

THE
Free Presbyterian Magazine
And MONTHLY RECORD

VOL. XXXI.

May 1926.

No. 1.

The Changeless Gospel.

GOOD news is always pleasant to hear, but none appreciate it so much as those who are in need of the message brought. But of all the good news that ever fell on mortal ears there is none like the good news from heaven. The Gospel or the good news of God has been as a drink of cool, refreshing water to many a thirsty soul, and as a cordial to revive many a drooping heart. In the New Testament much is said of the Gospel. What, then, is it? Literally it means good news or tidings. But it is good news about a certain matter. It is good news about God's salvation. The Gospel, generally speaking, is the message that tells of God's great salvation, and this message is committed to men set apart by the Holy Spirit to declare to their fellow-men. It is variously designated in the New Testament Scriptures as the Gospel of God—setting forth the truth that the message tells that God is the Author of this great Salvation—sometimes as the Gospel of Jesus Christ telling us that the great salvation is wrought out by Him—sometimes as the “glorious gospel of God,” or literally, “the gospel of the glory of God,” telling us that in this salvation God's glory is shining forth—and sometimes as the Gospel of the grace of God telling us that God's salvation is all of grace from beginning to end. Now, as God's salvation, revealed in Christ, is unchanging, the message that declares that salvation is unchanging also. God, in His infinite wisdom, in purposing to save a multitude which no man can number, made provision on a scale sufficiently adequate to accomplish the purposes of His heart, and not only so, but provided such a salvation as would meet the needs of every one that was to be saved. This salvation was God's remedy for the cure

of a disease which was universal, and which, however varied the symptoms, was in every individual of the race of Adam the same. As a remedy it never yet failed, nor will it ever fail, to meet the needs of a sinner to whom it is applied by the Holy Spirit.

This is the Gospel the Apostle gloried in proclaiming, and over whose integrity he watched with a jealousy that betokened how dear it was to himself. The thought that any one, however exalted, angelic or human, should take upon himself to declare any other message concerning God's salvation than that which made it unmistakably clear that it was not by works of righteousness that the sinner is saved, but by grace, was intolerable to the Apostle. This comes out very plainly and clearly in his Epistle to the Galatians. "Though we, or an angel from heaven," he writes, "preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again: If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (Gal. i. 8, 9). These are solemn words. It is in no light manner the Apostle invokes the curse of God upon any who would dare to preach another gospel. His words are weighted with the most solemn import, and tell us that any one, even an angel from heaven, who would preach any other gospel than he had preached, and the Galatians had received would be fit for perdition. That is a malediction that ought to be always before the minds of all who preach. What, then, was the Gospel which the Apostle preached and which the Galatians had received? In the immediately succeeding verses to the above he tells us certain things concerning this Gospel.

1. "The Gospel which was preached of me is not after man." Its very nature was in antagonism to anything man would have thought of. This accounts for its non-reception by men in their natural state. The wisdom, revealed in this salvation of which the Gospel tells, is the wisdom of God, and it is foolishness in the eyes of men. The Gospel which the Apostle preached is a Gospel which tells that man must be brought in guilty before God, feel himself lost and ruined and totally unable to do anything for himself—it was for such God's salvation was provided. Now this is the very last way the wisdom of man would have suggested for salvation—that the deliverance should come through the righteousness of another. The Gospel preached to the Galatians was not, therefore, after man. This is

plainly seen and proved by all the plans of false gospels thought out by men but directly opposed to God's Gospel.

2. "For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it." The fact that his Gospel was not "after man" indicates that he could not have received it from nor been taught it by man, hence he says, "For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it." It had not a human origin at all like the "other gospel" which had bewitched the Galatians. The Apostle was profoundly convinced that this message he delivered was of a heavenly origin.

3. "By the revelation of Jesus Christ." This then is what gives authority to this message; it was given to him by the revelation of Jesus Christ and has, therefore, the stamp of Heaven upon it. When it pleased God, who separated Paul from his mother's womb, and called him by His grace, to reveal His Son in him, he conferred not with flesh and blood but went into Arabia and returned again to Damascus (Gal. i., 15-17). It is because of this that the Apostle is so jealous that no change should be permitted in the declaration of the Gospel. It may seem a small thing in the eyes of men as it was in the eyes of the Galatian false teachers to get people to believe that they are to be made perfect by the works of the law, but such teaching daringly arraigns the infinite Wisdom of God in the plan of salvation and deceives all that listen to and receive it with a false hope.

It is therefore a very solemn and serious matter to be entrusted with the preaching of the Gospel. Men are not at liberty to change it to suit the changing caprices of men, for in so doing they are ceasing to be the servants of Christ. The Apostle gives not the slightest indication that changed conditions of outlook and changed circumstances will necessitate a change in the Gospel. His words indicate a finality that no changing circumstances will affect. If it is a solemn matter to be entrusted with the preaching of the Gospel it is also a very solemn matter to be listening to the pure Gospel of God being preached by one of His sent servants. The Gospel which Paul preached told of ruin and guilt as well as the way of escape, and when this message is to be made good news to any sinner the Holy Spirit convinces him of his guilt ere the remedy is revealed—for where there is no guilt—the news about this remedy may be heard from Sabbath to Sabbath for a lifetime, but it will never be good news until the sinner is made to feel his need. There

is no message that the preacher can deliver so encouraging as the Gospel and no message so sweet to hear for those who need it. It has carried many a hearer to the very gates of heaven and brought comfort when hope was well nigh gone. God's servants can say that some of the happiest moments ever they enjoyed in this world were when they were telling of God's great salvation and His people can also say that some of the happiest moments ever they had was when listening to the proclamation of this blessed message.

A Sermon

PREACHED BY REV. R. M. MCCHEYNE, AT LARBERT,
NOVEMBER 22ND, 1835.

“A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master: if I then be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you” (Mal. i. 6).

THE first conviction that is essential to the conversion of a soul is conviction of sin; not the general conviction that all men are sinful, but the personal conviction that I am an undone sinner; not the general conviction that other men must be forgiven or perish, but the personal conviction that I must be forgiven or perish. Now, there is no greater barrier in the way of this truth being impressed on the soul than the felt consciousness of possessing many virtues. We cannot be persuaded that the image of God nas so completely been effaced from our souls as the Bible tells us, when we feel within ourselves, and see exhibited in others, what may almost be termed godlike virtues. The heroes of whom we have read in history, with their love of country, and contempt of death—their constancy in friendship and fidelity in affection—seem to rise up before us to plead the cause of injured humanity. And what is far more baffling, our everyday experience of the kindness of hospitality—the flowing of unbounded generosity—the compassion that weeps because another weeps; and all this among men that care not for Christ and His salvation, seems to raise a barrier impregnable against the truth, that man is conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity. When we enter one cottage door and see a whole company of brothers and sisters melted into tears at the sight of a

dying sister's agonies; or when we enter another door and see the tenderness of a mother's affection toward the sick infant in her bosom; or when we see, in a third family, the cheerful obedience which the children pay to an aged father; or, in a fourth family, the scrupulous integrity with which the servant manages the affairs of an earthly master, we are ready to ask: Is this indeed a world of sin? Is it possible that the wrath of God can be in store for such a world? It will be very generally granted that there are some men so utterly worthless and incorrigible—so far gone in the ways of desperate wickedness, that nothing else is to be expected for them but an eternity of hopeless misery. There is a crew of abandoned profligates who scoff at the very name of God and religion. There are atheists who openly deny His very being—infidels who openly deny that Christ came in the flesh. There are cold-blooded murderers, and worse than murderers, who are confessed by all to be a disgrace to the name of man. For these, few would dare to plead exemption from the awful vengeance that awaits the ungodly. So that there is a felt reasonableness in the dreadful words: "The abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars shall have part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." But that the obedient child and the faithful servant—the tenderly affectionate mother—the hospitable and generous neighbour—the man of intelligence and good feeling—that all these should ever be bound up in the same bundle of destruction and consigned to the same eternal flames, merely because they do not believe in Jesus—this is the rock of offence on which thousands stumble and fall to their inevitable ruin.

There is, perhaps, no way more commonly used by man to repel all the personal convictions of sin which the Word of God would cast on us. For do I not feel within me all the tender affections of humanity—all the honesties and integrities of our nature? Do not I feel pleasure in being honest and fair-dealing—in being compassionate, and generous and hospitable? How plainly, then, may I say to my soul: "Soul, take thine ease? These virtues of thine are a sure token that thou art born for a blessed eternity." Ah! my friends, is it not a most blessed thing that, in the passage now before us, God wrests from our hand the very weapon wherewith we would defend ourselves, and turns it with a shaft to pierce our worldly

consciences? And, oh! if we had minds as intelligent as when Adam walked with God in Paradise, nothing more would be necessary to carry to our hearts the overwhelming conviction of sin than the repetition of the words: "A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you." There is a power and a pathos in this argument, which might well break down the hardest and most unfeeling mind; it is as if God had said, as he elsewhere doth: "Come and let us reason together." You say that you have many excellent virtues—that you have tender and beautiful affections; you say that filial and parental love occupy a master-place in your bosom—that integrity and unsullied honesty beat high in your breast. And do I deny all this? Shall I detract from the glory of my own handiwork, so beautiful, even in ruins? No, it is all true; the son does honour his father—the servant is faithful to his master; all is beautiful, when I look only to the earthly relationships. But that is the very thing which shows the utter derangement of all the heavenly relationships; for, "if I then be a father, where is mine honour? if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you." I see that you honour your earthly fathers, and serve faithfully your earthly masters; but that is the very thing which shows me that I am the exception. I see that there is not a father in the whole universe that is deprived of the love of his children, but me—there is not a master under heaven that is robbed of the honour and service of his domestics as I am. If, brethren, you and I were sunk into actual brutality—if we had no love for parents—no honesty to masters—then God might have cause to say of us that nothing better could be expected from such wretches than that we should forget our heavenly Father and Master. But, oh! when there are such tender affections in our bosoms towards our earthly relations, is not our sin written as with an iron pen, and with lead in the rock forever, that we make God the exception—that we are godless in the world?

I would, with all affection and tenderness, beseech every one of you to search his own heart and see if these things be not so—see if that which you generally take for the excuse of your sins be not the very essence of them. What would you not do, what what you not suffer for the sake of an earthly parent? and yet you will not expend so much as a thought, or the

breathing of a desire, for your heavenly Parent. God is not in all your thoughts. You will toil night and day in behalf of an earthly master; yet you will not do a hand's turn for your heavenly Master. God is the only parent whom you dishonour; God is the only master whom you wrong. "If you were blind, you should have no sin; but now it is plain you see, therefore your sin remaineth." If you were incapable of affection or fidelity, then you should have no sin; but now it is plain you are capable of both, therefore your sin remaineth. Imagine a family of brothers and sisters all bound together by the ties of the closest amity and affection. Oh! it is a good and pleasant sight to see brethren dwell together in unity. "It is like precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts of his garments. It is as the dew of Hermon that descended upon the mountains of Zion." What will they not do for each other? What will they not suffer for each other? But imagine, again, that all this unity, which is so much like the temper of heaven, was maintained among them, whilst all the time they were united in despising the tender mother that bore them—in turning away from the grey-haired father that had brought up every one of them. Would not this one feature in the picture change all its beauty and all its interest? Would it not make their unity more like that of devils than that of angels? Would you not say that their affection for one another was the very thing which made their disaffection to their parents hateful and most unnatural? Oh! brethren, the picture is a picture of us: "A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you."

