

THE Free Presbyterian Magazine

AND

MONTHLY RECORD

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

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

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Ominous Signs of the Times in England	241
The Witch of En-Dor, by Rev. Professor R. J. G. McKnight, Ph.D., D.D.	244
Bartimeus An Dall	254
The Harmony of the Two Books	257
The Romeward Movement Among English Non-Conformists..	262
The Lark's Song: A Story for the Young	265
Social Customs and God's Law	266
"Behold My Servant," by the late Rev. John Ross, Brucefield, Ontario	268
Literary Notices	269
Notes and Comments	270
Church Notes	278
Acknowledgment of Donations	278
The Magazine	280

PRINTED AT THE
"COURIER" OFFICE, INVERNESS.

THE

Free Presbyterian Magazine

And MONTHLY RECORD.

VOL. XXXIII.

November 1928.

No. 7

Ominous Signs of the Times in England.

FROM time to time in our Notes and Comments attention has been called to happenings in the ecclesiastical and theological worlds that are anything but encouraging to those who believe in the truth of God as it is presented in the Scriptures. We do not mean to say that the doings or utterances of a number of extremists should be taken as the standard by which to judge the denomination to which they belong, but we do hold that the views and opinions of these extremists if tolerated only, to say nothing of being supported, range the denomination to which they belong on the side of error. No church or denomination worthy of the name, and professing to be a witness for Christ in the world, will tolerate her paid servants to teach what is clearly in contradiction to her received standards. Discipline in the State, in the home, and in the Church, though too often flouted in our day as a relic of the past, is too precious a weapon to be thoughtlessly relegated to the lumber heap of cast-away things, and the Church that is willing to cast discipline of a scriptural kind to the four winds of heaven in the name of the broader charity, more pleasing to the delinquents and the world, is forgetful of her God-given privileges and rights. In the present amazing welter of matters ecclesiastical the Church of England has received prominent attention in the press—even our Scottish leading dailies have devoted considerable space to the happenings at various Church of England Conferences. This may to a certain extent be due to the publicity given to the debates in Parliament on the Prayer Book. But apart altogether

from this the Church of England is the most powerful national Church in the British Empire, and when we say the most powerful we use the term in its worldly connotation, not in its spiritual. It is not simply a denomination but a Church recognised by the Parliament of Great Britain. Its doings and its decisions, therefore, have an interest to the nation at large. The question whether the Church of England is fulfilling the functions of a true Church of Christ is a question on which we do not enter at present, our main purpose is to show that she is tolerating a system of things within her borders that would be regarded as sheer anarchy in the State. Take for instance, the decision of the Bishops to allow the Rejected Prayer Book to be used notwithstanding the adverse decisions of the House of Commons, for though the Bishops certainly issue that permission with a qualification, the fact remains that the very men who occupy their positions on the Episcopal bench to the Crown are flouting the State in its legislative representatives in promulgating this decision. There is a possibility that this action of the Bishops may lead to the dis-establishment of the Church, for which many in England are crying.

Then in matters of doctrine there are what Patrick Walker termed right-hand and left-hand declensions. The Modernists are now a rather formidable body within the Church, and they are making themselves heard, not only at their own special Conference, but even in the Church Congress prominent places were assigned to such men as Bishop Barnes, Dean Inge, Canon Streeter, and Dr Major. In the Modernist Conference strong, and sometimes stupid, things were said. A young clergyman—Mr Allen—who has scarcely cut his theological teeth, spoke with all the dogmatism of an iconoclast smashing some of the beliefs that had hitherto been most firmly believed. But it was at the Church Congress held at Cheltenham that the Modernists came out strong, notwithstanding the vigorous protest of Lord Halifax at the English Church Union meeting. Canon Streeter, without a blush, stood up before the large gathering of churchmen and delivered himself after this fashion: "Modernists are a group of persons who, looking round on a civilisation that is likely to perish for lack of a religion, wish to offer it a religion which is intellectually a possible one. The Modernists believed that the Church should try to make its theology intellectually the best

possible, and having done so, should popularise the results. "For the discussion of moral and religious questions," added the Canon, "the younger generation of the class sufficiently educated to enjoy plays and novels and not wholly frivolous are largely dependent on writers like Mr Bernard Shaw and Mr H. G. Wells. and since so many people do go to Mr Wells for their theology you will, I think, agree with me that it is a matter for congratulation that, taken over a period of years, Mr Wells's theology has steadily improved. Anyone who aspires to present these people with a theology which he believes to be superior philosophically or ethically to that of Mr Wells must imitate Mr Wells to the extent of thinking, writing, and preaching in the language of the contemporary world, and he must express himself in relation to its conceptions." The Modernists are on a vain pursuit if they are out to satisfy the intellect. It is the heart that is the seat of the trouble, and no theology that begins with the head will be of any avail. The Holy Spirit in His divine work within we dare not ignore. And has it come to this that a dignitary of the great Church of England has, and advises others, to take Mr H. G. Wells, that writer whose vagrant imagination may do well enough in fiction, but which has no right to invade the more serious realm of history, to say nothing of theology. Dean Inge, while putting in a caveat against deifying evolution, has no difficulty in accepting it as an explanation of God's marvellous universe. Bishop Barnes and Dr Major, head of Ripon Hall, Oxford, as thorough-going Modernists, had also a place assigned to them and read papers at the Congress. The Congress started badly in the presidential address, when Dr Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester, expressed regret that no representative from the Roman Catholic Church was present. When one reads such utterances, is it any wonder that a feeling of dismay steals over one. No doubt the heaven has been at work for years that is now manifesting its presence. This Magazine has always taken a keen interest in the struggle waged by the Protestant party in the Church of England against the Romanisers and its effort to keep our people enlightened as to the happenings in that Church is to let them know the evil fruits reaped from small beginnings of departure from creedal statements and solemn ordination promises. What the end may be no one can foretell, but we cannot help feeling for the great number of God-

fearing people within that Church who are at their wits' end what to do. Viewed from our standpoint, their course is plain and clear, viz., to make it undubitably clear to those in authority that if such disloyalty to the truths of God and the Reformation attainments are tolerated then there is no other course open to them as loyal Christians and true Protestants but to take the drastic step of separation from the Church of England. At some later date we hope to have an opportunity of reviewing the religious and ecclesiastical situation as it affects Scotland, the land in which we have a more immediate interest.

The Witch of En-Dor.*

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR R. J. G. M'KNIGHT, Ph.D., D.D.

(I. Sam. xxviii., 1-25.)

THE Spiritualists seem to feel that in Saul the King of Israel and in the Witch of En-dor they have Bible proof of their system. I am glad they appeal to the incident and rest their case largely upon it. Because if there ever was a thorough exposé of Spiritualism it is found in this passage.

When men appeal to the Bible for the proof of any system, the first thing they must do is to take the Bible as a whole. The first step, then, is to ascertain what the general attitude of the Bible towards Spiritualism is. Anyone with the aid of an ordinary concordance can find that out in less than ten minutes. One of the first passages he will find is Exodus xxii. 18—"Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." It would require a tremendous stretch of the imagination to regard that as favourable to Spiritualism. Or turn to Deuteronomy xviii. 10-12—"There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord;

*The above is notes of a lecture by Rev. Prof. R. J. G. M'Knight, Ph.D., D.D., Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, U.S.A., which appeared in the October "Bulwark," and is reprinted here with the Editor's permission.—Editor.

and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee." (Verse 11, a necromancer i.e., "One that seeketh unto the dead." A consulter of familiar spirits, i.e., "One that asks of a witch.")

Here is rather a complete list—in fact it would seem to cover the whole clan from "Margery" down. How a Spiritualist can get any comfort out of that or any support for Spiritualism is more than I can understand. I could go on and cite passage after passage from other parts of the Bible—all to the same effect. See Leviticus xx. 27, Leviticus xix. 31, I. Samuel xxviii. 3, II. Kings xxi. 6, II. Kings xxiii. 24, Isaiah viii. 19, xix. 3, Exekiel xiii. 6. These passages are sufficient to show that the general attitude of the Bible is absolutely against any attempt to establish communication with the dead.

But here is a passage which Spiritualists claim as a warrant for their operations—I. Samuel xxviii. 1-25. Let us examine it. The historical setting is easy. The Israelites and the Philistines are about to join battle. The Philistines are encamped at Shunem and the Israelites at Gilboa. These places are about five miles apart. En-dor is about two miles from Shunem. Eventually, Saul the King of Israel arrives at the cave. And what a place it was! The reader may easily imagine what the cave of the witch would be like. A dark, dank cavern under a hill. In one corner lies a cow, lazily chewing her cud and dreaming of green hills far away. By her side lies her young hopeful, an innocent calf, wholly content with his native surroundings; and altogether ignorant of the royal reception which he is to attend a little later in the evening! Near the door sits the woman. In her lap a cat, at her feet half a dozen mongrel dogs. A few tame lizards glide about the ground, save in the shadow of the scrawny witch.

