadh ann, agus a dh' òlas a shàth as, bitheadh e geal, thigeadh iad as na Innseachan Shìos, agus dheanadh siad iad féin a nigh-eadh ann gus am bitheadh iad geal.

Tha iad ag ràdh gu 'm bheil tobar shìos aig Inbhirfeòrain anns am bheil feartan sònraichte, ach tha tobar a's fearr againn an so, eadhon tobar na beatha. Rinn Daibhidh e féin cho dubh ris an duine 'bu duibhe a bha riamh air thalamh, ach b' aithne dha c' àit an robh a leigheas. Tha e féin ag innseadh: "Le hìosop deana mise glan." Rinn an tobar so glan e. An uair a bha Daibhidh air a ruagadh le Saul, tha e air innseadh dhuinn ciod

\* Recruiting.

de 'n robh a chuideachd air a deanamh suas. Bha i air a deanamh suas de na h-uile eucorach agus doibhear a bh' anns an tìr, agus do mhuinntir a bha fo fhiachaibh, agus bha iad uile di-bheatha \* aige. Agus is ann de 'n leithidibh sin tha Crìosd a' deanamh suas Eaglais. 'Se so 'tha 'ga deanamh cho làidir, eadhon, gur h-ann de na h-uile eucorach agus doibhear, agus de 'n mhuinntir a ta fo fhiachaibh tha Crìosd 'g a deanamh suas. Tha cunntas againn mu bhaile mòr Inbhirnis, gur h-e a bh' ann air tùs blàr-mòine. Tha nise a' mhòine air a toirt as, agus tha e air a dheanamh suas do shraidibh agus do thighibh brèagha. Ach an saoil thusa, a pheacaich, nach bitheadh e ni bu ro-iongantach gu 'm bitheadh do chridhe-sa, a ta cha 'n e a mhàin mar bhlàr-mòine, ach mar shùilchruthaich, air a dheanamh suas gu bhi 'n a ionad anns an gabh Crìosd còmhnuidh, na baile mòr Inbhirnis a bhi air a thoirt o bhi 'na bhlàr-mòine gu bhi air a dheanamh do shraidibh agus do thighibh brèagha.

Tha e air 'innseadh dhuinn ciod a rinn baile mòr na Ròimhe cho laidir. 'Se 'bha ann air tùs bothanan fàil, ach tha e nise air a dheanamh suas do thighibh làidir cloiche. Chuir uachdaran na Ròimhe fios a chum nan uile eucorach agus dhoibhear, agus mhortair a bha 's an tìr iad a theachd agus gu 'm bitheadh iad di-bheatha aige. Ciod a ta deanamh eaglais Chrìosd cho làidir? Ciod, ach gur h-ann de 'n leithidibh sin a ta i air deanamh suas?

## Professor W. M. Alexander and Revivals.

A CORRESPONDENT has sent us the following letter which he forwarded to the Editor of the *Free Church Record*, but which he got returned with the query, "Are you a Member or Adherent of the Free Church?" As the letter is a good one, and brings out, in a plain and pithy manner, certain points of importance in connection with the case of the Free Church and Professor W. M. Alexander, we give it a place in our columns:—

### REVIVALS.

SIR,—Perhaps you will allow me to make a few remarks in regard to the letter with above title which appeared in your last issue. The writer classes Dr. Alexander with Paul and Baxter. I happened to read quite recently Dr. Alexander's famous book *Demonic Possession*, and fail to see what claim such an author as the author of that book can possibly have to be placed in the same category with Paul and Baxter. It may be said that I am reviving an old controversy, and that I am behind the times, when I refer to Dr. Alexander and his higher critical views! Well, I am a constant reader of the *Record*, and I notice that the Free Church has conferred the highest possible honours on Dr. Alexander, and

\* Welcome, probably for *deadh-bheatha*.