Oh! it is a fearful thing when our very virtues, to which we flee for refuge against the wrath of God, turn round most fiercely to condemn us. What avail your honesties?—what avail your filial attachments?—what avail your domestic virtues which the world so much admire and praise you for, if, in the sight of God, these are all the while enhancing your ungodliness? Let no man misunderstand me, as if I had said that it was a bad thing to be honest, to be faithful and just and affectionate to parents. Every sensible man knows the value of these earthly virtues, and how much they are invigorated and enlarged and begin a new life, as it were, when the worldly man becomes

a believer. But this I do say, that if thou hast nothing more than these earthly virtues, they will, every one of them, rise in the judgment only to condemn thee. I say only what the mighty Luther hath said before me—that these virtues of thine, whereby thou thinkest to build thy Babel tower to heaven, are but the splendid sins of humanity; and that they will only serve to cast thee down into tenfold deeper condemnation. God doth not charge you brethren with dishonesty, with disobedience to parents. The only charge which He brings against you here is the one long sin of the natural man's life—ungodliness. God is not in all your thoughts. He admits that you have earthly virtues; but these just make blacker and more indelible your sins against heaven.

I. I infer from this passage that our worldly virtues will not atone for sin, or make us acceptable in the sight of God—Humanity is a ruin, but it is beautiful even in ruins. And just as you may wander through some magnificent pile over which the winter storms of whole centuries have passed, and stand with admiring gaze beside every fluted column, now broken and prostrate, and luxuriate with antiquarian fancy amid the half-defaced carving of Gothic ages—as you may do all this without so much as a thought of the loss of its chief architectural glory, the grand proportions of the whole towering majestically heavenward, with bastion and minaret, all now lying buried in their own rubbish—so may you look upon man; you may wander from one earthly affection and faculty to another, filled with admiration of the curious handiwork of Him who is indeed the most cunning of artists; you may luxuriate amidst the exquisite adaptations of man to man, so nice as to keep all the wheels of society running smoothly and easily forward; you may do all this, as thousands have done before you, without so much as a thought of the loss of man's chiefest glory—the relation of man to his God—without thinking that while many amid the rubbish of this world are honest and fair dealing and affectionate to parents, there is not one that seeketh after God.

Let us imagine for an instant that these worldly virtues could take away sin; and just look to the consequences. Where would you find the man altogether destitute of them?—where is salvation to stop? If honesty and generosity are to blot out one sin, why not all sin? In this way you can fix no limit between the saved and the unsaved; and, therefore, all

men may live as they please, for you never can prove that one man is beyond the pale of salvation. Again, if worldly virtues could blot out sin, Christ is dead in vain. He came to save His people from their sins. Angels ushered Him into the world as the Saviour of sinners. John bade men behold in Him the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world; and the whole Bible testifies that "through this man is preached unto you the remission of sins." But if the every-day honesties, and kindnesses, and generousities of life could avail to take away sin, what needed Christ to have suffered? If anything so cheap and common as earthly virtues are could avail to the blotting out of sin, why needed so inestimably precious a provision to be made as the blood of the Son of God? If, with all our honesties and all our decencies and respectabilities in the world, we do not stand in need of everything, why doth Christ counsel us to buy of Him gold tried in the fire that we may be rich? Nothing that is imperfect can make us perfect in the sight of God. Hence the admirable direction of an old divine—"Labour after sanctification to the utmost; but do not make a Christ of it; if so, it must come down one way or other. Christ's obedience and sufferings, not thy sanctification, must be thy justification." The matter seems a plain one. God is yet to judge the world in righteousness—that is, by the strictest rule of His holy law. If we are to be justified in His sight on that day we must be perfect in His sight. But that we cannot be by means of our own sanctification, which is imperfect. It must be through the imputing of a perfect righteousness, then—even the perfect obedience of Christ—that we are to be justified in that day. We are complete only in Christ; we are perfect only in Christ Jesus. But, ah! brethren, if our sanctification will not do for a righteousness in that day, much less will our worldly virtues do. If your honesties and worldly decencies are to be enough to cover your nakedness and make you comely in the sight of God, why needed Christ to have fulfilled all righteousness as a surety in the stead of sinners? Why does He offer to make poor sinners the righteousness of God in Him? Why does He say of His saved ones—"Thou wast perfect in beauty through my comeliness which I put upon thee?"

II. I infer from this passage that earthly virtues may accompany a man to hell. I desire to speak with all reverence and with all tenderness upon so dreadful

a subject. The man who speaks of hell should do it with tears in his eyes. But, oh! brethren, is it not plain that if the love of earthly parents and honesty to earthly masters be consistent with our utter ungodliness upon earth, they may also be consistent with the utter ungodliness of hell? Which of you does not remember the story of the rich man and Lazarus? When the rich man lifted up his eyes in hell, being in torments, and when he prayed Abraham to send Lazarus to dip his finger in water and cool his tongue, what was the one other desire which in that fearful hour racked the bosom and prompted the prayer of the wretched man? Was it not love for his brethren? "I pray thee, therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house; for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment" (Luke xvi. 27). Ah! my brethren, does not this one passage remove a dreadful curtain from the unseen world of woe? Does it not reveal to you some eternal pains which you never dreamed of? There will be brotherly affection in hell. These parching flames cannot burn out that element of our being. But, oh! it will give no ease, but rather pain. The love of children will be there; but, oh! what agonies shall it not cause when the tender mother meets the children on whose souls she had no pity—the children whom she never brought to the Saviour—the children unprayed for—untaught to pray for themselves! Who shall describe the meeting of the loving wife and the affectionate husband in an eternal hell—those that never prayed with one another, and for one another—those that mutually stifled each other's convictions—those that fostered and encouraged one another in their sins? Ah! my friends, if these, the tenderest and kindest affections of our nature, shall be such fierce instruments of torture, what shall our evil affections be?

I would now speak a word to those of you who are counting upon being saved because you are honest and affectionate. Oh! that you would be convinced this day by Scripture and common sense that these, if you be out of Christ, and therefore not at peace with God, do but aggravate your ungodliness, and will add torment inexpressible to your hell. If, then, our very virtues condemn us, what shall our sins do? If the ungodly shall meet with so fearful a doom, where shall the open sinner appear? But if there is a fountain opened up in Zion, to which both the ungodly and the sinner may

go; and if only you will be persuaded to believe that you are neither more nor less than one of these lost and undone creatures, I know well how swiftly you will run to plunge yourself into these atoning waters. But if you will still keep harping upon the theme of your many excellent qualities—your honesty, your uprightness, your exactness in equity, your kindness in charity—and will not be convinced by the very words of God, that though the son honour his father and the servant his master, these do but add a deeper and more diabolical dye to your forgetfulness and contempt of God—if you still do this, then we can only turn away from you with sadness, and say—"The publicans and harlots enter into heaven before you."

Some Famous Answers in the Shorter Catechism.

(Continued from vol. xxx., p. 451.)

ONE of the finest answers in the Shorter Catechism is that given to the question—"Who is the Redeemer of God's elect?" The answer reads—"The only Redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was, and continueth to be, God and man in two distinct natures, and one person, forever." Those who are most familiar with the great controversies that have raged round the person of Christ will best appreciate the extraordinary care and precision that characterise this answer, conserving as it does the truth in a short space, in a remarkably comprehensive statement on the Person of Christ. To guard against the possibility of bringing any one else into the place of honour as Redeemer of God's elect, the Answer asserts that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only Redeemer. His eternal Sonship is also clearly affirmed in opposition to those who hold that this relationship is not eternal, but has its beginning either at the Incarnation or the Resurrection. In opposition to the Docetic heresy it is asserted He "became man," that is, not in appearance only, but in reality. "And so was and continueth to be, God and man in two distinct natures and one person for ever"; these words assert that during His humiliation He did not cease to be God for the time being, and if the modern doctrine of the Kenosis does not directly assert this, it comes perilously near doing so. It is question-

able if one who consistently holds this doctrine could accept the statement "and so was and continueth to be God and man." The same criticism may be offered to the Lutheran doctrine of the "*Communicatio Idiomatum*," which was invented in defence of the peculiar Lutheran view of Consubstantiation which asserted that "Christ was present in, with, and under the elements in the Lord's Supper." This necessitates the presence of the entire person of the Incarnate Son, soul, body, and divinity wherever the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is celebrated. To get over this difficulty the Lutherans, with whom originated the doctrine of the Kenosis, invented the theory that each nature shares in the essential attributes of the other nature. When they came to explain more fully what they meant they affirmed in detail that the humanity shared with the divine in its omniscience, omnipresence, and power of giving life. This view is in opposition to the statement that our Lord "was God and man in two distinct natures." The Reformed doctrine of the "*Communicatio Idiomatum*" is, that what is predicable of one of the natures is predicable of the Person. The Apollinarian heresy which asserted that the divine nature took the place of the human soul (pneuma) at the Incarnation is also guarded against by the words of the Catechism, "in two distinct natures," as is also the Eutychian or Monophysite heresy which confounded the two natures. The opposite extreme is seen in the Nestorian heresy, which emphasised the natures to such an extent that it made two persons. "There are two distinct natures," said Dr Duncan, "but not separate" in the one Person for ever. It will be seen from the foregoing that the Catechism Answer is an exceedingly careful and well-guarded statement of the scriptural doctrine of the Person of the Lord.

The Answers to the Questions dealing with the application of the Redemption purchased by Christ are also admirable statements of scriptural truth. "How are we made partakers of the Redemption purchased by Christ?" To which the Divines give the answer—"We are made partakers of the Redemption purchased by Christ, by the effectual application of it to us by His Holy Spirit." Here the work of the Holy Spirit is prominently brought before us, and the Spirit's method of applying this redemption is set forth in the words of the succeeding Answer—"The Spirit applieth to us the redemption purchased by Christ, by working faith in us, and thereby uniting us to Christ in our effectual

calling." This brings us to one of the finest answers in the Shorter Catechism—the Answer to the Question, "What is effectual calling?" "Effectual calling," so runs the Answer, "is the work of God's Spirit, whereby, convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, He doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ, freely offered to us in the Gospel." In this answer our attention is directed to the Spirit's work and the free offer of Christ in the Gospel. Man's ruin by the Fall is complete, and he is rendered utterly helpless as far as doing anything for his salvation is concerned. The Fall affected the Conscience, bringing such confusion into it that light is called darkness and darkness light, evil good and good evil. The Understanding was darkened. The Will became so perverse that its whole bent was always away from God, and the Heart had lost all love to God. When the Holy Spirit effectually calls a sinner He begins with the Conscience—"convincing us of our sin and misery." But the work of the Holy Spirit being thorough, is not confined to the Conscience. He deals with the Understanding "enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ"—light is made to shine into the Understanding. But the work is not confined to the Conscience and the Understanding. The Will is also dealt with—"renewing our wills"—nothing short of the Spirit's omnipotent power could change the perverse bent sin gave them. And finally the Spirit deals with the Heart—"persuading and enabling us to embrace Jesus Christ as He is freely offered to us in the Gospel." It will thus be seen that the work of the Holy Spirit in effectual calling is of the most thorough kind. Every faculty of the soul is operated on—Conscience, Understanding, Will, and Heart. Were the Conscience convinced only and the other faculties untouched, it would not be sufficient, however thorough that conviction might be. So the Westminster Divines, as truly Spirit-taught men and faithful students of God's Word, have given us in this all-important doctrine, one of the finest Answers of the Shorter Catechism.