We get a little insight into the conditions that must have existed in the witch's cave from the closing part of the record. The writer tells us that the culinary appointments were anything but inviting. Saul was sorely distracted on this occasion. His mind was centred on one thing, and the usual details of house-keeping would ordinarily have been overlooked. But when the witch, later in the evening, invited Saul to partake of a little food cooked in that cave, the record says—"But he refused, and said, I will not eat." (I. Samuel xxviii. 23.) So strong was his revulsion that it required the com-

bined forces of the women and two able-bodied men to get a morsel of the food offered past his lips. But his servants, together with the woman, compelled him." (I. Samuel xxviii. 23.) This, then, is the environment.

Now, the first question is, how did he come to interview the witch? The fact of the matter is that the Lord had forsaken him—just as verse 6 distinctly tells us, and as he himself says in verse 15. That is, the man who attempted to communicate with the dead was, by his own description of himself, a God-forsaken wretch. You see the Spiritualists appeal to this passage, and I am merely quoting what the passage says. A God-forsaken wretched King, whom God has ceased to communicate with in any way, thinks he can circumvent God by getting into communication with a departed spirit. I ask you, is it likely that God would allow himself to be circumvented in this way?

The second question is, what kind of a woman is it that professes to be able to do what this God-forsaken wretch wants done? The passage describes her as "a woman with a familiar spirit." But what kind of a woman is that? To answer that question it will be necessary to look at the expression in the original Hebrew. The Hebrew says she was a Ba-alath obh. Two words are used in this description. The first word, "Ba-alath," means "mistress." The original meaning of the second word is "wine skin" or "leather bottle," such as they used in the Orient. This wine-skin was water-tight and could be inflated. It became distended as the wine fermented. Then, figuratively, the term came to be applied to those who inflated their chests for the purpose of practising ventriloquism. The Bible tells us just what she was—she was "the mistress of an inflated thorax." That is, she was a ventriloquist. She could throw her voice and make it appear that the sound came from another part of the room. Of course, she professed to do more than that. She professed to be able to bring up spirits. But the Bible tells us what she was: A ventriloquist.

The Bible, therefore, tells us that once a recreant, half-crazed, God-forsaken, credulous King of Israel went to consult a woman who lived in a cave and had the powers of a ventriloquist. Now, if a man goes to the opera he expects to hear music; if he goes to a ventriloquist he expects an exhibition of ventriloquizing. Saul went to a ventriloquist. The presumption is that he witnessed an exhibition of ventriloquism.

First he "disguised himself." We can hardly blame him for that. He knew his course was not respectable. He takes two men with him. He travels perhaps six or seven miles after dark, and past the sentinels of the Philistines. At last he comes to the cave of the witch. The witch is at home. Business is dull. It may be better after the battle. Spiritualism (witchcraft) always experiences a revival after a war. Saul confronts her and says (verse 22)—"I pray thee, divine unto me by the familiar spirit and bring me him up, whom I shall name unto thee." Now, there is not any doubt that the woman claimed to be able to "bring up" spirits. The request Saul makes does not astonish her in that respect. Nor is there any doubt that Saul in his present condition was willing to believe she could do it. But the Bible says she was a ventriloquist. Keep that in mind. Saul was deceived, but the author of this passage was not deceived.

The woman, however, is wary. Her business is under the ban. When a stranger asks for a drink of "Scotch" in America these days, he is usually reminded of the 18th Amendment. So she reminds Saul (verse 9)—"And the woman said unto him, Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land: wherefore then layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die?" This shows the attitude of Scripture toward Spiritualism. Whenever any king followed the Bible he banned the witches. Saul, himself, banned the witches as long as he made any pretence of following the Lord. But now Saul is desperate. So, to reassure the woman (verse 10)—"And Saul sware to her by the Lord, saying, as the Lord liveth, there shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing." Although Saul is disguised, the woman can see that he is greatly overwrought and terribly in earnest. Business had been bad and she determined to risk a seance.

Of course she would arrange her guests so that they would be in the light of the candles, and she herself would be in the dark. That was strictly ethical. To this day mediums always choose to operate in the dark. Not because the spirits are afraid of the light, but because the light cramps the medium's style. Even a flashlight can upset a seance. Now she is ready for the "sitting." It is about to begin. (Verse 11)—"Then said the woman, whom shall I bring up unto thee?" Notice this—this woman professed to be a clairvoyant—a mind-

reader—everything that a first-class medium claims to be. But she had to ask, "Whom shall I bring up?" Why didn't she know without asking? Why didn't one of the spirits she claimed to be familiar with tell her who this was and what he wanted? (If the mediums could do any of the things they profess to be able to do they would not need to give seances at 1000 dols. a head. If they can tell me when I am going to die—six months hence—why can they not tell what the price of U.S. steel will be to-morrow morning?) She is ignorant. She has to ask Saul "Whom" she shall bring up." Mediums have no knowledge that is not gotten by natural means. So Saul tells her. He says (verse 11)—"Bring me up Samuel."

Now you may rest assured that all this while the witch has been busy in her mind. She must succeed, for times are hard. All the time she is asking herself, "Who is this person? What does he want?" She would give much to pierce that disguise. At the mention of Samuel she becomes doubly alert. Here is a clue. "Who," she says to herself, "could be wanting Samuel?" Samuel, remember, is the old prophet who had brought all the hardships on the witches by saying (I. Samuel xv. 23)—"For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft." Saul wanted to show Samuel that while he might "rebel" he would never be guilty of "witchcraft." Consequently, he ordered all the witches to be killed. And remember, too, that this woman would remember that, if she ever remembered anything. What Samuel said was the cause of her death sentence, and one usually remembers things like that. This is all the clue she needs—she pierces the disguise of her tall, gaunt visitor, and screams (verse 12)—"She cried with a loud voice, and the woman spake to Saul, saying why hast thou deceived me? For thou art Saul." No wonder she screamed. You would have screamed too. She thought her hour had come. She thought Saul had laid a trap for her, and had succeeded in catching her, and now he would put her to death. Oh, I know the record, says (verse 12)—"And when the woman saw Samuel she cried with a loud voice." But remember that this whole interview is recorded from the point of view of the effect it had upon Saul and his two companions. Saul and his two companions thought the woman screamed because she saw Samuel. In reality she screamed because she saw and recognised Saul. The evidence that this

was the cause of her fright is conclusive. If this witch actually could bring back departed spirits, and if she made a practice of bringing back the dead, and if she undertook the task of bringing back Samuel, with the expectation that Samuel's spirit would really appear, why should she scream when she saw what she fully expected to see, and what she was used to seeing in the practice of her art? The bringing back of Samuel would have been merely a part of the day's work. There would be nothing unusual in that. Accordingly there would be no reason for her scream as far as Samuel is concerned. But the fact that she did scream is recorded. Now, why did she scream? The context makes it plain why she screamed. "She cried with a loud voice, and the woman spake to Saul, saying, why hast thou deceived me? For thou art Saul" (verse 12).

This is a point that has been consistently overlooked by the interpreters of this passage. I know it says (verse 12)—"And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice." But it must be remembered that this whole interview is recorded from the point of view of the effect it had upon Saul and his two companions. There can be no doubt that both Saul and his companions were deceived. And it is from these two companions that the record comes. The woman would never tell it. Saul died the next day, and therefore he would have very little opportunity to tell it. And if he did tell it, he would tell it as he saw it. Most probably then this account comes from these two servants, who were thoroughly deceived. The thing the woman is trying to do is to pierce the disguise of Saul. The first words of the woman after her scream are—"Why hast thou deceived me? For thou art Saul?" The appearance of Samuel, if he had appeared, would not have helped her to recognise Saul. Her mind, up to this moment, has been centred on her visitor. She feels perfectly sure that Samuel is not coming into that cave. If she had had any notion that he was, she would have been far from there very soon after Saul mentioned Samuel's name. But Saul's disguise has created an apprehension in her mind. The appearance of Samuel, if he had appeared, would only have increased her apprehension. It would not have helped her to pierce the disguise. But there was no disturbance from any spirit. She concentrates on the disguise. She notes the awkward position he has assumed to conceal his unusual height. Perhaps she catches a glimpse of the insignia

of royalty. Gradually an idea takes form in her poor brain. A tall man, with a body-guard, asking for the spirit of Samuel, on the eve of a battle with the Philistines, who can it be? Who but Saul the King of Israel? All this passes with incredible swiftness through her mind, and then she cries—"Why hast thou deceived me? For thou art Saul." And Saul, not Samuel, was the one she feared. And recognising Saul she screamed. No other interpretation fits the facts. I know Saul and his two companions thought she saw Samuel. But what she saw and what they thought she saw were two different things. It is always so when dupes visit a medium (witch).

Now it is evident that Saul himself saw nothing. If he had seen anything he would not have had to ask what form it was of. The passage never intimates in any way that Saul saw Samuel. The best the woman can do is to make him think that he sees Samuel. And that she does.