not only so, but lauded his praises over and over again ; and now we hear Alexander, Baxter, and Paul named in the same breath. To be candid, I may say that, to me at least, such effusions in regard to Dr. Alexander's greatness seem to be a bit dubious. We all know that a guilty person who seeks to minimise his faults endeavours, whether to himself or to his fellows, to extol certain things in connection with his wrong-doing. This it seems to me is what the Free Church is doing in thus seeking to extol Dr. Alexander. All who have taken an interest in Church matters for some years past, know that the Free Church has not done its duty to the cause of truth in the way Dr. Alexander was dealt with. And now, instead of confessing their sins, and repenting of them, Free Churchmen seek to hide their sins, and the sins of the Church. Such procedure is not likely to hasten a revival. When Dr. Alexander was dealt with by the Free Church, he acted in regard to his book in exactly the same manner in which the Free Church is now acting in connection with her sin in neglecting to deal with him as she ought to have done. He minimised the unscriptural views advocated in his book, and withdrew his book, not because of its errors, but because it was making a disturbance in the Church—and by the bye, it seems that booksellers did not know till the beginning of last September that Dr. Alexander had withdrawn his book from circulation. The Free Church has from the beginning of this case sought to excuse Dr. Alexander—the majority of her ministers knowing at the same time that *Demonic Possession* was a higher critic's production—and they have continued to minimise and cover their unfaithfulness for the past number of years. Like Saul of old they may say, "Blessed be thou of the Lord : I have performed the commandment of the Lord," yet "this bleating of the sheep, and lowing of the oxen" cannot be overlooked or silenced, except by honest confession and true repentance. I have often heard the remark made, "You should hear Dr. Alexander preach and speak." I may say that I read one article from his able pen which I liked very well, but I would have liked it better if *Demonic Possession* had never been written or had its author given conclusive evidence before the world of his conversion from higher criticism. I may say, however, that I have read articles from the pen of other higher critics which no man on earth could find fault with as to soundness of doctrine. So that this is not a proof of what a man really is. But I am afraid my letter is too long already, and so I close, expressing the hope that the Free Church will cease to act in a self-justifying spirit, when her actions demand quite different conduct.—I am, etc.,

A. M.

**Southern Presbytery.**—This Court has appointed as a Thanksgiving Day for the Harvest, Wednesday, 22nd November, in the Glasgow congregations, and any other suitable week-day in the same week in the rest of its congregations.

## Notes and Comments.

**Protestant Meetings in Scotland.**—A series of important Protestant meetings were held during last month in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other towns in Scotland. These were addressed by Rev. Dr. Robertson, Venice, a writer who has done so much to enlighten the British public on the evils of Romanism. Dr. Robertson came as far north as Inverness, where he addressed a large and an enthusiastic meeting. Mr. John Kensit also had a large meeting in the Synod Hall, Edinburgh, presided over by Rev. Prof. Kennedy Cameron, when reference was made to the elder Mr. John Kensit's death. It is to be hoped that these meetings will help to enlighten the people of Scotland on the dangers of Romanism and Ritualism. It is to be observed, however, that the class of people who attend these meetings are, as a rule, already interested in the subject and antagonistic to Rome. The difficulty is to reach the big mass who Gallio-like care for none of these things.

**Mr. John Redmond's Fair Speeches.**—One can scarcely recognise in the Irish leader the man who said on Irish and American platforms things that are conveniently kept in the background for the present. Even taking it for granted that Mr. Redmond is sincere in the promises he is making of toleration to the Protestant minority he forgets that he is not the arbiter of his Church's policy, and the real crux of the question is admirably brought out by Lord Ashtoun when he says:—"It is very well known that the fate of any Home Rule proposals by the government will be mainly affected by the question of civil and religious liberty for Irish Protestants and Loyalists. Personally, I do not believe that any suggested securities will be of any practical value. It cannot be too frequently repeated that religious liberty for Protestants is a religious question, and that, therefore, it will be decided, not by Nationalist Members of an Irish Parliament, but by the Church of Rome, *i.e.*, by her Hierarchy and priesthood. We have, therefore, to deal, not with the laymen, but with a Church which still avows herself to be the bitter and unrelenting foe of religious liberty for Protestants, and has always acted on this theory whenever she has had the chance. Already she has vastly too much political power in Ireland. Is it wise, or common sense, to give her more?"

**St. Andrews University** is the subject, says the *Bulwark*, of our leading article, or rather the subject is the pretence that for St. Andrews and other such educational blessings we ought to feel an abiding affection for the Papacy. We have tried to state our obligation at its true proportion. But there is an aspect of the Papal claim worthy of note. We are reminded by a highly esteemed correspondent that the Bull, confirmatory of Bishop Wardlaw's College in St. Andrews, was a Bull from Benedict III., who was an anti-Pope. He and Gregory XII. were, by the