The Answers to the Questions on the great doctrines of Justification, Adoption, and Sanctification are also admirable. Another very fine Answer is that to the Question—"What benefits do believers receive from Christ at death?" "The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory; and their bodies, being still united to

Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection." On the same high plane is the Answer to the Question, "What benefit do believers receive from Christ at the Resurrection?" "At the Resurrection, believers being raised up in glory, shall be openly acknowledged and acquitted in the day of judgment, and made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of God to all eternity." The great end for which God created man is now attained for all believers—their glorifying God—being themselves raised up in glory for this end—and they are made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of God to all eternity.

Luther's Early Spiritual Struggles.

(Continued from vol. xxx., p. 444.)

"THIS young monk, absorbed in the quest of a gracious God in the Erfurt monastery," says Dr Mackinnon, "is a tragic figure." Rome, with all her gorgeous ritual and her splendidly-attired hierarchy, has nothing to offer this poor captive battling with problems that are shaking his soul to its very foundations. For a time he found some rest in reading the writings of Bernard and Gerson. Luther afterwards acknowledged help received from Staupnitz, the Vicar-General of his Order, on such questions as predestination, etc. "If Dr Staupnitz," he says, "or rather God, through Dr Staupnitz, had not aided me in this, I would have been long since in hell." In 1510 Luther was sent to plead the case of his monastery at Rome. When he came in sight of the city he dropped on his knees, but ere he left it its sanctity—at least what passed for such—was to be an utter abomination to him. "I would not," he said, "have missed being in Rome for any amount of money. Had I not seen it with my own eyes, I would not have believed it. For there is there so great and shocking impiety and wickedness. There neither God nor man, neither sin nor shame is regarded." Luther spent only a few weeks in Rome, and his time was taken up with attending to the interests of his Order, and with visiting, praying, and saying masses at the shrines of the apostles and saints. As he was anxious to get some benefit for his grandfather's soul in purgatory, he climbed the Scala Sancta (the Holy Stairs) at the Lateran, saying a Paternoster at each step. It was only when he arrived at the last

step that the thought passed through his mind, "Who knows whether it is true?" This is Luther's own account given in a sermon preached on 15th September 1545. The well-known story of the words, "The just shall live by faith" coming to him as he climbed the stairs rests on the authority of his son, Paul, who was only eleven years old, who says he had the story from his father. Dr Mackinnon is not disposed to accept this version of the time when the light dawned on the darkened soul of the struggling monk, and attributes it to a later period when the truth as set forth in Romans i., 17, set him free. We are not in a position to call in question Dr Mackinnon's view and the quotations he gives from Luther's writings seem abundantly to confirm his contention.

In 1512 Luther graduated as a Licentiate in Theology and a fortnight later as Master and Doctor. There was one passage of God's Word which was a sore stumbling block to him, Doctor of Theology though he was; this was Romans i., 17: "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written, the just shall live by faith." Troubled in conscience, he hated a just God who must needs punish sinners even in spite of such satisfactions as he was able to give. He chafed against the phrase "righteousness of God" in wrathful rebellion he tells us. Misreading the Scriptures and understanding "righteousness" to mean "punitive righteousness" he threw himself into paroxysms of bitter indignation. "Thus I raged," he says, "and my conscience was agitated by furious storms. I beat importunately at that passage in Paul, thirsting with a most ardent desire to know what the Apostle meant." At last the light shone into his understanding, and in reading "the just shall live by faith" with what goes before, he now saw that the "righteousness of God" must be understood in the passive and not the active sense. In other words, the righteousness of God that was revealed in the Gospel was the righteousness provided by Christ and which God mercifully imputes to the sinner believing in Christ. Luther read the passage in Roms. i. 17, as follows:—"For therein is the righteousness of God by faith (Greek, *ek pisteos*, translated in other places in this Epistle "by faith," but in the 17th verse, "from faith") revealed to faith." That is, in the Gospel "the righteousness of God by faith" is revealed to "faith." Other interpretations of this great passage have been given by orthodox commentators, but we are merely stating Luther's view at present. Henceforth, he says,

the whole Scripture assumed for him a new aspect. "Therefore," he adds, "just as I had previously hated the phrase, 'Justitia Dei' (righteousness of God), so now I extolled it with equal love as the sweetest of words. And so to me that passage in Paul was the true gate of paradise." The way for a guilty sinner to God, such as he felt himself to be, was not by works of righteousness, which he had done, but by the righteousness of Another. In his lectures on the Psalms and Romans the complete change of his outlook is clearly reflected, as yet he did not realise that he had come into possession of a truth that was to shake the whole mighty fabric of Romanism from the topmost stone in the building to its very foundations. Rejoicing in his deliverance, he little realised that God had placed in his hand a weapon that was to strike a smashing blow at one of the most tyrannical systems that had ever held the mind of man in thrall.

It was in 1515 that Luther found himself up against the teaching of Rome on indulgences. To begin with, Luther thought he was only waging war against a wandering deceiver in the person of Tetzel, but as the attack developed he learned to his cost that Tetzel was only a unit of a mighty army against which he found himself out to do battle. An Indulgence Bull had been issued by the Pope in 1515, half of the proceeds of which were to go to the Pope and the remainder to Prince Albrecht of Brandenburg. Tetzel was one of the most skilful and pushing of the Indulgence preachers. "As soon as the money in the coffer rings," said the lying preacher, "the soul from the fire of purgatory springs." Luther was carefully watching the progress of events; his soul burned with indignation at the cruel deception, and at last when the "Instruction" of the Archbishop of Mainz fell into his hands he felt bound to make a public protest. The whole conception underlying indulgences Luther felt to be at variance with the religion of the New Testament. He drew up his objections to indulgences in a series of theses, in which he appealed to the theologians of Wittenberg and other universities. He assumes throughout that his polemic is in accordance with the mind of the Pope and all good Christians. He sent these Theses with a letter to the Archbishop of Mainz, in the hope that he would put a stop to the reprehensible things done by his agents. At this stage Luther had no thought of breaking with Rome. He still revered the Pope and the priesthood, still believed in Penance, though striking against its abuses. Yet in these Theses the

doctrine of justification by faith is assumed. It is at the bottom of his antagonism to the gross conception of indulgences. But as yet Luther is not fully conscious that he has struck a blow that is destined to shake the world of Christendom. How he came to realise this and finally to break with Rome is to be told by Dr Mackinnon in his second volume, which is not yet issued, and which we hope to notice when published.

Scoto-Catholicism.

THIS is the term used by Dr Wotherspoon in his recently issued *Life of "James Cooper, Presbyter in the Church of God, M.A., D.D., Litt. D., D.C.L., LL.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Glasgow,"* to describe that movement in the Church of Scotland engineered and fostered by the Scottish Church Society and to the advancement of whose ideals Dr Cooper gave his whole-hearted support. The biography is a revelation of the gathering strength of this movement in the Church of Scotland. Dr Cooper was a strange mixture. He did not like the Calvinism of the Westminster Standards, as might be expected, for while he valued the Confession as a formal link to what he called the Catholic faith, he disliked its Calvinism as an obstacle to reunion with Episcopalians (p. 234). As to Puritanism he writes:—"Puritan I never was: I think they deprived the Church's worship of that glory and beauty for which God provided at the erection of the Tabernacle, and which He has impressed on every whit of His great temple of the Universe" (p. 23). He was strongly opposed to certain innovations, such as the General Assembly's decision to permit the Individual Communion Cup in 1908, which, notwithstanding the Procurator's legal advice that the law of the Church forbade it, was carried on Dr Norman Maclean's motion. When discussion of the Deceased Wife's Sister Act of 1907 came before the General Assembly, a Committee was appointed to look into the matter of the Church's relation to the new law. The Committee reported to the 1909 Assembly that the majority of them were of the opinion that such marriages were not contrary to Scripture, and recommended that ministers celebrating and parties contracting such marriages should be relieved from ecclesiastical censures. Dr Cooper desired that the Church should reaffirm its law and enjoin

obedience to it, insisting that there is a Christian law of marriage delivered to us by our Lord—which excludes the marriage of persons in near affinity. The Committee's recommendation was, however, carried by a large majority, and on being sent down to Presbyteries as an overture received their almost unanimous approval. When the overture came back to the Assembly of 1910, Dr Cooper opposed it as an evasion of the Confession. The overture was passed into an Act by a large majority, so that it is now the law of the Established Church that "ministers celebrating and parties contracting such marriages [as a man with his deceased wife's sister] are relieved from ecclesiastical censures." Some of his criticisms were not lacking in a shrewd estimate of men, as witness the following, though we cannot go in with all he says of "our past history":—"How very sad the conduct of the U.F. leaders! They are doing enormous injury to religion in Scotland: I had hoped they would have borne the stroke with meekness and bravery. But they have always praised the violent in our past history and seem bent on bettering that example. I hoped we might have addressed them, but plainly the time for speech is not yet. They are too sore, and too proud. I have not seen one word of penitence or confession even of mistake" (p. 226). He is here referring to the commotion produced in the ministerial ranks of the United Free Church after the House of Lords' decision in 1904.

Throughout the biography the main topic is Dr Cooper's obsession for unity—not so much with Presbyterians, Congregationalists, or Baptists in Scotland—but with Scottish Episcopalians, and then with the great Anglican Church in England, and finally with the Eastern Churches, when they would be in a position to negotiate with Rome. This he admitted was looking a long way ahead—we trust a great deal longer ahead than Dr Cooper would be willing to contemplate. "The idea of union," says his biographer, "almost the name—was in itself sacred to him." The whole biography is very "churchy," and one with sound Presbyterian sympathies cannot but feel a kind of ecclesiastical nausea at the feast of matters about holy days, liturgical forms, beautiful crucifixes, etc., served for consumption by Dr Cooper and his biographer. In the opening autobiographical chapter he says:—"I was never opposed to such Episcopacy as we had in Scotland, when the Bishops were subject in spiritual things to the General Assembly, and acted in their several dioceses in conjunction with our Scottish gradation of