But now she has to answer Saul's question—"What sawest thou?" Even then the woman does not assert that Samuel was present. Note what she says (verse 13)—"I saw gods ascending out of the earth." Evidently she intended to make a longer seance and give Saul his money's worth. She starts in like a regular medium by establishing a rather nebulous and uncertain communication with the spirits. She was going to have a little "static" to start with, and then "tune in" a little later. So she starts in as though the spirits were "trying to break through." But Saul is too eager—too impatient for a slow seance. He wants action, and he wants it right away. He breaks in. "What form is he of?" She had spoken of "gods." Again, that question shows that he himself saw nothing. Oh, well, the woman thinks, I can move as fast as he likes. He is paying for it. "What form is he of?" "Why" (verse 13) she says—"an old man cometh up and he is covered with a mantle." She is "tuned in" now. Now you can see that it is quite a little jump from the "gods" to "an old man covered with a mantle." But Saul doesn't care—Saul doesn't stop to think that gods are never old. He wants to talk with Samuel, and he is willing to dispense with the artistic niceties of the seance. She says she sees Samuel, and that is good enough for Saul (verse 14)—"And Saul perceived that it was Samuel." "Perceived" from what? What evidence had he that Samuel was there? None at all. except the word of a witch.

He "perceived" whatever he "perceived" from the woman's description, and not from anything he saw. And as for that description, she had seen Samuel in the flesh many a time, and probably had taken good care that Samuel did not see her. She knew Samuel was an old man when he died, and anybody could describe the dress of a prophet.

Up to this point her task has been comparatively easy. All she has had to do was to talk with Saul and tell him what she pretended to see. Now, however, Samuel is supposed to have appeared, and Samuel will have to begin to talk for himself. He always could do that when he was living. Think now, what power will this woman need most to complete the deception of this seance? If she is going to make Saul think Samuel is speaking, what will she have to do? The answer is plain enough. She will have to ventriloquize. And the passage tells us, to begin with, that that is her best accomplishment—she is an artist at it—in fact she is *ba-alath obh*, a ventriloquist. And how easy that would be—in a dark cave with its echo—in darkness where it is impossible to determine the direction of a voice or the location of a speaker—and with only a nervous, God-forsaken wretch to deceive. Nevertheless, since Saul is paying for it, she will give him an example of her best art.

Only one thing more she needs to know. She now knows that this is Saul, and that Saul wants to see Samuel, but she still has to find out what Saul wants of Samuel. How will she find that out? Well, for a ventriloquist that is very easy. She assumes a hoarse voice, as though Samuel had caught his death of cold lying in the grave, and says (verse 15)—"Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up?" Pretty good leading question, isn't it? But why did she have to ask it? Why does a clairvoyant have to ask leading questions? That is one of the inscrutable things about the business—but they do—and they have to. Now, as soon as Saul answers this leading question she will know what she wants to know—and the seance can proceed.

But before the seance proceeds, let me point out the fact that this question which the witch puts in the mouth of Samuel stamps the whole seance as a fraud. That is the last thing Samuel would have said—"Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up?" Would a man like Samuel, who hated witchcraft, grant to this scrawny

witch, or to the recreant Saul, the power to disturb his soul's eternal repose? Does the Bible anywhere teach that a wicked witch can at will call a saint back from glory? Any man who thinks it does is simply a Moron. That is "witch talk," not the talk of a saint from glory. But let the seance proceed. Saul must now answer the question the witch has put in the mouth of Samuel. He must tell "why." Accordingly, he says (verse 15)—"I am sore distressed, for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams; therefore, I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do." What a fool Saul was. What a fool any man is to think he can outwit Almighty God. By this answer Saul reveals to the witch all that is in his mind. She has now all the information she needs. She knows her guest is Saul, knows that he wants Samuel, and knows what he wants Samuel for. All she needs now is to do a little quick thinking, and to put the results into the mouth of Samuel. So she begins by saying a very obvious thing (verse 16), something that Samuel or any other sane person would be apt to say—"Wherefore then dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy?" The witch herself could see what a fool Saul was. She marvelled that a King could have so little sense. I wonder that she had the self-control to wait until this point in the seance to ask it. But, by asking it now, she gets time to think of what Samuel would naturally say further. Quickly her mind goes back to that interview which Samuel once had with Saul. And how well she would remember it. Every word of it would be indelibly printed on the pages of her memory. Why? Simply because it was the cause of a death sentence that included her. And it all comes back to her—all that Samuel had said to Saul on that momentous occasion. Such a striking fulfilment of prophecy seems for the moment to thrill even this vile wretch of a witch, and she begins to speak, almost forgetting that this is a seance (verse 17)—"And the Lord hath done to him as he spake by me." Remember she is representing Samuel as the speaker. And Samuel is supposed to be speaking directly to Saul. But the woman forgets that for the slightest fraction of a moment. She says—"The Lord hath done to him." And then she realises her mistake. Samuel is supposedly addressing Saul

directly. How will he address him? Certainly in the second person. Samuel should say—"The Lord hath done to thee." And if Samuel had been speaking, that is what he would have said. But the woman is speaking—she is impersonating Samuel—and as she looks at Saul and thinks of his condition, she says—"The Lord hath done to him." She uses the third person. Now, what will she do? To go back and correct her mistake would only make it more apparent. She must trust to the disturbed condition of Saul—and go on. And that is just what she does. "The Lord hath done to him, and he spake by me." Now, she is back on solid ground—if Saul has not detected her slip. And he hadn't. His poor muddled brain was in no condition to detect errors.

But what shall she say to Saul now? What would Samuel be likely to say? Well, as has been pointed out, she knew what he did say to Saul on one occasion. And she reasons that Samuel would likely say something of the same kind if he could at this moment. Samuel had said (I. Samuel xv. 28)—"The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine." This was on the occasion of Saul's failure to destroy the Amalekites. So the witch feels that she will be on safe ground if she just repeats that. And she does. (Verse 17)—"For the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand and hath given it to thy neighbour, even David." You see she just takes what Samuel said, and brings it up to date by mentioning David. And this sounds a good deal more like Samuel than that witchy question she first put into Samuel's mouth—"Why has thou disquieted me to bring me up?" Next thing is, "Why did God rend the kingdom from Saul?" Of course she knew that, and so she says (speaking for Samuel) (verse 18)—"Because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day." That is all in Chap. xv. Just like a medium! A medium never tells anything that cannot be found out by natural means. Once in a long while a medium may make a good guess.

And now to give content to this seance she must venture a guess. And how little a guess it was! She knew how discouraged Israel's King was. She knew how his cowardly heart was quaking. She knew God had departed from him. She knew that when God departed from Israel there was little hope of victory. She

knew Saul and his sons would be on the battlefield. She knew if Israel lost the battle they would probably be slain. She knew that. Everybody knew that! And as she knew all this, is the next verse much of a prophecy? Would Samuel have to come back from glory just to tell this? (Verse 19)—“Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines; and tomorrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me; the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines.” And would Samuel have said—“Tomorrow shalt thou be with me?” Was Saul going to be with Samuel?

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the most successful seance ever staged. The Bible gives Spiritualism the pen, and allows it to write its own story. Spiritualism takes the pen and does its best. And when it has done its best—taking it just as Spiritualism writes it, the result is a travesty. It reveals its own weakness. It merely shows that the God-forsaken dupe that put himself in the hands of a medium can be fooled by tricks that should be apparent even to a child. It is written to show what an unscrupulous medium can do with a credulous fool. And suicide is the outcome of it all. (I. Sam. xxxi. 4)—“Therefore Saul took a sword, and fell upon it.” “So Saul died.” (I. Sam. xxxi. 6.)

Bartimeus An Dall.

VII.

(Air a leantainn).

III.

“ Agus an uair a chual e gu'm b'e Iosa o Nasaret a bh' ann,
thoisich e ri glaothaich agus ri radh, Iosa, Mhic, Dhai-
bhidh dean trocair orm.”

Dh'fhag sinn Bartimeus ag eisdeachd ris a cheud sear-
moin shoisgeulach a chual e. Tha e cosmhail gu'n d'rinn
an luchd searmoineachaidh an dleasdanas. Bha an teach-
daireachd maith. Bha i simplidh, dìreach, agus gu h-iomlan
mu Iosa Crìosd.

Cha'n aithne dhuinn am modh 'san do labhair iad.
Bhitheadh e taitneach dhuinn air an sgath-san fios a bhi
againn gu'n do thaisbein iad fìor chomh-fhaireachduinn, ris
na briathraibh grasmhor a labhair iad, agus ris an duine

bhochd bha ag eisdeachd riu. Ach mar 'eil aithne againn air so, is aithne dhuinn ni tha gu mor ni's cudthromaiche, gu'n do dh'innis iad dha an ni a b'fheumaich e air a chluinntinn. Ciod sam bith cho neo-ealanta agus a dh'fheudadh an cainnt a bhi, dh'innis iad dhasan gu'n robh fear leigheas nan dall am fagus. Agus ciod an coimeas ris an naigheachd ud, an luach a bhitheadh aig a chainnt bu shnaimhte bha air a labhairt mu Philat, no Herod, no Caesar no cumhachd na Roimhe, no mu ghnothuch saoghalt' air bith. Cha mhò a bhitheadh cainnt nam feallsanach a b'ainmeil air son sta dha. Bha an duine dall, agus a cur feum air gu'm bitheadh a shuilean air am fosgladh, agus gus an deantadh sin, bha na h-uile ni eile ciod 'sam bith maise na cainnte leis an labhradh daoine' orra, dhasan na shuarachas agus na dhìomhanas.