Council of Pisa, declared "to be notorious and incorrigible schismatics and heretics, and guilty of plain perjury; which imputations being evidently proved, they deprive them both of their titles and authority, pronounce the Apostolic See vacant, and all the censures and promotions of these pretended Popes void and of none effect." After deposing the two rivals the Council elected a new Pope, Alexander V., so that for a time there were three Popes each refusing to abate his claims. It was during the time of this triple scandal, after the Council had deposed him, that Benedict XIII. sent the Bull to St. Andrews, for Wardlaw was espousing his side. The subject is dealt with on pp. 18-23 of Dr. Hay Fleming's "Reformation in Scotland." It is hard to understand how modern Romanists can attach importance to Benedict's Bull. Such virtue as it conferred on the University was imaginary; any stability possessed by the new College was because of the inherent good of its purpose and plan. The Pope was a transitory being, denounced as unworthy by his rivals and by the Council of Pisa. The anti-Pope was a nobody on the theory of apostolic succession, and yet St. Andrews prospered without an apostolic blessing. It flourishes now without the countenance of the Pope, whose alleged apostolicity makes him regard St. Andrews as the seat of much evil. A little mild reflection in this vein might have saved the College authorities from cheapening themselves to be anxiously civil to the Vatican.

**Is it Reconciliation or Betrayal?**—At a recent meeting of the English Congregational Union tremendous enthusiasm was evoked by the statement of Dr. Forsyth that there was now a truce between him and Rev. R. J. Campbell of the City Temple. Mr. Campbell, it is true, made a statement which evidently was accepted by most of those present as a declaration of his belief in the Deity of Jesus of Nazareth, but after his vain excursions into the unsatisfying regions of bold and daring speculation, we cannot though we would fain believe it for his own sake that he has realised that Jesus alone can satisfy the deepest longings of the human heart. The path he mapped out for himself was certainly not a path leading to the Cross, and the daring and blasphemous utterances on matters of vital interest to every Christian cannot be easily forgotten. There were days in the history of English Congregationalism when Mr. Campbell's magnetic influence would not blind men to higher interests. Congregationalism gave to England a Goodwin and an Owen, and to America a Jonathan Edwards.

**Uncalled for Interference.**—A circular has been sent to us by the British Women's Temperance Association affectionately urging on all Ministers and Sessions of the Churches of Scotland the desirability of arranging for the supply of unfermented wine in the observance of the Lord's Supper. Far be it from us to discourage those who are doing what in them lies to combat the giant evil of drunkenness in this country. While we cannot

personally agree with those who advocate total abstinence as a principle binding the consciences of all Christian men and women who may be practising temperance along quite as scriptural lines (though not total abstainers), yet we would not find fault with those who, feeling it as a matter of conscience, have become total abstainers, any more than we would dare to condemn the Nazarites, the Sons of Rechab or John the Baptist whom the Lord so signally blessed. But we must emphatically protest against the uncalled for interference of the above Association in regard to the wine used at the Lord's Supper. The Lord's table is not the table of devils, and we simply do not believe that any man or woman who had a *right* to sit at it ever rose from it to pursue a drunkard's career. The real evil is not in the wine used, but in the careless and loose manner in which almost all classes without grace or the fear of God are allowed to sit at the Table. Let them first purge out the old leaven, and we have absolutely no fear of the consequences.

**Harvest Thanksgiving.**—During last month the subject of fixing a date for the Harvest Thanksgiving was discussed in the Presbyteries of Caithness (Established, United Free, and Free). A number of the speakers at the Established and United Free Presbyteries coolly suggested that the week-day observance should be done away with as it was observed chiefly as a holiday for pleasure. Surely one day in three hundred and sixty-five is not too much to ask of this pleasure-loving and godless age to give to God as a day in which they may return thanks to Him for crowning the year so liberally with His goodness. We refer to the above Presbyteries and speakers not because of their importance but because the utterances of the latter are symptomatic of the age. We call attention to a note under another heading to a finding of the Northern Presbytery at a recent meeting.

## Church Notes.

**Communion.**—Oban, and Halkirk (Caithness), first Sabbath of November; St. Jude's, Glasgow (Jane Street, Blythwood Square), second; Edinburgh, Dornoch, Helmsdale, and Fort William, third.

**Meeting of Synod.**—The Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church will (God willing) meet in St. Jude's Hall, Glasgow, on Tuesday the 14th November. Rev. D. Graham, moderator, is expected to preach at 11 a.m.

**Presbyteries and Harvest Thanksgiving.**—At a meeting of the Northern Presbytery, held at Dingwall on the 2nd October, it was resolved to put on record their sense of the undeserved kindness of God in bestowing upon us again a generous harvest, and also to instruct all the congregations within the bounds of this Presbytery to observe a Thanksgiving Day for the harvest, and to recommend as a general rule that the Thanksgiving Day should be held by congregations belonging to this

Church simultaneously with such services in connection with other denominations, and that a note to this effect should be sent to the Editor of the *Free Presbyterian Magazine* for insertion in the November number.