Church Courts" (p. 23), and on next page he says :—"For myself, I confess that I should have gone heartily with the majority of the General Assembly at Perth in 1618 and voted in favour of the Five Articles." These were the Articles which were swept away by the famous Glasgow Assembly of 1638. It is no wonder, therefore, to read:—"Nor was I ever called to be a Covenanter. I could not have signed either the National Covenant of 1637 or the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643" (p. 26). In a sermon preached at Aberdeen on the bi-centenary of the Revolution of 1688, he described the Solemn League as a "dreadful compact" (p. 27). While he justifies himself for remaining in the Church of Scotland and promising "to concur with the Presbyterian government thereof, and never to endeavour the prejudice or subversion of the same," yet he adds—"I am profoundly convinced that without an acceptance of the Historical Episcopate that visible unity for which our Divine Master prays can never be achieved." How the two things can be reconciled is to us a mystery. Dr Cooper did not believe in a merely local union, as he called the projected union of the Established and United Free Churches, he had his eye on the Church of England. "If we have agreed to go so far for a merely partial and local union, how much more should we be ready to ask [from Parliament] the same sanction for a change which would benefit, instead of hurting, ourselves; enable us to go hand-in-hand in the first place with our brethren of England in the work of the Lord Jesus" (p. 30). His biographer says at one time he dreaded a merely Presbyterian Union (p. 298), but he changed from this and became a strong advocate for union of the Established and United Free Churches. His view on the matter at an earlier period is quoted in one of our notes under "Notes and Comments." Prof. William Fulton, Aberdeen, offers the following explanation of the change :—"Why did Dr Cooper appear reluctant at first to support the cause of Presbyterian reunion in Scotland? For two reasons. One was, lest by a reunion which should not include the Episcopal Church, not to say the Free Church, the realisation of the principal of nationalism should be unduly postponed, or even frustrated; and the other reason was, lest in the new United Church of Scotland the differences between Scottish and Catholic Christianity should be accentuated in the course of years. But he was apparently reassured on both grounds by the terms of the final draft of the 'Articles Declaratory of the Constitution of

the Church of Scotland,' in which the subject of the national recognition of the Church appeared to receive unambiguous statement, and in which also there was included a doctrinal affirmation bearing 'the very hall-marks of Catholic orthodoxy.'"—(Aberdeen University Review, March 1923). In 1918, in a letter to a friend, he says:—"I have found all my life that the providences which most distressed me at the time were really helpful to the fulfilment of the ends which I most earnestly desired. Here, for example, our union with the U.F.'s, so far from hindering the progress of Catholic worship and doctrine and a reunion with the Anglicans, is positively opening new doors for effort in both these directions, and the desires I have tried all my life to fan into a flame among a few are kindling in quarters where I never expected to see them" (298). But one of the most illuminative statements in this connection is contained in a letter of 25th June 1919: "The union, I am clear," he writes, "must go through. . . . It will give a free field for more Catholic usages, which are rapidly coming in among the U.F. clergy here: it will give us a number of excellent men; and it will remove the obstacles, as well as predispose us all to the wider union that can alone reunite high and low in Scotland, and give Christ a United Church for the marvellous Empire He has given to our race. That will be a body able to speak even to the Pope, and take a proper part in the union of all believers" (p. 306). If Dr Cooper's dream had been realised in his own time it is evident from his biography that it is not among the Low Church party he would be in the Church of England, but among the Ritualists, who have a like pious dream of union. He says in a letter written during his Broughty-Ferry ministry—"I am by no means inclined to Romanise, but I am more and more opposed to popular Protestantism and the philosophic liberalism" (p. 107). About the same time he says "the Reformation age has always rather repelled me than attracted me." This was written a short time after he had sent a letter to Dr Sprott, in which he expresses his deep concern whether he should remain in the Church of Scotland or not. If a man is known by the company he keeps, Dr Cooper's visits to the Mirfield Community, and his statement that Dr Orchard's views in many ways commend themselves plainly indicate where his sympathies lay.

But there were other objectionable matters in Dr Cooper's teaching, such as his views of Christ's "de-

scent into hell" (a phrase which the Westminster Divines interpreted in the so-called Apostle's Creed as "continued in the state of the dead and under the power of death till the third day") and prayers for the blessed dead. In regard to the former, he says in a letter dated 11th June 1915:—"Among the many things that the war is teaching us is a deeper understanding of the Article in the Creed, 'He descended into Hell': it was St Peter, who, for so many years knew of the martyrdom in front of him, who gave us the Scripture sanction for this blessed assurance that Christ Himself found activities of mercy between His death and Resurrection" (p. 275). Dr Cooper evidently is referring to the passage in I. Peter iii. 19, but his statement is in direct opposition to the correct interpretation of Peter's statement of Christ preaching to "the spirits in prison." As early as 1894, when he was minister of the East Church of St Nicholas in Aberdeen, he published a sermon under the title "The Blessed Dead and Their Remembrance in Prayer by the Church on Earth," which was ably reviewed by Dr Hay Fleming in the "British Weekly" (19th April 1894). Near his end he records that a minister called on him who held services on All Souls' Day, and read the names of members of his flock who died during the year. "I suggested to him," he says, "that after reading them he should read II. Tim. i. 16-18, showing that St Paul thought and prayed at the remembrance of loved ones gone." This is pure imaginary interpretation. We have no proof that Onesiphorous was gone.

The state of the Church of Scotland revealed by this book is discouraging. Dr Cooper, it is true, got into trouble with his Presbytery over some of his ritualistic teaching, but his own testimony is that the views he advocated were spreading not only in the Established, but in the U.F. Church, and he ought to know. That such views would be permitted in the Church of Scotland only shows the laxity prevailing, and if this movement grew in spite of a stricter subscription than now prevails, what will happen now that wider liberty has been given by Parliament. The Scottish Church Society is working along the lines of the larger union so dear to Dr Cooper's heart, and its influence is growing year by year. Dr Cooper was not a man who would keep his cherished ideas to himself; he certainly had courage, some would say that the right word was daring, and alike in the Assembly or the class-room he shunned not to declare his views of men and movements that so vitally affected the history of

Scotland. His sympathies were with the men who brought sorrow and tears to Scotland during the reigns of Charles I., Charles II., and James VII., and one can never tell how many students were influenced by him in the wrong direction. His biographer, Dr Wotherpoon, in summing up his work, says:—"He believed that any real reconstruction of the National Church must include that element of it which was deliberately excluded and driven into separation by the Settlement of 1693-4" (p. 338). Such a viewpoint can only be compared to Archbishop Sharpe's when he betrayed the Church of Scotland after the Restoration, but who nevertheless had the effrontery to say—"I have done more for the Presbyterian Government in Scotland than any minister who can accuse me."

Short Exposition.

BY THE LATE REV. JOHN ROSS, BRUCEFIELD, ONTARIO.

"I have surely heard Ephraim bemoaning himself thus—Thou hast chastised me, and I was chastised, as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke; turn thou me and I shall be turned, for thou art the Lord my God. Surely after that I was turned, I repented; and after that I was instructed, I smote upon my thigh; I was ashamed, yea, even confounded, because I did bear the reproach of my youth. Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child? for since I spake against him I do earnestly remember him still: therefore my bowels are troubled for him. I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord" (Jer. xxxi. 18-20). Let us notice (1) The penitent bemoaning himself; (2) the interest with which the Lord regards him; (3) the answer which He makes to his moaning. (1) The penitent bemoaning himself. His moanings are poured out before God. It is to God he speaks. He owns the chastening hand of the Lord. "Thou hast chastised me and I was chastised." He felt it. It made him smart. It brought him low. His own behaviour under the chastening is intimated in the confession he makes of his own behaviour under it: a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke. He did not know how to act in it, or how to bear it. It was a restraint upon his liberty. Free before, now under the yoke; running wild before, now brought under control; but stupid, self-willed, all his care and struggles directed to the shaking himself free from the yoke and to recover his former liberty and enjoy his

former indulgences. But the yoke that God puts on is not thus to be shaken off. It must remain on, till God's time for removing it comes. He wearies himself, hurts himself, and puts forth unavailing efforts until he is obliged to cease, and give up his struggles and submit to bear the yoke and become bidable and obedient. His petition in his bemoanings, "Turn thou me." He wishes to turn, but cannot, and prays to God to turn him. His faith, "And I shall be turned." He believes in God's power to turn him. He is actually turned, and sees the contrast between his wild struggles at the first to get free of the yoke. It was chastening that he bewailed at first; it is sin now. "I repented, I smote upon my thigh, I was ashamed, yea, even confounded, because I did bear the reproach of my youth."

An Explanation.

BY REV. N. CAMERON.

IN a lecture delivered in St Jude's F.P. Church, Glasgow, last New Year's Day, in offering some observations on the practice of the Free Church of Scotland, the following remarks appear:—"This last effort in this way" (viz., to remove excrescences of the world and the flesh—F.P. Magazine for March, pp. 411 and 412) "came from the congregation of Kilmuir, Skye. Their minister forsook them at the Assembly (as reported in the Free Church Record), and the petition was turned down." The statement:—"Their minister forsook them," etc., was based on the report given in the Free Church Record of the terms of the Petition, and on a sentence or two in the speech of the Rev. Kenneth Macrae, their minister.

The Petition reads:—"Your Petitioners are deeply grieved at the prevalence of congregational social meetings and sales of work within the Church, and believe that such functions are *unscriptural and detrimental to true piety and gospel increase*. That they consider the presence of such within the Church as a factor directly making for disquietude and disunity, and a hindrance to that spirit of brotherly love which ought to prevail. Your Petitioners, therefore, pray the Assembly to take such steps as will in their wisdom make an end of the practices complained of" (*italics are mine*).

"The Rev. Kenneth Macrae, Kilmuir, in moving that the Petition be received, said he drafted the Peti-

tion, but further than that he had nothing to do with its origin. It was not the case that his people had been put up to it. The fact was that his people put him up to it. He had come to realise that feeling was very deep on the matter, *but he was not going to plead for legislation because he was afraid that the remedy might be worse than the evil, etc.* (italics are mine). The parts both of the Petition and of the speech italicised are the ground upon which I based the statement complained of, viz.—That Rev. K. Macrae forsook his congregation at the General Assembly, etc.

I fail to see, taking these statements at their face value, how any one could come to any other conclusion. What could be worse than practices “unscriptural and detrimental to piety, and a hindrance to brotherly love?” Did not the Petitioners from “very deep feeling on the matter” pray that steps be taken and an end be made of the practices complained of? Did they expect this could be done without some form of legislation? or did Mr Macrae expect it could be done otherwise? Surely, the Petitioners did not mean, if their feelings were very deep on the matter that, “fear of the remedy being worse than the evil” should cause them not to plead for legislation to have it removed. They were sure to realise that if the things complained of were not removed, seeing that they were “unscriptural and a hindrance to piety and to brotherly love,” no greater evil could befall any church. But Mr Macrae did not ask for legislation for fear that the remedy might be worse than the evil. Let any unbiassed person compare the terms of the petition with this statement of Mr Macrae, and I will be surprised if he will not come to the conclusion—that he forsook his congregation. All that he said or did after this statement availed nothing; for he had committed himself to the fact that he was not going to ask for legislation for fear of consequences. Mr Macrae immediately he saw the lecture wrote a letter to the “Inverness Citizen,” in which he describes the statements in my lecture as “utterly false.” However, I took no notice of that, but wrote him explaining the matter from my point of view, partly as stated above.

He then wrote me a letter in which he reveals facts which I knew nothing of when I delivered the lecture in which the statement complained of appeared. The facts are:—“In 1920 I spoke on the subject of congregational social meetings, etc., at the Assembly, and registered my dissent from the finding of the

House. My congregation then rallied to my support, and on the suggestion of "my men," I prepared the Petition for the 1921 Assembly, and my own name was the first upon it. It was thrown out from that Assembly upon technical grounds, but it was then stated on the floor of the House that "the congregation had been put up to it," and I got no opportunity to reply. I took my opportunity in 1922 by saying that the congregation had put me up to it, meaning that the suggestion had come from my men." Then comes a criticism of my letter to him, which I have removed by giving the Petition in full above. "Being convinced from experience that pleading for legislation was hopeless, and owing to the intensity of the feeling displayed by the opposition would in my judgment prove disastrous to the Church, not to myself, I intended to move in the House by way of Christian appeal to the congregations of the Church. *In this view I had the approval of my Session before the second (1922) Petition was drawn up*, and my words which you quote were intended to bear upon the motion which Mr Mackinnon of Gairloch was to move to that effect. How then can I have forsaken my congregation?" After I fully considered the contents of this letter, I saw that, on account of the light it casts upon the whole proceedings and especially because Mr Macrae's Session had agreed that he would not move for legislation, it was a fact that he did not forsake his congregation. All the above was quite unknown to me till I got it from Mr Macrae's letter. So I wrote him offering to withdraw the statement that he "forsook his congregation at the Assembly" provided that the above portion of his letter should be made public in our Magazine for the month of May. The part italicised will show that he did what he had the full consent of his Session for. Although he replied that he would go to the public press with the matter, I do herewith withdraw the comment that "he forsook his congregation." At the same time I do not acknowledge, that having no knowledge of the case but what appeared in the Free Church Record, my statement was then wrong. He should have seen to it that what he has now made public in respect of the proceedings in the case should not have been allowed to remain in the dark till now. That would have saved not only myself but many others from forming an opinion adverse to him. For I hold that no man, who did not know that the meaning of the petition was not to seek legislation, but

was "intended to move in the House (Assembly) by way of a Christian appeal to the congregations of the Church," could have gathered any such meaning from the wording of the Petition. But as I had no desire to injure Mr Macrae or any other person, I am sending this explanation for publication in the F.P. Magazine.