An dubhairt sinn na dhìomhanas? Nach'eil luchd-searmonachaidh focal Dé nan stiubhardaibh ann an tigh Chrìosd (1 Cor. iv. 1, 2; 1 Peadar. iv. 10). Agus nach d'ulluich e ri ar laimh stòr neo-chrìochnach air son pheacach chailte agus nach d'aithn e dhuinn tabhairt gu saor, eadhon mar a fhuair sinn gu saor (Mata. x. 8). Agus 'nuair thig anamaibh ocrach aig 'ur gairm-ne chum cuirm an t-soisgeil feitheamh ri bhi air am beathachadh, mu bheir sinn dhoibh plaoisg thioram feallsanachd, an aite biadh laidir teagasg an t-soisgeil no clach reusonaichidhean faoine, an ait' aran beo firinn shlainteil Dhé, no mu bheir sinn dhoibh scorpion bruidhne mu ghnothuichibh saoghalta an aite bainne fìorghlan an fhocail, bagaidibh o Eschol, uisge o bhainn na beatha, fion an aoibhneis, agus manna fathast fliuch leis an druchd leis an d'thainig e o neamh, nach'eil sinn ris an fhanoid is seirbhe air na doilghiosan is doimhne agus gu narach a brath an earbsa is cudthromaich. Cha'n e mhaoin sin, ach mu chuir an luchd searmonachaidh ud an ceill an sgeul aoibhneach ann an doigh neo-fhaireachdail, bha e na choire mhor, na chron air a dheanamh dhoibh fein, do Bhartimeus, agus do na firinnean beannaichte fein, ach gidheadh na chron do-labhairt ni's lugha na bhitheadh e an fhirinn ud a chleth, ciod 'sam bith an doigh air an robh i air a labhairt.

Ach mu tha suidheachadh an t-searmonaiche cho cudthromach, innis domh, am bheil am fear eisdeachd gu'n aobhar curam? Mu tha na daoine sin ag innseadh do Bhartimeus gu'm bheil Iosa dol seachad, ged a dh'fheudadh tu moran coire fhaotainn do mhodh innsidh an sgeil nach bi esan na fhìor amadan mu thionndaidheas e air falbh o'n chothrom oirdheirc so, agus ma philleas e chum a bhothain, gu suidhe ann an sin am bochdainn agus ann an dorchadas a faotainn coire, ri fanoid, no ann an diomb ri modh labhairt nan daoine'

ud. 'Se an an-mhuinneachd an gnothuch-san, ach 'se a ghnathuch-san gu'm bheil e dall agus gu'm bheil Iosa o Nasaret a gabhail seachad. Thugaibh an aire uime sin cionnus a dh'eisdeas sibh (Lucas viii. 18). Tha an rabhadh so o Chrìosd, agus O nach mor tha ri fhaicinn ann! Ma's coir dhuinne aire a thabhairt do ur searmonachadh, is coir dhuibhse aire a thabhairt cionnus a dh'eisdeas sibh. Mu tha cunntas soluimte againne ri thabhairt o'n chùbaid, is gann tha'n cunntas tha agaibhse ri thabhairt o'n aite suidhe ni's lugha ann an soluimteachd. Mar 'eil e na ni faoin an soisgeul a shearmonachadh, gheibh sibh nach 'eil e na ni faoin eisdeachd ris. Tha sàbhaladh siorruidh ceangailte ri sibh a dh'eisdeachd gu ceart. Is e dà mhodh eisdeachd tha ann cha'n e a tri. Tha eisdeachd a chum beatha ann, agus eisdeachd eile chum bais; ach cha'n 'eil eisdeachd eadar-mheadhonach ann, nach 'eil air a leanntainn le aon de na toraidhean ud. Feudaidh tu eisdeachd a mhain air sgath eisdeachd, fo'n bheachd nach bi tuilleadh mu dheibhinn, ach cha'n ann mar sin a bhitheas. Bithidh beatha no bàs mar thoradh air d'eisdeachd. Feudaidh tu rùnachadh nach atharraich an t-searmoin cuisean dha do thaobhsa, ach atharraichidh, agus bithidh sabhaladh no sgrios ann mar thoradh. Cha'n 'eil an soisgeul a fàgail neach air bith far an d'fhuair se e. Mar 'eil e na sgiathan chum a thabhairt do neamh, tha e na chloich mhuillinn chum a chur fuidhe do dh'ifrinn. Tha cuid agaibh a smuaineachadh gur ni ro neo-chudthromach e a thighinn do'n eaglais agus eisdeachd ri searmoin. Tha mi toirt rabhadh dhuibh gur mealladh ro mhor so. Labhraidh mi ribh ann am briathraibh Dhé. Is teachdairean sinne air son Chrìosd, mar gu'n cuireadh Dia impidh leinne; tha sinn a guidhe oirbh as uchd Chrìosd bithibh reidh ri Dia (2 Cor. v. 20). Oir tha sinne do Dhia 'nar fàile cubhraidh Chrìosd anns an dréam a thearnar, agus anns an dream a sgriosar; Do'n aon dream tha sinn 'nar boltrach bàis chum bàis agus do'n dream eile 'nar boltrach beatha chum beatha (2 Cor. ii. 15, 16). Mu tha ar soisgeulne foluichte, is ann dhoibh-san tha caillte tha e foluichte (2 Cor. iv. 3). Tha so a ghnath na fhirinn. Tha e na fhirinn an diugh mu'n t-searmoin so. Mar tha Dia fìor, tha na nithibh so faotainn coimhlionadh a nis anns gach neach do'n luchd eisdeachd. Tha gach neach dhibh ag abuchadh a nis air son sonas maille ri Dia, no air son fheirge-san ann an teine ifrinn; agus tha an t-aite tha sibh tabhairt do'n t-soisgeul a dearbhadh co dhiubh so ris am bheil 'ur n'aghaidh. Bithibh air 'ur faicill ma ta, agus a chum 'ur seoladh thugaibh fainear cionnus a dh'eisd Bartimeus. Tha mi smuaineachadh gu'm faigh sinn annsa a chuid is mò do chomharraidhean luchd eisdeachd mhaith, agus gairmidh mi 'ur n'aire chum iad sin a mhain.

The Harmony of the Two Books.

II.

(Continued from p. 182.)

IF we look over the history of science, we cannot but note that its theories are constantly changing. Prof. Frank Allen, head of the department of physics of the University of Manitoba, said to the writer recently:—"There is scarcely a theory of science which is generally accepted to-day, of which I would be ready to affirm that it may not be abandoned within a few years. Nearly all the theories which were regarded as satisfactory a few years ago, are now either modified or discarded by scientists."

The repeated abandonment of scientific theories and the ever-increasing knowledge of the authenticity of the Word of God should teach all Christians to accept the Scripture at its face value, and, even though portions of it are assailed by sceptics and "scientists falsely so-called" to await with unshaken faith the day when the hidden things shall be made known, and it shall be evident that God has revealed through inspired writers that which is forever true. . . .

If we accept the Word of God and make an honest interpretation of it, we must recognise God in the creation of matter, in the creation of life, and in the creation of all kinds of life. This is the fair, the logical, the Christian conclusion. The atheist builds his world without God, the deist with God looking on, and even self-styled theists of the present day often regard God as having nothing more than an indifferent oversight of the progress of the world. The latter is not a true theist, nor does he give God His full and rightful place in the world. A man who is a materialist or a deist should be willing to be designated as such. One should not profess Christianity in the Church and materialism in science. The Christian should give God, not the least place, but the largest possible place in the creation and life of the world.

Against the sin of atheism, materialism, scepticism, deism, and all the wickedness, corruption, immorality, and violence which follows, God is testifying to-day in every fossiliferous rock of the world. These and a multitude of other sins provoked the wrath of God against the antediluvian world. To hold the theory of spon-

taneous generation, and the brute origin of man is to rule God out as the great and sole Creator of all things, and it was ruling God out which was the underlying sin of the antediluvian world. When, therefore, you observe a piece of chalk, coral or crinoidal limestone, amber, coal, carbonaceous shale, millstone grit, or other fossiliferous rock, you have before you a monument of God's judgment because of sin.