The Western Presbytery has appointed that a Thanksgiving Day for the Harvest be kept by the congregations under its jurisdiction, leaving each congregation to fix a suitable date for itself.

**Acknowledgments.**—Mr. Angus Clunas, Treasurer, 18 Ardconnel Terrace, Inverness, acknowledges with thanks the following donations:—*For Sustentation Fund*—20/- from "Anonymous" (Tighnabruaich P.O.); 20/- from Mr. D. Shaw, Gourrock, per Rev. J. S. Sinclair; 12/- from "Anonymous" (Birnam P.O.); 5/- from "Anonymous" (Glasgow P.O.); 10/- from Mrs. Maciver, Nairn, per Mr. F. Maciver. *For Missionaries and Catechists*—10/6 from Mr. R. S. Mackenzie, Detroit, U.S.A., per Rev. J. S. Sinclair. *For Foreign Missions*—40/- from "A Wellwisher" (Carrbridge P.O.), for Kaffir Church Building Fund; 4/6 from "Friend," Gairloch, per Rev. J. R. Mackay, for Kaffir Bibles; 10/- from "Anon," Birnam, per Rev. N. Cameron, for Kaffir Psalms. 40/- from "A Wellwisher," (Carrbridge P.O.), for Portree Manse Fund. Rev. N. Cameron begs to acknowledge, with thanks, 10/- in aid of Sustentation Fund, and 10/- in aid of Rev. J. B. Radasi's Church Building Fund, from an "Anonymous Donor"; 5/- in aid of St. Jude's Building Fund, 5/- in aid of Rev. A. Macrae's Manse Debt, 5/- in aid of Rev. J. B. Radasi's Building Fund, and 5/- for Kaffir Psalms, from "Carrbridge"; and 10/- for Foreign Missions, from "Burnham." Rev. A. Macrae acknowledges, with thanks, 20/6 from "A Reader of the Magazine," Detroit, U.S.A., 20/6 from "C. M.," Simcoe, Ontario, per Rev. J. S. Sinclair, and 5/- from "Carrbridge," per Rev. N. Cameron, for Portree Manse Fund.

### **The Magazine.**

**Subscriptions Received for Magazine.**—J. D., Brodick, 7/6; Mrs. Jarvis, S. Devon, 2/6; E. M'Intosh, Boat of Garten, 18/1½; Miss Clark, Polwarth Gardens, Edinburgh, 2/6; A. Morrison, Lochmaddy, 3/-; R. S. M'Kenzie, Detroit, U.S.A., 2/6, and Free Circulation, 7/6; A. Fraser, Johannesburg, 3/-; Miss M'Kenzie, Aultgrishan, Gairloch, 6/10½; Miss J. Fraser, Crask, Lairg, 5/-; Miss M'Donald, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh, 2/6; Mrs. M'Pherson, Burnside, Kingussie, 5/-, and Donation, 15/-; Mrs. C. Gillies, Arkona, Ontario, 2/6; Miss M'Kenzie, teacher, East Market Street, Ullapool, 2/6; J. T. Brookes, East Croydon, 5/-; A. Fraser, for St. Jude's Collectors, 33/-; W. Grant, Seymour House, Chelsea, 5/-; M. Gillies, student, 2/6; Miss Graham, Maryhill, Glasgow, 1/2½; Mrs. Gunn, Upper House, Kinlochbervie, 2/6; Miss A. Fraser, Balgie, Shieldaig, 2/6; D. M'Kenzie, M. Kildrummie, 7/6; D. Brown, Greenock, 18/6; A. Bruce, Wick, 21/4; J. Stewart, Lochcarron, 21/-; A. Mackay, missionary, Staffin, Portree, 26/4; Misses Urquhart, Invergordon, 6/-; J. Adamson, Helmsdale, 3/-; Mrs. Campbell, Oban, 16/9; Mrs. Clarkson, Gillibrand River, Victoria, 2/6, and Donation, 4/6; Mrs. Finlayson, Butterbiggins Road, 2/5½; A. M'Askill, C. Kirkibost, North Uist, 13/-; Miss M'Kenzie, Habost, Ness, 2/6; J. Macleod, Lairg, 13/2; D. M'Kinnon, Glendale, 47/-; D. Allan, Ardpatrik, 2/6.

(Notice of some Subscriptions is held over till next month.)