Jejana or the Converted Hottentot.

I.

ON the Downs, in the district of Stellenbosh, in the midst of the deep sands and thick brushwood, stands a neat though humble dwelling, with a well-cultivated garden of considerable extent, and though all around is wild and waste, it is very pleasant to look upon, because the toil that made it fruitful has not been wrung from the sinews of the slave; for here the independent peasant holds the sway, and smiling plenty crowns the efforts of the industrious poor.

A widow is the owner of the Erf, and, with the assistance of her orphan children, its cultivator too; but this is not her best inheritance; the blessing of God, which maketh rich and addeth no sorrow thereto, has made this widow's heart to sing for joy, and no one can sit long beneath her lowly roof without acknowledging that the cottage, when illuminated by the beams of the Sun of Righteousness, can bestow more true happiness, than all the splendour of a palace, where God is not. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is the only remedy for the degeneracy of man; and the transcendent goodness of Jehovah is conspicuous in adapting to men of every language, of every hue, and of every degree of guilt, wretchedness and woe; and yet there are those who reject its all-sufficiency, and turn aside from the demonstrations of its power when exhibited by the barbarous Kaffir, the ignorant Hottentot, and degraded slave. But not so the Christian. He rejoices in the potency of that divine principle that can make the meanest of his fellow-creatures happy, and loves his religion the more for bringing home to the bosom of these degraded ones those principles that not only can make them virtuous and happy here, but also opens to them the portals of a glorious immortality. To the Christian, therefore, the story of Jejana will not be without interest, and if it should please God to make

it the means of bringing back one wanderer to the fold, or of strengthening one weak believer in the faith and love of Jesus, the purpose for which it is published will be fully answered.

Jejana was born at Bruintjes Hoogte, in the district of Somerset. Her mother was a Hottentot, and dying when her child was very young, gave her to the care of a young farmer in the neighbourhood, with the cattle and sheep she called her own. The young orphan was brought up in the family as a slave, and made herself so useful that the parents of the young man, when they removed from Bruintjes Hoogte, purchased her from their son (who had been left her guardian) for a team of oxen and a female slave. The farmer's route being through Tulbah, he spent one Sabbath there to have a child baptised, and poor Jejana, who till now had never heard the sound of the "church-going bell, nor smiled when a Sabbath appeared," was permitted on this occasion to tread the courts of the house of her God. All around was new and attracted her attention, but when the minister (Rev. Michael Vos) rose, her eager gaze was fixed upon him. The text was taken from the Revelation, iii. 15—"I know thy works." Jejana listened with profound attention to the minister, as he portrayed the sinner's evil doings, and conscious that her own wicked ways were brought to light, she, in her ignorance, thought the preacher was God; and the affrighted girl tried to hide herself behind one of the pillars of the church, for she imagined he looked at her in particular, and pointed her out. She left the church, but the deep and sorrowful emotions which had then taken possession of her soul still remained. The minister invited the farmer and his wife to his house; and as the dejected girl stood behind her mistress' chair, he fixed his eyes upon her, and asked her if she had been in church that day. "Yes, sir," said the afflicted girl. "Did you understand?" "No, sir." "Do you know that there is a God?" "I have often used His name in oaths and curses, but I know nothing about Him, sir: tell me where He is, and what He is." "God is a Spirit; He is everywhere," said the minister, "and hears all you say, and sees all you do." "Do you know you have a soul?" "No, sir." "Yes, that within you which feels glad and sorry is your soul, and when you die it must be happy for ever with God, or be sent to everlasting fire in hell." "O, sir, what shall I do, for I have never done anything but evil in my life." Here

the conversation was interrupted, and Jejana was obliged to go with her master and mistress, and saw the kind pastor no more, though doubtless his prayers followed the unhappy girl. She pursued her journey, but the arrows of the Almighty were within her soul, the poison whereof drank up her spirit; the terrors of God set themselves in array against her. By day and night the hand of the Lord was heavy upon her; she tried to keep from sleep, for she expected to awake in hell. Alas! she knew not that there was a balm in Gilead and a kind Physician there; but at length she obtained some little help from an old Hottentot called David, who came to her mistress's house on business. Having said that he had been in church, she earnestly enquired what he had heard there, and opened the state of her heart to him; he seemed, however, to have had but little knowledge of the way of salvation, for he only told her to pray to God to teach her and help her. To her inquiry how she should pray and what she should pray for, he told her to go and kneel down and look unto God in heaven, and say—"O God, help me! O God, teach me!" and so eager was the poor girl to practice the old man's lesson that she put down the meat her mistress had given her to dress, and ran away to the bush to pour out her soul in David's words—"O God, teach me! O God, help me!" adding, "for David says Thou wilt."

The Late Kenneth Graham, Achiltibuie.

THE subject of this brief notice, the late Mr Kenneth Graham, was born at Achiltibuie in the year 1837, and died there, very suddenly, on his way to attend public worship, on the 4th June 1925, at the ripe age of 88 years.

It seems he was first awakened to a realisation of his lost condition as a sinner during the Communion week at Coigach in 1899, and admitted a member in full communion in 1906. His awakening was destined not to swiftly vanish after the manner of the morning cloud and the early dew, but to permanently abide and bear the fruits of righteousness. He had deep convictions of sin and guilt which caused great dejection for a considerable time, and left their distinctive marks on his strong bodily frame, which never afterwards was quite so robust as formerly.

The time or the means whereby he was brought to taste that the Lord is gracious cannot now be determined, but that he partook of God's mercy, love, and grace in Christ's benign salvation was abundantly proved by a humble, loving, and steadfast Christian walk to the end. Of him we may justly say—"Our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world."—D. N. M.

Seumas Renuic.

(Air a leantuinn o t.-d. 465).

Chaidh an sin an luchd breth a ghairm, agus a' mionnachadh; cha do labhair e bheag na'n aghaidh, ach gu'n do thog e fianuis, "Nach suidheadh neach a toirt breth airsan a bha 'g aideachadh ceud-faithean, Protastanach, na Cleireanachd, na bha gabhail orra bhi seasamh taobh obair cumhnantaichte Athleasachaidh." Bha moran de'n luchd breth na'n luchd aidichidh. Bha daoine uaisle ann, a dhiult gnothuch a ghabhail ris a chuis. Thuirt fear de na daoine uaisle so, 'se tarruing as, "nuair a chual e Mr Renuic a tionndadh agus a labhairt riu." "Tha mi air bhall-chrith a bhi dol a ghabhail beatha, a choltach sin do dhuine diadhaidh, cha dhean mi e, ged a bheireadh sibh uam mo chuid an t-shaoghal." Fhuaradh leis an luchd breth ciontach e, agus chaidh a bhinn a thoirt a mach—Gu'm biodh e air a chrochadh an ath Dhi-h-aoine ann am Margadh an fheoir. Dh' fheoraich Morear Ghlinn-iuch, an t-ard breitheamh dheth; "Am biodh e airson tuille uine?" Fhreagair e, "Gu'n robh e an t-aon ni dhasan; na'm biodh an uine ni b'fhaide, gu'n robh sin gu math; na'm biodh i ni bu ghiorra gu'n robh sin gu math; 'se am mo Mhaighstir an t-am is fearr." Chaidh an sin a thoirt air ais do'n phrìosan. Chaidh dail chuig la eile chuir na bhas, a thug air iomadh a bhi a toirt bheum.

Cha robh a h-aon de na dh' fhuiling anns na ochd bliadhna fichead chianail ud, a labhair ni bu dana, ni bu tapaidh, 's le ni bu mho do shaorsa na Seumas Renuic air bheulabli na cuirt; gidheadh cha robh a h-aon de na mairtirich da'n d' fheuch iad uimhir do chaoimhneas. Leig iad da labhairt gu saor, gu'n eis, na bacadh; ge d' an d'thug e 'n tiodal morair do h-aon diu, ach Morair Ghlinnuich, a bha na dhuin' uasal do thaobh breth. Agus ged nach d' fhuair a chardean cead ga fhaicinn, fhuair Papanach agus

Easbuigean comas dol far an robh e. Chaidh an t-Easbuig Paterson tric ga shealltuinn; agus bha e'n ro gheall air gu faigheadh e bheatha dha, ni bha gle fhuarasd fhaotainn, na'n guidheadh e fein air son sin. Dr' fheoraich an t-Easbuig deth; "Am bheil thu saolsinn, nach bi duine sam bith air a thearnadh, ach iadsan ata do aon bheachd riut-sa?" Fhreagair e, "Cha tuirt mi is cha do smaon-aich mi riamh, nach rachadh neach a thearnadh nach biodh a reir mo bheachdansa; ach is iad so firinnean airson am bheil mise fulang, agus cha b'ann le braiseadh, ach le cnuasachadh fada, a ta mi air mo steidheachadh gur araidh iad fulang air an son. Ghabh an t-easbuig a chead dheth, a cur an ceill gu'n robh e ro bhronach air a shon, e bhi co teann bharaileach. "Bu mhor am beud," ars esan, "e bhi deth lethid a bheachdan, oir is maiseach an gille og e." Chuir e fios gu Mr Renuic an oidhe mu'n d' fhuiling e, mu bha ni sam bith na chomas a dheanamh air a shon, gu'm biodh e ro thoilliche a dheanamh. Chuir Renuic taing da ionnsuidh airson a chuairceas, ach nach b' fhiosrach esan air ni sam bith bu chomasach e, na dh' iarradh e air, a dheanamh air a shon.

Chaidh caochladh athchuingean a sgrìobhadh le iomadh neach, ann an doigh cho fabhorach 'sa bha 'n comas do laimh 's do inntinn duine a dheilbh, 's cho do choltas strìochdaidh da'n riaghladh, sa chuir da ionnsuidh chum ainm a chuir riu; ach cha deanamh se e; chaidh a thairgse dha, na'n leigeadh e boinne dubh tuiteam air mir paiper, gu'm bu leoir e, ach cha deanadh sin gluasad air. Chaidh an sin a chumail ann an leithid do shas, 's do theannachadh, 's nach bu chomasach da a bheag sam bith a sgrìobhadh. Chaidh an fhianuis bais a thoisich e ri sgrìobhadh a thoirt uaithe, agus na h-innealan sgrìobhaidh a thoirt air falbh.