When God made a covenant with Noah, He promised not to destroy the earth again with a universal deluge. But God did not reverse His attitude toward sin. Though He recognised that "the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth," He promised that He would not curse the earth any more for man's sake, nor smite again every living thing as He had done. That so long as the earth remained, seed time and harvest, summer and winter should not cease. God has kept His promise, but through four thousand years of succeeding history He has made clear by precept and example that He cannot tolerate sin, and that He will judge men for it. His wrath burns against sin just as strongly as it did in antediluvian times. "God is angry with the wicked every day" (Ps. vii., 11). After naming a number of prevalent sins, Paul said to the Ephesians: "Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience" (Eph. v., 5). Jesus Christ points out a day when He shall judge the wicked—among them many outwardly moral men—and when they shall be condemned for ever (Matt. xxv. 31-46). When walking among the stones of this earth Jesus replied to those who criticised His disciples for praising Him: "If these should hold their peace the stones would immediately cry out" (Luke xix., 40). That would have been a testimony from the rocks against a sin of omission, but the rocks are crying out every day against sins of commission. Their fossils are warning us against the sins of the antediluvian world, violence, drunkenness, impurity, rejection of God, and other sins of which they were guilty, which are no doubt similar to the sins of the world to-day. This may help us to understand why men shall one day call to the mountains and to the rocks to fall on them and to hide them from the wrath of the Lamb (Rev. vi., 16). They have failed to accept the testimony of the rocks and forsake their sins. Dives wanted Abraham to send a messenger from the dead to warn his brethren lest they

should go to the place of torment as he had done. God sends a messenger from a world which was cut off on account of sin when He sends us to look upon the fossils of the ancient world.

If we accept the teaching of the Bible in all its fullness, and receive seriously its warning against sin, this does not mean that we are ready to block the progress of science or scientific investigation. Christianity welcomes investigation. Those who investigate it, and are convinced, do not become worse, but better scientists and students of literature. . . .

The Christian religion has always been the root of progress. A noted scholar said of the University of Leyden: "The Senate Chamber of Leyden's University is the most memorable hall of science." It was a group of Christian Hollanders, more than three hundred years ago, thankful to God for preservation of life and liberty, who founded Leyden University. On examination of a list of the twenty universities which were established in Europe between the years 1550 A.D. and 1700 A.D., will reveal the fact that they were all founded and maintained by some religious denomination. In America Harvard University was founded by the Puritans in 1636. Its first private benefactor was Rev. John Harvard, from whom it received its name. Rev. James Blair was active in establishing, and became the first president of William and Mary College. It was founded in 1692. Almost all the early primary and higher schools of education were organised and supported by Christian men and women. Why, then, the meaningless cry of the rationalist that the Christian who does not accept the theory of evolution is about to impede the progress of education in general and science in particular? Some rationalists are endeavouring to show that the "stupendous progress" of science during the past century has been due to the teaching of evolution. Jesus properly characterised such men as "blind leaders of the blind." It is true that progress has been made, but it has not been the result of the teaching of evolution or the inherent wisdom of the agnostics. It has been the result of the larger and deeper influence of Christianity. In order to prove this, one needs merely to ask what progress had been made in science or in any department of education in heathen lands where Christian missionaries have not gone? Compare fetish, Buddhist, or Mohammedan worshippers with Christians in their advance in civilisation

and science. Science is not harassed, or its progress impeded, by any argument which we have advanced, or any motive which may have been unexpressed. Let men search in the field of geology, zoology, botany, astronomy, anthropology, medicine, chemistry, physics, psychology, metallurgy, or any other branch of science, but let them always remember that God gives them the minds with which they work; that He has given them His word as a general guide in that work; that He has created both matter and life by His almighty power, and that He has given them intelligent and immortal souls in order that they may honour Him.

Why will men praise King James I., and the scholars who met at Westminster, Cambridge, and Oxford to give the well-known Authorised Version of the Bible to the world, and then lay that Book aside while they search in every other avenue of the world for a solution of that which it makes known in the simplest language? Why will men honour the name of William Wilberforce, as the man who overcame physical deformities and various handicaps, and who struck the shackles from the British slaves, and at the same time forget the fact that he cried: "Lord, be merciful to me, a sinner," in 1775, when his life lay all before him, and that he uttered the same prayer in 1833, when his work was done and he was passing out of this world? Unquestionably the Christian's Bible has been, and is, the greatest incentive toward progress in every worthy department of education, wherever it has been received among the nations of the world.

What, then, has been the difficulty when men have failed to see in the Bible and in the true religion an unparalleled blessing? The Apostle Paul, when writing to a church located in a great commercial and corrupt city, pointed out the root of the difficulty many centuries ago. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (I. Cor. ii., 14).

The scientist of to-day needs to come to Jesus Christ like the learned Nicodemus of old, and sit at His feet as a little child. He should begin at the first of John and learn that Christ was in the beginning with God. That "all things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made." He should learn, like Nicodemus, that he needs not merely life, but a new

life which is born of the Spirit, in order to apprehend God and the things of God. Peter points out that all who were saved from the Flood in Noah's day were saved in the ark, and that all who are saved to-day are saved through the resurrected Christ. This is the heart and fountain of all truth. The greatest biologist and philosopher before Christ pointed out the great and enduring fact that "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge" (Prov. i., 7). This is the greatest fact that can be given in the present generation. Science alone cannot give it. Science can develop a man's brain, but it cannot give him a heart that will love and bless. The trained head and the unregenerate heart may combine to curse and destroy. Science can place in a man's hand a weapon that will kill, but it cannot transform his heart so that he shall desire to sacrifice and save. When science shall have classified all knowledge, it will place on the pinnacle of this mountain of accumulated facts the greatest of all facts, that Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

The old stone book can point, does point, to sin; it points to a fallen, sin-cursed, ruined world. But that is all that it can do, and here it leaves both the scholar and the proletarian. The written Book points to a way out. It points upwards. It points to a Redeemer who can lift—has lifted—the curse of sin, and guides the way toward a land where there is no sin nor sorrow nor death. And here we have the harmony, the grandeur, the glory of the Two Books. They each have their message. Why confine ourselves, our pupils, or our ideals to the old stone book? Look into it! Read it, and read it rightly! But look into the Written Book, and there see the greatest fact of the universe. There see the One who, though He hated sin, came into a world cursed with it to redeem fallen men!

The Written Book points the geologist to One whose presence makes the mountains tremble (Ps. civ. 6), whose touch causes them to smoke (Ps. cxliv. 5), and whose voice calms the waves of the sea (Mark iv. 39); the astronomer to One who knows the number of the stars and calls them all by name (Ps. cxlvii. 4); the zoologist to One who calls all the beasts, creeping things, and flying fowl to praise Him (Ps. cxlviii. 10); the botanist to One purer than the lilies (Song of Solomon ii. 2); the embryologist to One who sees our substance yet being imperfect (Ps. cxxxix. 16); the anatomist to One who knows

all our frame (Ps. ciii. 14); the physician to One who heals all our diseases (Ps. ciii. 3); the chemist to One whose blood makes the blackest sin whiter than the snow (Is. i. 18); the physicist to One who conserves all matter (Eccles. iii. 14); the orthopedist to One who makes the lame walk (Matt. xv. 31); the oculist to One who makes the blind see (Luke vii. 22); the psychologist to One who knows all man's thoughts (Luke vi. 8); the economist to One who sees that when goods are increased they are increased that eat them (Eccles. v. 2); the physiologist to One who gives men strength in their old age (Ps xcii. 14); the artist to One who sets His bow in the clouds (Gen. ix. 13); the aeronaut to One who makes the clouds His chariot and who rides upon the wings of the wind (Ps. civ. 3); the wireless telegraphist to One who takes the wings of the morning and bears His message to the uttermost part of the sea (Ps. cxxxix. 19); the electrician to One who uses the lightning as His messenger (Job xxxviii. 35); the meteorologist to One who has gathered the wind in His fists (Prov. xxx. 4); the agriculturalist to One who causes grass to grow for the cattle and the herb for the use of man (Ps. civ. 14); the mineralogist to One who is more precious than gold (Ps. xix. 10); and all, to One who is more radiant than the dawn (Ps. xix. 5); more majestic than the mountains (Song of Solomon ii. 8); more glorious than the sun (Acts xxvi. 13); to Jesus Christ, the Son of the Living God (John vi. 69).

The Romeward Movement Among English Non-Conformists.

OWING to the strong hold Romanising teaching has in the Church of England, it is generally thought that the Romanising tendency is confined to that denomination, but to those who are watching the trend of ecclesiastical movements it is well known that Nonconformists are also taking a prominent part in this disloyal and dishonest movement. For the enlightenment of those of our readers who are not aware of what is going on in this direction, we are taking the liberty of printing part of an article in the September "Churchman's Magazine" by A. M. A. in which he exposes the notorious Dr Orchard, and gives some disquieting facts.

"Dr W. E. Orchard," he says, "was appointed to the historic King's Weigh House Congregational Chapel in 1914.