Tri laithibh mu'n d' fhuiling e, chaidh a thoirt air bheulabh na h-ard-chomhairle, ach cha d' fhuaras fios ciod a thachair an sin, amhain gu'n dubhairt iad ris, gu'n do nochd iad mor chaoimhneas da, gu'n d' thug iad tuille uine dha gu'n iarraidh, ni nach d' rinneadh do neach roimhe de 'n t-seorsa. Fhreagair e iad le suilibhearas neo-chumanta, cuir an ceill an t-aobhneas a bha aige ann a bhi fulang maslaidh airson ainm a Mhaighstir. An deigh sin dh' fheoraich cairid ris, Cia mar bha e? Fhreagair e, gle-mhath; agus bithidh mi moran ni's fearr an ceann thri laithean. Thuirt e ri mhathair, gu'm b'e crochadh Raibeart Graidh (mairtearach treun) an crochadh mu dheireadh a chunnaic e, 's gu'n robh faireachdainn laidir air inntinn, gu'm be fhein an ath neach. Thuirt e tric gu'n robh e faicinn feum airson fhuilangas anns an am; agus gu'n robh e dearbhta

gu'n deanadh a bhas ni bu mho do dh' fheum, na ged a bhiodh e beo iomadh bliadhna. Chaidh fheoraich dheth, ciod a tharladh da'n fhuigheal a dh' fhadadh e na dheigh? Fhregair e gu'm biodh cuis gu math maille riu; oir cha treig Dia 's cha thilg se dheth oighreachd fein.

Air la a bhais, ghuidh ard fhear gleidhidh a phrìosan air, nach labhradh e mu aobhar a bhais aig a chroich. Thuirt Mr Renuic ris, An ni a bheireadh Dia dha gu labhairt, gu'n labhradh e sin, 's nach labhradh ni na bu lugha. Thuirt fear coimhead a phrìosan ris, na'n cuireadh e ainm ris an athchuinge, a bha aigesan na laimh, gu'm faigheadh e a bheatha fathast. Fhreagair e nach do leugh e riamh anns an sgriobtair, na ann an eachdaraidh na' mairtearaich, a bhi ag asluchadh airson am beatha nuair a ghairnte iad gu fulang airson na firinn; ged a theagamh gu'n iarradh iad orra gu'n am beatha ghabhail agus fianuis a thogail ann an aghaidh an aingidheachd a bhi ga'm mortadh, ach do mo thaobhsa mheasainn a ni sin a dheanamh, mar a teicheadh sa dol air ais o'n fhirinn, sa bhi cuir cul ri fianuis a thogail airson Chrìosd.

Fhuair an sin a mhathair agus a pheathraichean cead da fhacinn; an deigh dhoibh urachadh a ghabhail, air dhasan buidheachas a thoirt, thuirt e, "O Thighearn, thug thu mi, an uighe da uair uine do'n t-siorruidheachd, 's cha'n eil e cuir ni's mo uamhas orm, na ged a bhithinn gu luidh sios air leabaidh rosan; seadh, tre ghras chum do chliu, feudaidd mi a' radh nach robh eagal bais orm o na thainig mi do n' phrìosan so; ach o'n dearbh aite san deachaidh mo ghlacadh b-urrainn mi dhol gu seimh gu lobhta na croich. O! cia mar is comasach dhomh a bhi seasamh, ri bhi ann an da uair do uine ag giulan crun glòir." Dh' earlaich e an sin iad, a bhi deanamh ullamh airson bais, "Oir is e sin," ars esan, rìgh nan uamhais, ged nach eil e mar sin dhomhsa 'nis, mar bha e iomadh uair dhomh ann mo sheachranaibh, is ann mo dheuchainibh, nuair a bha mi ga'm fholach fein anns na beanntaibh; ach a nis bitheamaid subhach agus aoibhneach, oir tha posadh an Uain air teachd, agus rinn a cheile i fein ullamh. An do shaoil leamsa riamh gu'm biodh eagal fulangais agus bais air a thoirt air falbh mar so uam? Ciod a their mi ris, "Is ann o'n Tighearna tha so; is iongantach e 'nar suilibh-ne." Is iomadh uair a mheas mi 'n costuis, Crìosd a leantuinn, ach cha do thuig mi riamh gu so, gu'm biodh e co socrach; agus co aig tha fios air urram agus sonas sin a nis. "Esan a dh' aidicheas mise an lathair dhaoine, aidichidh mise esan am fianuis m'Athair." Thuirt e iomadh uair, "Nis tha

mise am fagas do chrìoch uine; 'si m' iarrtus a bhi a' moladh an Tighearn, tha e na shith riarachail, agus do-labhairt taitneach dhomh, gu'n do chum e mi o aontachadh anns a ni bu lugha, leis na naimhdean." Air dha a mhathair fhaicinn a' gul, dh' earalaich e i a chuimhneachadh, iadsan a ghradhaich ni sam bith roimh Chrìosd, nach b-airidh air iad. "Na'm biodh gradh agaibh dhomhsa, bhiodh aoibhneas oirbh gu'm bheil mi dol a dh'ionnsuidh m' Athair, gu bhi faotainn seilbh air ni nach fhaca sul," etc. Chaidh e 'n sin gu urnuigh, anns an deachaidh e gu mor a mach ann am moladh, agus a' tagar gu h-araidh as leth an fhuigheal a bha fulang, gu'n togadh an Tighearna fianuisean, a bheir-eadh an teisteanas sìos chum ginealaichibh a bha teachd, agus nach fhagadh an Tighearna Albainn: mar an ceudna, ag aithris mor mhuinighin dochais, gu'm biodh an Tighearna grasmhor do Alba.

Mu dheireadh, air dha an drum a chluinntinn a' bualadh airson an fhreiceadan, thainig braiseadh do ghradh air is thuir e—"Sud agaibh am faireachdain deagh-bheatha chum mo phosaidh; tha 'm fear-nuadh-posda teachd; tha mi ullamh." Ghabh e 'n sin a chead de mhathair agus de pheathraichean, a' guidhe orra gu'n a bhi fo dhiobhail misnich; oir, ma's biodh crìoch air so uile, gu'm faiceadh iad aobhar molaidh ann an obair an la sin. Chaidh thoir an sin mar bu ghnathach a dheanamh, gu tigh iosal na combairle, agus nuair a leughadh a bhinn-ditidh, dh'iarradh air ni sam bith a bha aige ri radh a labhairt an sin. Fhreagair e, "Cha 'n eil ni agam ri radh ribh, ach a ni sin a ta sgriobhta ann an Ieremiah xvi., 14, 15, "Air mo shonsa feuch tha mi 'nur laimh," etc. Dh'innsadh dha gu'm buaileadh na drumachan aig an aite mhillidh fad na li-uine, agus gu'm b' fhearr dha urnuigh a dheanamh anns an aite san robh e, ach dhiult e sin a dheanamh, ag radh, nach do smaoinich e ni sam bith ro-laimh, ach gun labhradh e gu saor, na bheirte dha ri aithris. Thairg iad an sin dha ministear sam bith gu bhi maille ris; ach fhreagair e, "Na'n gabhainn a h-aon dhiubhsan air son mo sholas na mo chomhairlichean, cha bitheann an so an diugh." Cha'n eil mi ag iarraidh ach an aon duine so—b'e sin an caraid a bha maille ris aig am a bhais.

Dh'imich e 'n sin chum na croich le mor shuilibhearas, mar neach ann am braiseadh do chaithream aoibhnis, 's cha'n fhacas a leithid do aireamh shluaigh, riamh roimhe aig bas millidh; ach cha robh a bheag air a chluinntinn, do bhrìgh 's gu'n robh na drumachan a bualadh gun lasachadh fad an ama, on a chaidh e suas air faradh na croich, gus an

do thilgeadh thairis e. Ach le eud cairdean a bha 'm fagus da, bha beagan de bhriathran deireannach air an cumail air chuimhne.

Nuair a thainig e 'n tus gu lobhta na croich, dh'iarr cuid air gun dad a labhairt, do bhrìgh 's nach cluinneadh an sluagh e; aich air sin cha tug e feart sam bith. Bha h-aon de na gearraich na sheasamh ri taobh na croich, a thoisich ri campar a chuir air, le radh, "Aidich ar rìgh, agus ni sinn urnuigh air do shon." Fhreagair e, "Cha bhi cuid agam deth bhur urnuighean; thainig mi an so, chum fianuis a thogail 'nur 'n aghaidh, agus an aghaidh bhur seorsa," Thuir an gearrach, "Aidich ar rìgh, agus guidhe air a shon, ciod air bith a their thu air ar son-ne." Fhreagair e, "Cha labhair mi ni's mo riut; tha mi ann an uine ghomrid gu tais-beanadh ann am fianuis Rìgh nan rìghrean, agus Tighearn nan Tighearnan, a chuireas taire, naire, agus amaladh air uile rìghrean na talamhainn nach do rioghaich air a shon."

Sheinn e ciii. Salm, agus leugh e Taisb. xix., rinn e 'n sin urnuigh, a tiomnadh anam do Dhia tre 'n Fhear-Shaoraidh, agus gu'm biodh a chuis air a cuir ceart na am fein; mar an ceudna cuir fhianuis air an Tighearna, gu'm b'e sud an la' a b-aoibhnich a chunnaig e riamh san t-saoghal; la' airson an robh mor fhadachd air. Lean e fada ann am moladh an Tighearna, do bhrìgh 's gu'n do chuir e urram crun na mairtearachd air; urram a bha mi-chomasach do na h-ainglibh, do bhrìgh 's gun robh e mi-chomasach dhaibhsan am beatha leigeil sìos airson am Maighstir rioghail. Ghearan e gun robhas a cuir dragh air ann e bhi ag aoradh do Dhia, ach ars' esan, "Bidh mi oscionn na'n neoil sin; ann an sin bidh mi gad' mbealtuinn, agus gad' ghloraichadh gun bhacadh, gun sgur, gu sìorruidh.

Thug iad air an sin sgur, 'sa dhol suas an fharadh, ni a rinn e, 'san sin rinn e urnuigh, agus thuirt e, "A Thighearna, tha mi basachadh anns an dochas, anns a chreid-eimh, nach treig thu Alba, ach gu'n dean thu fuil t-fhianuisean siol t-eaglais, agus gu'm pill thu ris, agus gu'm bi thu glormhor 'nar tìr. Agus anis, a Thighearn, tha mi ullamh, rinn a cheile, bean an Uan i fein ullamh." Air da na chomhdach a bhi air a chuir air aghaidh, thuirt e ris a chairid a fhritheal air, "Beannaichd leat: bi dìchiollach ann an dleasdanas, dean do shith re Dia tre Chrìosd. Tha deuchainn throm a teachd. Airson an fhuigheal a dh'fhag mi, thug mi thairis do Dhia iad. Innis dhoibh uamsa gun sgiothachadh, na bhi fo' dhiobhail-misnich ann a bhi cumail suas an Fhianuis, agus ullaichidh an

Tighearna dhuibh ministearan, agus luchd teagaisg, agus nuair a thig e, ni e na firinnibh tarchuischte so gloirmhor anns an tir.” Chaidh a thilgeadh thairis, leis na briathraibh so na bheul, “ A Thighearna ann ad laimhsa a ta mi tionnadh mo spiorad, oir shaor thu mi, Thighearn Dhia na firinn.”

Mar sin bhasaich Seumas Renuic dileas, diadhaidh, eudmhor, tri la’ an deigh dha bhi sea bliadhna fichead do aois, na dhuin og, na mhinisteir og, ach na Chrìosduidh abuch, agus na mbairtearach cliutach airson Chrìosd, air sgath nach do ghradhaich e a bheatha gu bas, tre fhuil agus focal fhianuis, thug e buaidh, agus mar sin fhuair e h-aithris air na h-uile ribe, agus bron, agus le mothachadh mhoran a thug roimhe taire dha, a rinn fianuis an deigh a bhais, an aghaidh na h-uile maslaidh, culchaineadh, agus dohbheart a chuireadh as a leth, airson a dhilseachd mu’n fhianuis a thug e air taobh na firinn, a bha e ’nis an deigh a seuladh le fhuil, agus le leithid do ionmhas foighidinn, ciùineachd, ioraisleachd, seasmhachd, misneachd, gradh-laiste, agus eud lasarach, a chuir amaladh air naimhdean, a chuir leth-bhreithich ceart, a dhaighnich luchd-stadaich, a thug solas do chairdean, agus mor ioghnadh air na h-uile.