Since that time he has completely altered the character of the services and has compiled a Prayer Book akin to Roman and Anglo-Catholic Missals. Indeed, his services can be followed easily from Roman Catholic service books. The whole round of Saints' Days is kept according to the Roman Calendar. He has all the services and extravagances that were so strongly denounced by the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, issued in 1906. His prayer book is far in advance of the Deposited Book so recently rejected twice by Parliament. His preaching and writings are distinctly sacerdotal and liberal, and he belittles and antagonises the old orthodox beliefs and fundamental doctrines of evangelical faith. He has asserted in the pulpit and in the Press that he is charged with introducing a priestly system, and teaching Romanism. To which he says: "I do not deny these charges." The Trust Deeds which bind him to his Congregational Church, covenant for the standards of the Protestant Faith, but he deliberately flouts them, and is set on making his Church the centre of Free Church Romanism.

"He was secretly ordained a priest (although previously ordained as a Presbyterian minister) by Bishop Vernon Herford, who claims that his orders are accepted by Church of Rome and the Greek Church. He refused to answer questions on the point of this secret ordination, and managed to keep it a secret for upwards of six years. The facts are, he was first made a deacon in a private chapel at Oxford, then a Priest in his own Church at Easter, 1917. He has constructed a Romish reredos, with a large crucifix as the central feature, a table built on the papal style with eight large candles, which he designates the High Altar (he has a second altar for special services). Upon this structure he has set up a 'Tabernacle,' wherein is reserved—a consecrated wafer—the Host! before which a red lamp burns continually. Devotees are taught to worship this presence, and the most extravagant services are held in connection with it, e.g., 'Mass of the Presanctified' and 'Benediction.' Many old worshippers have been obliged to leave, and a new set of worshippers has gathered. He uses the Roman 'Stations of the Cross,' and has introduced the 'Confessional,' which Bp. Samuel Wilberforce characterised as 'the crowning curse of Popery.' He publicly announces on his notice board daily Mass, and he uses the 'English Hymnal,' an extremely popish hymn book, used by the most advanced Anglo-Catholics.

"Numbers of his immediate helpers have seen the dishonesty of their position and have joined the Church of Rome, e.g., Rev. Stanley James (his assistant), verted in July 1923. Several former lady members of his congregation are now nuns in Anglican and Roman Convents. Dr Orchard published the assertion in 1926 that there were '67 parsons' (with hundreds of laity) in definite membership of the Society of Free Catholics. There were 10 Methodists, 9 Congregationalists, 8 Presbyterians, 5 Baptists (the rest Unitarians and Undenominational). He steadfastly refuses to name them, and secrecy enshrouds much of the propaganda. In many Churches contention and controversy has been aroused by Dr Orchard's freak Catholicism, and the attempts of members of the Free Catholic Society. Wesleyan.—At Syston, Leicestershire, by Rev. J. A. C. Copson, a leading member of the executive, and near by, at Swithland, the chapel is a regular popish place of devotion, etc. At Blackwell, near Birmingham, the introduction of candles and ceremonial. At Kingsway Hall, London, a little chapel with Romish pictures. Dr E. J. B. Kirtlan, Rev. A. J. Short, Rev. J. E. Rattenbury have been tainted. Baptist.—At Belvoir Street, Leicester, an upheaval by the minister, Rev. T. A. Bampton, once on the executive of the Society of Free Catholics. At Chaminster Road, Bournemouth, the minister joined Rome, at Princes Gate, Liverpool, enlightenment caused minister to change. Congregational.—At Derby, Brixton, Streatham Hill, Lewisham, Burton-on-Trent, Bedminster, Bristol, Oxford, Wellingboro, Southend-on-Sea, Monmouth, Islington, Alford, Lincoln, Halifax, Fleetwood. Erdington, near Birmingham, Presbyterian; Old Meeting, Birmingham, Unitarian."

Putting Something in First.

"I can't get interested in missions!" exclaimed a young girl petulantly, and, if truth must be told, a bit superciliously, as she left a thrilling missionary meeting in company with an older lady. "No, dear," came the pitying response; "It isn't to be exactly expected you should—yet awhile. It's just like getting interest in a bank, you have to put in a little something first; and the more you put in, the more interest you get. Time, or money, or praying, it doesn't matter which — but something you have to put in, or you never will have any interest. Try it, dear—just put in a little something, and you're sure of the interest."—THE KING'S OWN.

The Lark's Song : A Story for the Young *

ON only two occasions have I had the pleasure of looking into a lark's nest. The first was . . . in South Wales. On entering the field I found the nest, and at once called the children together and obtained their promise not to disturb it; which promise was faithfully kept. During the whole of that day the parent bird was seen and heard high above the field. The second occasion was in a green field of wheat in Cambridgeshire, where there was a nest containing three eggs. My young readers no doubt know that a lark seldom or never rises from or returns to the nest exactly on the spot, but a few yards away, so that an observer shall not easily locate the nest.

But for many years I have listened to the song of a lark without being reminded of a dear young friend who was a member of my Bible Class at Kilburn. His name was Harold Frederick J——; and at the time of his death he was about sixteen years of age. He had a praying mother, and a brother and two sisters attended the same school.

On two Lord's Day afternoons Harold was absent from the class through illness, and on the second afternoon I asked the superintendent of the school to go with me to visit him. Mr Wilkins sat on one side of the bed, and myself on the other. After a few general remarks, Mr Wilkins said: "Well, Harold, I think you are very ill. Is there anything you would like to say to us?" With an effort the youth turned to me and said: "Do you remember preaching one 'Sunday' evening about eternal life?" I replied. "Do you mean from the Lord's Prayer in the seventeenth chapter of John?" (I find that this was my text on August 5, 1900). He said, "Yes. On that evening I first felt myself a sinner in the sight of God; and as you spoke of the knowledge of God and of the Lord Jesus being a fruit and a proof of the possession of eternal life, every word seemed to go into my heart with a power I never felt before. Ever since then I have been more and more desirous to know the Lord Jesus for myself." On leaving the room his mother confirmed this testimony, and said that during his brief illness she had often heard him in prayer without his

*Reprinted from the "Gospel Magazine."

knowing she was a listener; and that "eternal life" was the constant subject of his petitions.

But my young friends will wonder what connection there is between the youth and a lark's song. In a few days Harold passed away, and I had to conduct the funeral service. This was on May 28, 1902, at Willesden New Cemetery. I may say here that the Old Cemetery was filled, and a large field had been recently added. This will explain what happened at the funeral. The grave was one of the first dug in the added part.

It was a lovely day of spring, and the sun was shining brightly in a blue, cloudless sky. Just as the coffin was being lowered into its resting-place, a lark rose from the grass only about ten yards from the grave, and mounted singing until it was immediately above the grave and the mourners standing round. It continued its thrilling song until we all left the cemetery.

This incident has not had a previous record in print. I now give the details of it so as to secure the attention of dear young readers to the subject of "eternal life." How marvellous is the fact that from a tiny egg, within twenty days, a living bird should emerge, capable not of flying but of singing its Maker's praise! But it is much more marvellous that God in rich sovereign grace should implant "eternal life" in the soul of a sinner once dead in sin, and enable that sinner to pray for an interest in redeeming love. All true prayer is first breathed into the soul by God the Holy Spirit; and this is equally true of all true praise. A dead bird cannot sing: therefore true prayer and true praise are proofs of the possession of life.

O that it may be the happy lot of my youthful readers to hear the voice that gives life, and to know Him who is Life! His sheep hear His voice; and He gives to His sheep "eternal life," and they can never perish, for they are loved with an everlasting love.—WILLIAM WILEMAN.

Social Customs and God's Law.

IF we turn our attention to the respect that men pay to social customs, matters of etiquette, and such like, we will see what a subordinate place God has in the thought and lives of many. We would not criticise men and women because they endeavour to conform to good

social custom and usage, because they like to be in style as regards their manners as well as regards their clothes. In itself, there is nothing wrong in such a desire. The point to which we direct attention is this: Many overestimate the importance of these things, and are far more concerned about questions of social etiquette than they are about the commandments of God. Just as in the days of Christ, many were scrupulous about eating with unwashed hands or taking into their bodies that which was not ceremonially pure, while indifferent to those things that come out of the man and which really defile him, such as evil thoughts, thefts, murders, covetings, pride, deceit, and such like, so there are those to-day who are very scrupulous about conforming to matters of social etiquette who are more or less indifferent to the commandments of God. Who does not know those who are more shocked at seeing a man eat pie with a knife than they are at hearing him swear? Who does not know those who are more mortified at making a grammatical mistake than at breaking a moral law? How many there are who are more afraid of breaking the law of hospitality than of breaking the laws of God? Such allusions as these, and their number might easily be multiplied, show how true it is that God occupies a subordinate position in the lives and doings of many. No doubt we ought to have good manners. We ought to pay some heed to the laws of social etiquette, but after all it is not these things that make the man. Many who observe them most scrupulously are inwardly corrupt and a disgrace to decent society, while many who are very deficient in such respects are among nature's noblemen. In proportion as we are men, in proportion as we have strong and noble characters, in that proportion we will scorn to put the customs and usages of society above the laws and commandments of God. The relation of life, we repeat, is the relation we sustain to God, and we show ourselves to be fools and weaklings indeed if we render the customs and usages of society a homage that we do not render the great and eternal God. — "The Presbyterian" (Philadelphia).

Troubles for Christ's sake are but like the prick of an awl in the tip of the ear, in order to hang a jewel there. Let this also put the saints upon patience: when we know that a trial will have an end, we are by that knowledge encouraged to exercise patience.—*John Bunyan*.

“Behold My Servant.”

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

“Behold my Servant whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my Spirit upon Him, and He shall show judgment to the Gentiles” (Matt. xii. 18).

CONSIDER the attention called to Him and what is here said of Him by God (1) He is called His Servant whom He hath chosen. (2) His beloved in whom His soul is well pleased. This is what He is in His relation to God—His chosen Servant, the well-beloved of His soul in whom He is well pleased. And this is a matter of serious importance to us. (3) He promises to put His Spirit upon Him. (4) He gives it to Him as His work to show judgment to the Gentiles. (5) The character which He displays in doing this work. (a) Peacefulness. He shall not strive nor cry, neither shall any man hear His voice in the streets; (b) Compassion and gentleness towards the weak, the bowed down, the penitent, the languishing—a bruised reed shall He not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench. (6) His success—Till He send forth judgment unto victory, and in His name shall the Gentiles trust. Till He send forth judgment unto victory: (a) In the souls of his people one by one; (b) In the world by making His religion to rule the world and by which all opposing systems and abounding iniquities shall be brought to an end. He will do this because He is chosen of God to do it, for His soul delights in Him and because He has put His Spirit upon Him to do it. He is in every way qualified to do it.

Odd Christians.

It is not every man that is converted that we should altogether choose as a companion. There are odd people to be met with who will go to Heaven we have no doubt, for they are pilgrims on the right way, but we have no wish for much of their company on the road. They are cross-grained, crabbed, and cantankerous, with a something about them that one's nature can no more delight in than the palate can take pleasure in nauseous physic. They are a sort of spiritual hedgehogs; they are alive and useful, and no doubt they illustrate the wisdom and patience of God, but they are not good companions; one would not like to carry them in his bosom.—
C. H. Spurgeon

Literary Notices.

PHILIPPIAN STUDIES: LESSONS IN FAITH AND LOVE, by Handle: C. G. Moule, D.D., Bishop of Durham. Glasgow: Pickering and Inglis, Bothwell Street. Price 3s 6d net.

The publishers are to be congratulated in giving to the public such a neat and serviceable edition of Dr Moule's "Philippian Studies," and at so reasonable a price. Dr Moule's chief characteristics as a commentator were loyal adherence to God's Word and up-to-date scholarship in New Testament Greek. In his "Studies" of the Philippian, Ephesian, and Colossian epistles he brings out many interesting truths for the reader's consideration. One can praise the work without accepting every statement made by Dr Moule.

CHURCH AND STATE: POLITICAL ASPECTS OF SIXTEENTH CENTURY PURITANISM, by the Rev. A. F. Scott Pearson, D. Th., D. Litt., F.R. Hist. S. Cambridge: University Press. Price 7s 6d net.

In his important work on the great Presbyterian-Puritan leader, Thomas Cartwright, Dr Pearson touched briefly on his views on Church and State. In this monograph he has dealt with the subject more fully and expounded Cartwright's views on the Two Kingdom doctrine. Perhaps in no country has this subject been so thoroughly dealt with as in Scotland, and one has only to mention such names as Andrew Melville, George Gillespie, and Principal Cunningham to have recalled to one's mind that the matter has been handled by theological giants. Dr Pearson's work will fill an important place in the literature of the subject tracing as it does the early orderly formulation of the doctrine for which the Church of Scotland in her best days contended.

THE SPEECH OF THE FAITHFUL WITNESS, by the Rev. C. J. Attwood, of Worthing. London: Protestant Truth Society, 3 and 4 St Paul's Churchyard, E.C.4. Price 1d, or 6s per 100.

This is an excellent address on the words: "Never man spake like this Man." It is a loyal defence of the Deity of the Son of God in opposition to the destructive, anti-Christian teaching of Modernism.

LECTURE ON THE SABBATH, by Rev. N. Cameron, Glasgow. Inverness: Printed at the "Courier" Office. Price 1d, post free, 1½d.

At the request of some friends, this Lecture on the Sabbath has been reprinted from the pages of the Magazine, and may be had at the "Courier" Office, Inverness.

Notes and Comments.

Defence of the Bible.—The above heading caught our attention in reading a recent issue of the "Glasgow Herald," and being interested in the subject we proceeded to read the paragraph through. As we did so we soon learned that it was a lecture delivered by Prof. A. B. Macaulay, D.D., of the United Free College, Glasgow, to the School of Study and Training. Could it be after all that the United Free Church professors (or at least one of) were mending their ways? We were not left in doubt for long as the following paragraph shows:—

"Inerrancy might be claimed but could not be vindicated for the Bible. In its information about science it was not superior to contemporary knowledge. Yet it was inspired, and they need not think that its inspiration could be disputed by arguments which, after all, owed any force they possessed to an ill-judged choice of the ground on which it was sought to establish its reality. God could be discovered in other books, and for that reason inspiration could be claimed for them. But God was discoverable in the Bible in a character in which he was discoverable nowhere else. To put the inspiration of the Bible on the level of other books was not an evidence of insight and of right judgment." If this be the kind of inspiration the Bible claims for itself we have read it in vain. Those who wish to know what the Bible teaches on this subject would do well to carefully study Dr Warfield's recently published "Revelation and Inspiration."

The American Sabbath.—"The Bulletin of the New York Sabbath Committee" quotes the "Houston Post-Dispatch" as saying: "The conception of 'Sunday' as a day of rest has been breaking down for several decades, however, and in most of its aspects it has become the most restless day of the week, and by far the most violent.

It is marked fifty-two times during the year by a nationwide wave of motor accidents, murders, hi-jacking, and riotous disturbances Except in isolated instances it is no longer a day of rest. It takes the form of a frenzied re-action to a week of strenuous action. In the light of its divine origin there is grim irony in the fact that it acts as a reservoir to fill the hospitals, morgues and jails. The appalling violence of the American 'Sunday' shames the nation's claim to being a religious land." This is what we are fast heading for in Scotland. "Week-end Motor Accidents" is a standing heading now in newspaper printing offices, and men's mad rush for pleasure is pursued swiftly by retributive justice.

Increase in Sabbath Desecration.—That the concern for the increase in Sabbath desecration is not confined to the more orthodox branches of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland is evident from the report recently given in to the Glasgow United Free Church Presbytery by the Rev. Archibald Dawson, Newton Place. Mr Dawson said in his report: "The general conclusion was that within the Presbytery there had been a decided increase in secular activities. More trains were running, more steamers were sailing, and more 'buses and more private cars were on the roads. Excursions by rail, steamer, and 'bus were made much more attractive and tempting on Sabbath than on any other day. It could also be said that the number of workmen who were being asked to work on Sabbath had increased." We quote the above to show how serious the matter has become, and those of the working classes who were determined to turn the Lord's Day into a day of pleasure may find that they sold their priceless heritage too cheaply if it ends in their being called to work on the divinely appointed Day of Rest.

"A Shorter Bible."—We are not surprised. The next thing will be no Bible at all. The teaching from our pulpits has been that we are to follow an ideal Jesus, and try to live an upright and honest life seeking the good of our fellow-creatures and looking up to God as our Heavenly Father; the question of being born again and the precious blood of Christ without which there can be no remission of sins, does not come into the theology of such preachers. We give an extract from the "Morning Post" of August 16th: "A Shorter Bible. The Authorised Version 'Up-to-date.' 'The Shorter Bible'

will contain probably less than one-fifth of the contents of the Bible. Every passage which is not of much importance or interest as compared with the rest will be omitted. The first three Gospels appear in one as a running account of our Lord's life on earth. Genealogies are left out, some fifty Psalms, Leviticus, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, and large parts of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Revelation, Job, Proverbs, etc. The aim of the editors is that the book shall be interesting on every page.' We have quoted enough to show the scope of the book. We are told that 'some twenty clergy and laity are engaged upon the work, and sound common sense is asked for rather than scholarship.' " Poor souls! Commonsense rather than scholarship is asked for. These commonsense twenty men have set themselves up to have more commonsense than the Holy Spirit, who, as the Spirit of Truth, wrote of Him who is "the way, and the truth, and the life." Are we to believe that according to the commonsense of these twenty men the portions that they have cut out are not inspired and not worthy of the commonsense of these men?"—"Quarterly Record of the Trinitarian Bible Society" (October).