Bha e iosal na phearsa, ro mhaiseach san aghaidh, agus mar bha Daibhidh og, mac Iesse, ruiteach agus sgiamhach na ghnuis. Labhair a chuid bu lionmhor do shluagh gu maith air shon an deigh a bhais; thuirt eadhon a mhurtairean gu’n deachaidh e do neamh. Bha Morear Tairbeart aon de’n luchd comhairle, a labhairt mar so mu thiomchioll—“Se duine bu sheasmhaich na bheachdan a chaidh riamh air ar beulaobh. Bhiodh cuid de na daoine, air uairean, a chuireadh sinn car tuathal, ach dh’ fhartluich oirnn riamh esan a ghlìdeachadh; far am fagadh sinn e, ann an sin gheibheadh sinn e; na’m b’ann an laithean Nocs a bha e beo, cha rachadh gu brath a chuir gu bas airson an aobhar cheudna.” B’e neach fa dheireadh e, chaidh a chuir gu bas ann an Albainn air son fianuis Iosa, agus saorsainn, aideachadh, agus obair chumhnantaichte, ath-leasachaidh anns an rioghachd.

Ri leantuinn.

A lazy Christian shall always want for four things, viz., comfort, content, confidence, and assurance. God hath made a separation between joy and idleness, between assurance and laziness, and therefore it is impossible for thee to bring these together that God hath put so far asunder.—*Brooks*

Notes and Comments.

The late Prof. Cooper's Dream of a United Church.

—In an article in this issue we call attention to the activities of the late Prof Cooper in connection with the Union movement. Dr Cooper, as may be seen from the above-mentioned article, was out for a much larger union than the gathering together of the Presbyterian denominations of Scotland, and his position is nowhere more clearly set forth than in a letter dated 1st May 1907, and addressed to the Rev. Thomas Hannan, the Episcopal clergyman of St Peter's Church, Musselburgh:—"A United British Church," he writes, "sound in faith, Catholic in order, full of good works, friendly with and helpful to the ancient Churches of the East, would be able even to make terms with the great Roman Church—so that we might help on unity in its fullness. Though this is to look far ahead. What all who love those things have most to dread is a merely Presbyterian Union, engineered by policy at the bidding of prejudice. Our safety is to set up the revealed will of Christ, to invoke the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and, believing in Him, to be brave enough to walk by principle." Dr Cooper in his last years came to favour the projected union of the Established and United Free Churches, because it opened up, in his estimation, a way for the larger Union on which his heart was set. His views are more fully set forth in our article, "Scoto-Catholicism," in this issue.

Society for the Propagation of Atheism in America.

—"The Presbyterian and Herald and Presbyter" (Philadelphia) in recent issues calls attention to the formation of the Atheist Club in Rochester University, a Baptist institution of Rochester, New York. The "English Churchman" makes the following comment on the aims and activities of the atheists:—"It appears that a Society has been formed in the United States called the "American Association for the Advancement of Atheism." According to an announcement this society has started an extensive campaign to assail every kind of belief in God. Numerous branches of the Association are to be established. Colleges are to be instituted. The press is to be largely utilised, and public meetings are to be held far and wide. Moreover, a radio station is to be erected for the purpose of broadcasting the Association's godless notions and

principles. We have not come across any indication of a direct connection between this organisation and Russian Bolshevism, but the aims of the two seem to be very much alike. They want to destroy all the restraints of religion, and they realise that the most effectual way of achieving their purpose is to eradicate from minds, especially of the young, every vestige of the fear of God. It is a solemn thing to think of the power which the "prince of this world" now possesses and the manner in which he is using it for the destruction of souls. Apparently he is working with special vehemence and malignity, knowing that his time is short."

The Convention of Royal Burghs and Sabbath Trading.—The question of Sabbath trading was raised at one of the meetings of the Convention of Royal Burghs recently held in Edinburgh. There were motions by the Provosts of Rothesay and Wick, calling attention to the necessity to grant local authorities more adequate control of refreshment shops and Sabbath trading. Provost Green, Wick, withdrew his motion in deference to Provost Hicks, Rothesay, whose motion he seconded. In the speeches the action of the Aberdeen Magistrates in granting the use of the Palais de Danse for musical entertainments and refreshments on the Lord's Day was severely criticised. The action of the Aberdeen Magistrates called forth a strong protest at a public meeting held in the city. Some of the speeches delivered by the clerical speakers were of the milk and water type, but others sounded a more militant and scriptural call to the people to resist this new effort to rob them of the sanctity of the Sabbath.

United Free Church Vote on Union.—In the report of the United Free Church Committee on Conference with the Church of Scotland it is stated that of the 63 home presbyteries, 61 voted in favour of the Assembly's remit as to whether the main causes of separation between the Churches had been removed. Islay was opposed and Uist made no return. The kirk-sessions showed a vote of 1155 in favour, and 235 were opposed; congregations showed 1122 in favour and 285 opposed. The "Scotsman," which is using all its influence in favour of Union—a particularly bad omen—mentions that while the vote in favour in many cases was carried by small majorities, so also was the vote against. The plain fact of the matter is that the voting against was very much larger than most people anticipated, and must have come as a shock to the United Free Church

leaders. This may account for the strain of the speeches recently delivered by the leading ecclesiastics in both Churches, in which they assert in strong terms that there is no going back now. We cannot prophesy what may happen, but past unions engineered by worldly-wise ecclesiastics have not been such successes as to encourage men to be reckless in trying another experiment in that direction.

Mississippi Follows Tennessee. — The State of Mississippi has now followed the good example of Texas and Tennessee in prohibiting the teaching of Evolution in the State schools. The vote was 29 to 16. The new legislation prohibits teachers teaching "that man descended or ascended from a lower order of animals." A penalty of 100 to 500 dollars and cancellation of the contract of the offending teachers is to be exacted for violation of the Act. It is encouraging to learn that these State legislatures of the United States have set their faces against this illusory scientific obsession. No doubt the learned men will laugh to scorn the efforts of these legislators as symptomatic of medieval darkness and obscurantism, but we feel confident that the tide will one day turn, and the obscurantists will then be discovered to be the men who in face of the most damaging evidence clung to a theory which in its most approved form sought to banish God from the great work of creation.

Church Notes.

Communions.—May—First Sabbath, Kames and Oban; second, Dumbarton; third, Edinburgh. June—First Sabbath, Coigach and Applecross; second, Shieldaig; third, Dornoch, Glendale, Helmsdale and Lochcarron; fourth, Gairloch and Inverness. July—First Sabbath, Lairg and Beaully; second, Tain, Staffin, and Tomatin; third, Daviot, Halkirk, Flashadder, and Rogart; fourth, Plockton, Bracadale, and North Uist. August—First Sabbath, Dingwall; second, Portree; third, Bonar-Bridge. South African Mission.—The following are the dates of the Communions:—Last Sabbath of March, June, September, and December. Note.—Notice of any additions to, or alterations of, the above dates of Communions should be sent to the Editor. We are requested to call the attention of those interested to the change of date of Applecross Communion from 3rd Sabbath of September to 1st Sabbath of June.

Meeting of Synod.—The Synod will meet, God willing, on Tuesday, the 18th day of May, at 6.30 p.m., in

the Hall of St Jude's Free Presbyterian Church, Glasgow. The retiring Moderator, the Rev. Neil Macintyre, will conduct divine worship beginning at the above hour.

Acknowledgment of Donations.

John Grant, Palmerston Villa, 4 Millburn Rd., Inverness, General Treasurer, acknowledges, with thanks, the following donations received up to 15th April 1926:—

COLLEGE FUND.—Mr Wm. Anderson, Palmerston N., New Zealand, per Rev. D. Beaton, £1.

GENERAL BUILDING FUND.—Mr Wm. Anderson, New Zealand, per Rev. D. Beaton, £1; Rod. Mackenzie, Fort-William, 2s.

HOME MISSION FUND.—"M." Hull, £5; Anon., Argyll, per Rev. N. Cameorn, £2 10s.

JEWISH AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.—Mr J. Livingston, Stockton-on-Tees, per Rev. N. Cameron, £2 10s; an Adherent, per do., 15s; Mrs Macinnes, Glasgow, per do., £1. On account of Rev. J. Tallach's Car Fund, per Rev. N. Cameron:—Miss F. MacLennan, Lenbihlaggan, 6s; Friend, Raasay, 6s; Miss J. Macaskill, Glasgow, 10s; per General Treasurer—Rod. Mackenzie, Fort-William, 5s; Miss I. Morrison, Ballantrushal, 10s; per General Treasurer, o/a Rev. J. Tallach's Car Fund—J. F. B., Bellanoch, 5s; Well-wisher, Tomatin, 7s 6d; Mrs J. Miller, Wick, 10s; Mrs C. Macdonald, Toronto, £1 16s; Rod. Mackenzie, Fort-William, 5s; — Tarbert, Lochfyne, £1; Three Friends, Fortrose, 8s; Mr A. J. Mackenzie, Schoolhouse, Ardgay, 10s; A Friend, Edinburgh, 10s; Sinclair Murray, Scotscaider, £1; A Friend, Clachan, per Mrs Tallach, 5s.

SUSTENTATION FUND.—Mrs Campbell Purley, Surrey (Carr Bridge), per J. Campbell, £10; D. Murchison, Rannoch Station, 16s; Miss Lucy Graham, Culkein, Drumbeg, 5s; Alex. Macpherson, Bass, Strontian, £1; Miss M. Grant, Larig View, Aviemore, 12s; Mr A. Macpherson, Scotstown, Strontian, 16s; Mrs A. Macphail, Ardentinny, 6s; Friend, Bridge of Weir, £1 1s; Miss J. Morrison, Ballantrushal, 3s; Norman Shaw, Toward Point Lighthouse, 6s; John Livingston, Stockton-on-Tees, per Rev. N. Cameron, £2 10s.

The following lists have been sent in for publication:—

CLYDEBANK CHURCH DEBT FUND.—Mr James Nicolson, 19 Osborne Street, Clydebank, gratefully acknowledges:—From Friends, Braes, Portree, per Mr A. Macaskill, £2 14s.

EDINBURGH CHURCH PURCHASE FUND.—Mr A. Maclean, 16 Marchmont, Crescent, Edinburgh, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the following donations:—Mr John Maclean, Vancouver, \$10, per Rev. N. Macintyre; a Lady Friend, Detroit, £5, per do.; A Friend, Waternish, £1, per General Treasurer.

GREENOCK CHURCH PURCHASE FUND.—Rev. N. Cameron gratefully acknowledges the following donations:—Mr John Macdonald, £2; the Oban Kirk Session, £5. Mr J. Urquhart, 12 Lynedoch Street, Greenock, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the following:—Mr A. Macaskill, Raasay (Coll. Card), £11 16s; Mr A. Macaskill, Portree (Coll. Card), £4 3s 6d; Mr J. Macleod, Harris (Coll. Card), £3; Mr John Macaulay, Melvaig, Gairloch (Coll. Card), £4 6s 6d; Mr D. Macleod, Raasay (Coll. Card), £2 13s; Mr N. Graham, Glasgow, 10s; Mr F. Morrison, Flashadder (Coll. Card), £4; Friend, Glasgow, £1.

TALLISKER CHURCH BUILDING FUND.—Mr John Macintyre, Carbstmore, gratefully acknowledges the following donations:—Per Mr M. Morrison,

Portnalong—Miss B. Morrison, Mount Florida, Glasgow (Coll. Card), £20 4s 6d; per Mr Jas. R. Macrae, Hawkhill—"Few Adherents of the Church in Broadford and Breakish" (Coll. Card), £3 10s; Mr D. Mackenzie, 1 Railway Cottage, Achnasheen (Coll. Card), £1 13s; per Rev. D. M. Macdonald, Portree—Nurse S. A. Nisolson, Inverness, 10s 6d.

REV. D. MACFARLANE'S MINISTERIAL JUBILEE PRESENTATION.—

Mr John Grant, 4 Millburn Road, Inverness, Treasurer of the above Presentation Fund, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, contributions up to 15th April amounting to £151 13s 11d, which amount includes the following anonymous donations:—"A Friend of 93," Dunvegan Postmark, 10s; J. F. B., Bellanoch, 10s; A. W. O. G., Achnasheen, 10s; F.P., Tomatin, 5s; A Well-wisher, Tomatin, 7s 6d; Friends, Fearn, 16s; an Old Lady, Diabeg, 2s 6d; Friends, Edinburgh, 10s; J. R., West Linton Postmark, 5s; Friend, Scabost, Skye, 10s; A Friend, Tain, £1; A Friend, Inverness, 2s 6d; "Northerner," Oban, 5s; F.P., Tain, 3s; "Three Friends," Halkirk, £1 7s; "S. O.," Helmsdale, 5s; "Three Friends," Fortrose, 13s; M. G., Raasay, 5s; A Friend, Tomatin, 10s; Two F.P.'s, Forres, £1; Anon., Inverness Postmark, £1; A Friend, Bonar-Bridge, 5s; Ten Subscriptions, per Mr John Macdonald, Dusary, £2 17s (North Uist); Nine Subscriptions, Kyle, per Mr A. Robertson, missionary, £4; Sixteen Subscriptions, Plockton, per do., do., £2 14s.

LEGACY.—Mr John Grant, General Treasurer, begs to acknowledge, with grateful thanks, the sum of £1000, in payment of a legacy, free of legacy duty, from Messrs McCash and Hunter, solicitors, Perth, agents for the Executors of the late Mrs Mackay, Sydney House, Lairg. The legacy, under the will of the late Mrs Mackay, is bequeathed to the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland for the purposes of the Church.

The Magazine.

Corrections.—The initials to the brief obituary notice of the Rev. Wm. Scott should have read "J. A. MacL." instead of "A. S." On p. 455, line 6 from top, for "one" read "united."

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED FOR MAGAZINE.—4s SUBSCRIPTIONS.—

Mrs Anderson, Kinlochlaggan; Mrs Isa, Angus, Millhouse, Ullapool; John Booth, Bradford; Mrs Calder, Tannachy, Rogart; Alex. Colquhoun, Glendale; Mrs Catherine Dunnet, Castletown; John Leitch, West Lodge, Dolphinton; Mrs J. Mackenzie, Strath, Gairloch; Mrs D. Macdonald, Craig, Arrina; Miss M. Campbell, 313 Ametree Street, Glasgow; Miss A. Macdonald, Trumisgarry, North Uist; Alex. Macdonald, Bachuil, Lismore; Mrs Mackay, Bayview, Kyle; Miss Macgregor, 14 Pulteney Street, Ullapool; A. Stewart Hunter, Balmuchy; Colin Maclean, Morefield, Ullapool; Mrs Macmaster, Dalnabreck, Rogart; Miss Macpherson, Greenebie, do.; J. Mackay, Muie, do.; N. Morrison, 34 Northton; John Macaulay, 7 Tolsta; Miss Ina Matheson, Tanera; Miss M. Mackenzie, King's Norton, Birmingham; Mrs J. Miller, 5 Westbanks Terrace, Wick; Miss Banks, West Park, do.; Miss B. Macdonald, 13 Alexander Street, Clydebank; Miss Mary Grant, Lairg View, Aviemore; Mrs Catherine Maclean, Borve, Portree; Alex. Macrae, Braes of Ullapool; Mrs A. Macleannan, Dallas, Forres; Miss B. Macdonald, 9 Borodale, Ness; Miss K. Grant, The Hydro, Kilmaccolm; Kenneth Mackenzie, Achnasheen; Angus Macleod, Culkein, Drumbeg; Robt. Colvin, Suisgill, Kildonan; Miss M. Macleannan, Westcott, Fortrose; M. Tucker, Trowbridge; John Ross, Kimberley, Fearn; Rod. Mackenzie, New Pier Terrace, Fort-William; Miss M. Maclean, Easter Aviemore; Mrs H. Macleannan, Alcaig, Conon-Bridge; Mrs K. Macleod, Shore Street, Ullapool; C. S. Murray, Scotscauld; Mrs J. R. Crowe, Oatlands Park, Weybridge; S. Nicklin, Walsall, England; Angus Nicolson, 6 Balmeanach, Portree; John Mackay, Benarmine Lodge, Rogart; Duncan Macleod, Altnabran E., Lochinver; John Macleod, Inchnadamph, Lairg; James Forbes, South

Clunes; Miss J. Maclean, 28 Buckingham Terrace, Glasgow; A. Robertson, missionary, Ploekton; Miss M. Robertson, Field, Baleskine, Lochmaddy; Mrs J. Ross, Loane, Rarichie, Fearn; Miss Gillies, Abbey Craig Park, Stirling; Mrs Connell, 68 Port Street, do.; John Weir, Tarbert, Lochfyne; Alex. Macpherson, Scotstown, Strontian; James Maccallum, Kilfinnan, Tighnabruich; Mrs A. Macphail, Ardentiny; Miss C. Mackay, Hougharry, North Uist; Chas. Maclellan, Claddach, do.; John Cameron, do., do.; Miss B. Mackenzie, 26 Strath, Gairloch; Miss A. Morrison, 3 Windsor Park, Bridge of Weir; Miss Stewart, Whiting Bay; Alex. Fraser, Ballachulish East; Norman Shaw, Toward Point Lighthouse; Donald Mackay, Knockando, Morayshire; Miss D. Ross, Golspie; Miss Macleod, Minton Cottage, Lairg; Mrs Macleod, Struth, Leverburgh; Donald Matheson, Durinish, Kyle; Mrs Macdonald, Uiginish, Dunvegan; Miss Isa Morrison, Ballantrushal, Lewis; Mrs Macrae, Arrat, Diabeg; John Murray, Skigersta, Lewis; Donald Thomson, No. 2 do. do.; Rod. Robertson, 6 Elgoll, Skye; Miss J. E. Morrison, Oakfield, Helensburgh; Kenneth Macleod, Mossiel, Spean-Bridge; Miss G. Macleod, Hill of Fearn, Ross-shire; Simon Macleod, Reef, Achiltibuie; Edward Macleod, W. Shinness, Lairg; Wm. Macsween, Cottages, Raasay; A. Rankin, Mamore, Fort-William; Nurse J. Macaskill, Nurses' Home, Conon-Bridge; Murdo Maclellan, 449 St George's Road, Glasgow; George Mackenzie, Culkein, Clashnessie; Alex. Mackenzie, 12 Aultgrishan; John Livingston, Stockton-on-Tees; Samuel Tingey, Potter's Bar, Middlesex; John Mackenzie, 20 Achintraid, Kishorn; D. Manson, Rocky Lane, Monton; John Manson, B.S.C., Orpington, Kent; Duncan Macarthur, 26 Hill-foot Street, Glasgow; A. Gunn, Morness, Rogart; Mrs Macvicar, 6 Mill Place, Raasay; Mrs A. Mackintosh, Lochrosque House, Achnasheen; Miss Isa, Williamson, Spittal, Watten; Don. Fraser, Hill of Calder, Scotscaid; Mrs Macaskill, 6 Wallace Street, Clydebank; Miss M. Macrae, 12 Willowbank Street, Glasgow; Mr Samuel Fraser, draper, Strathpeffer; Mr C. Kerr, Culeg, Lochinver; Mrs Grant, Corner Cottage, Evelix, Dornoch; Lt.-Com. H. D. Grant, New York; Neil Grant, Strathaird, Skye; Neil Mackenzie, Achnacurum, Clashnessie; D. Campbell, Police Station, Barvas; James Campbell, 10 Bramshile Gardens, London; Miss J. C. Kerr, Pitlochry; Mrs K. Kerr, Torbreck, Lochinver; D. Macdonald, Dunnaglass; John Macleod, 953 Haig Street, W. Perth, W. Australia; Miss Ann Macdonald, 3 Kirklee Gardens, Glasgow; Miss M. Mackinnon, Achanteny, Ardnamurchan; Mrs Macinnes, 41 Elderslie Street, Glasgow; Mrs Morrison, Easter Arbol, Fearn; Colin Urquhart, Luibmore, Achnasheen; Don. Macdonald, Woodend, Portree; Don. Mackenzie, Tarbert, Scourie; Arch. Macleod, 9 Edinbane, Portree; John Nicolson, 9 Tolsta; Mrs T. Ferguson, Applecross; Miss B. Macleod, 27 Park Circus, Glasgow; Miss M. Mackenzie, 13 Glengyle Terrace, Edinburgh; Mrs Macleod, Dundas Castle Gardens, South Queensferry; Nurse C. Macdonald, Machrie Hotel, Port Ellen; D. Murchison, The Stores, Rannoch Station; Rod. Munro, Achmelvich, Lochinver; D. Cameron, Pine View, Conon-Bridge; Wm. Maclean, Leckmelm, Garve; John Gillies, senr., Ardue, Applecross; Mrs Hugh Mackay, Rearquhar, Dornoch; Miss J. Bain, 18 Irvine Place, Aberdeen; Kenneth Kemp, Cullicudden, Conon-Bridge; James Morrison, Kirkton, Assynt; Miss Annie Mackenzie, Barnfield, Inverasdale; John Macleod, Balmacnab, Raasay; Mr A. Mackinnon, 15 Shore Street, Applecross; Mrs John Macrae, Sannachie Shore, Kishorn; Mrs L. Maclean, 5 Upper Breakish, Kyle; Alex. Maclean, Grafton, Auckland, New Zealand; Alex. Campbell, 5 Diabeg, Achnasheen; John Maclellan, 22 do. do.; John Maclellan, 20 do. do.; Rod Cameron, 11 do. do.; Don. Mackenzie, 7 do. do.; Mrs A. Macdonald, 14 do. do.; Mrs D. Fraser, 15 do. do.; Miss F. A. Beaton, West Alligin, do.; Mrs H. Matheson, Drumbuie, Kyle; Don. Paterson, Borrisdale, Leverburgh; Don. Macsween, 12 do. do.; Miss Murchison, Mansfield and D. Hospital, Mansfield; Mrs John Moore, High Beech, Oxtou, Birkenhead; Miss Hayden, 170 Durham Street, Hartlepool; Mr Stone, 80 Arncliffe Gardens, West Hartlepool; John H. Ross, Box 314, Emigrant, Montana; Ewen Ross, Tooley Street, London; Mr Macleod, 3 Clachan, Raasay; Miss M. Macleod, 12 Church Row, Hampstead; Donald Macrae, postman, Fortrose; Mrs C. Watson, Pasadena, California; Mrs A. Campbell, Lochyside, Banavie.

Other Subscriptions Held Over until Next Month.