A Blind Leader of the Blind.—The spread of worldliness has brought about a state of affairs in many professedly Christian Churches, where associations of people are held together by purely social ties, and their main function seems to be the provision of cheap amusement. Also, in many cases, the provision of funds for carrying on the work is chiefly dependent upon the proceeds of entertainments and the like. An indication of the depths to which such may sink is furnished by a sorry story in "The Christian World" of March 29th last, under the heading "A Parish Gamble," where we are told of a church in the city of Manchester, the rector of which, requiring the sum of £50—for repairs—and, "having organised one or two other 'mild gambles' to assist the Christian cause . . . thought there would be no harm in a draw." He "has many friends in the theatrical profession, and from these kindly disposed persons he received various articles to be given as prizes, including boxes at the theatre, six miniature liqueurs, two bottles of port, a bottle of old brown sherry, and a bottle of brandy. Over 5000 twopenny tickets had been disposed of when the police intervened." Strange to say, when interviewed by "The Manchester Guardian,"

the rector said "he did not see what harm the draw was doing and it might have done some good."—"Quarterly Record of the Trinitarian Bible Society" (October.)

A Belated Compliment and a Reminder of Unchristian Conduct.—The following from the "Record of the U.F. Church" (October) is the concluding paragraph in an "Open Letter to the Minority":—"Finally, if you must separate, may we in all brotherly sympathy beg of you—whether you seek admission to another Church or whether you form a new secession—that your action, taken for conscience sake, be carried through quietly and without bitterness, in the spirit of those Free Churchmen who in 1893, on the passing of the Free Church Declaratory Act concerning the Confession of Faith, so respected the spiritual autonomy of the Church that they made no appeal to the civil courts, and so fulfilled the law of charity that they left the Church they loved without the world knowing of their sacrifice, whatever we may think of the principles for which they suffered, we honour them for following in the footsteps of Him who went to His cross holding His peace." The writers of this letter seem to be quite at sea as to the reason for the separation in 1893, and it would be well to remind them that if the present United Free Church Minority get the same treatment as the Free Presbyterians got in 1893 they will be turned out of their manse and churches and left penniless as far as the tender mercies of the Majority are concerned.

Remarkable Decrease in Consumption of Strong Drink.—In 1900 the consumption of spirits in England was 32,239,522 gallons. In 1913 it was 22,004,432 gallons; to-day it is 10,412,921, and growing less. The figures for Scotland are still more striking. In 1900 the consumption was 8,623,092 gallons; in 1913 it was 6,709,343; and last year it was 2,456,283. The same decline is seen in the consumption of beer. In 1913 England consumed 30,758,800 bulk barrels; in 1927 the consumption had fallen to 23,418,640 barrels. The figures for Scotland in 1913 were 2,119,666 barrels, and in 1927 1,673,576. £298,800,000 is given as an estimate for the drink bill of 1927 for Great Britain, as compared with £301,300,000 in 1926. This is the lowest figure since 1918. In 1920 the bill reached the extraordinary figure of £469,700,000. This worked out at a consumption of £10 per head. To-day the consumption per head is £6 15s. The total proceedings for drunkenness in England and

Wales for 1927 were 74,303; five years ago the number was 84,257.

Sabbath Trading: "Unchristian and not Scottish."—

At the annual meeting of the Scottish Federation of Meat Traders' Associations (Incorporated), held recently in Greenock, the question of Sabbath trading was discussed. And it is a pleasure to know that the president (Mr Thomas Ritchie, Grangemouth), and others spoke out strongly against this growing evil in the meat trade. At the bi-annual meeting of Federation the president reported a resolution had been unanimously passed approving of the principle of the abolition of Sabbath trading, and he remarked the meat trade in Scotland was ready for this reform. Mr Andrew Haldane, Glasgow, declared Sabbath trading to be unnecessary, unchristian, and not Scottish. In Glasgow, with the exception of the Jewish shops, they had only one shop open. In Edinburgh a strong effort was made to bring to book the meat traders who kept their places open on the Sabbath. This effort was successful for a time, but it was an unfortunate thing, he remarked, that whenever some men found their principles were going to affect their pockets they pocketed their principles. A resolution was unanimously adopted that the Federation press for the amendment of the Shops (Hours of Closing) Act so as to have Sabbath made a closing day.

Recent Railway Disasters.—The railways of this country have boasted that they are as free from accidents as any in the world, and we believe their claim is true, but within 48 hours three serious railway smashes took place, and there has been considerable loss of life. A railway disaster is always a distressing occurrence, its suddenness, its wreckage, mingled with human beings, hurled into eternity without a moment's warning are fitted to fill one with a feeling of horror. The Railway Companies of this country have been, and are now, notorious Sabbath breakers. They barefacedly confess that their cheap excursions on the Lord's Day is an effort to stave off financial difficulties. Now, while God does not always settle accounts in this world, yet he often does, and it would be well for the Railways to lay to heart that such disasters, apart altogether from the more serious matter—the great loss of life—mean a very heavy financial outlay for the Companies involved. Probably

the worldly wise directors would laugh such sentiments to scorn, and guided by what they deem a superior wisdom, ply with issues that will not appear so insignificant in the end.

Report of "Continental Sunday" Commission.—

Under the auspices of the Lord's Day Observance Society a Commission, consisting of gentlemen interested in the Sabbath question, visited different places on the Continent. Their first experience of a "Continental Sunday" was at Ostend. It was beyond their worst anticipations. The day they saw seemed to be nothing less than "the devil's counterpart of the Lord's Day." "Shops of all kinds were doing business; cafés and drinking saloons were open; opera bars were crowded; there were noisy street processions with bands and banners; horse races were attended by thousands; bookmakers and betting tipsters were doing a roaring trade; theatres and cabarets were in full swing, and wines, songs, and revelries were indulged in until past midnight. The next Sabbath was spent at Montreux-Territet, Switzerland. Here the influence of Calvin and Knox are seen in a better observance of the Sabbath, but for the gratification of the gay crowd that come to this well-known resort there are dances, concerts, and theatricals provided on the Lord's Day. The last Sabbath was spent in Paris, and we give an extract in the succeeding note from the Lord's Day Magazine describing it.

How Paris Spends the First Day of the Week.—"Our last Sabbath sojourn was in Paris. It was a day of desecration we shall never forget. After the mid-day hour the Lord's Day became more like a Bank Holiday, only much more hilarious. It became in fact a gala day, a great carnival, in which almost everybody seemed in pursuit of pleasure of some kind.

The intensity of the traffic can hardly be imagined. Charabancs loaded with passengers thundered along the Boulevards. Motors, thousands of them, were hurrying hither and thither, and with their peculiar hooters and squeakers created a nerve-racking din. In the lovely Bois de Bologne (the largest playground in Paris) tens of thousands were on games and amusements bent. The horse races and bookmakers, the Champs-Élysées, with its café chantants, attracted thousands more. Almost every district seemed to vie with the other in offering new excitements — boxing contests, open-air markets,

trading establishments, street jugglers, wrestlers, and peripatetic singers adding to the diversions which seemed to await one at almost every turn. The theatres and music halls were likewise open, whilst the cabarets and dance halls of the Montmartre quarter attracted their crowds as well.

At nightfall the gaiety and excitement increased. The boulevards, of which there are 88, were thronged with streams of pedestrians. The cafes and drinking saloons, which exist every few yards along the pathway, were doing plenty of business. Indeed, it was impossible at many of them to get a seat at the little round tables with which they are provided. There the people sat drinking and chatting and card-playing and listening to songs until long past midnight." — "Lord's Day Magazine."

The First Scottish Woman Minister.—Miss Vera M. Finlay, M.A., has been called to the pastorate of the Partick Congregational Church, and is to be ordained this month. We have no hesitation in saying this is a bad beginning. The Word of God has spoken in no uncertain way as to women taking the office of the ministry. In an age, however, in which people are governed by their own wishes, one need not wonder what is happening. Congregationalism, like Presbyterianism in Scotland, it has travelled a long way from the ancient landmarks which were set up on the authority of God's unerring Word. There are now about a score of women ordained preachers, who are distributed as follows:—Baptist, 3; Congregationalist, 6; and Unitarian, 11.

The Bishops of the Church of England Charged with Sedition.—The Rev. C. E. Milnes, clerical secretary of the League of Loyal Churchmen, in the course of a statement issued on behalf of the League yesterday says:—"Although the House of Commons has twice rejected the Deposited Prayer Book, the Archbishops and Bishops have officially declared their policy of sanctioning and promoting the use of the rejected Prayer Book of 1928. The following extract from the Archbishop's official announcement makes their policy quite clear—"The Bishops in the exercise of their legal or administrative discretion will be guided by the proposals approved in 1928 by the Houses of Convocation and by the Church Assembly. The decrees of the Houses of Convocation and the decrees of the

Church Assembly have no force whatever unless they are made and ratified by the King's Majesty's supreme authority. The use of the Revised Book of 1928 is an unlawful act: the Bishops in promoting the use of that Book have committed and inaugurated a seditious conspiracy. The position is that the Bishops, acting with others, defy the House of Commons and tell the people of England that they are above the law. We call on the Prime Minister, as the leader of the House of Commons, to defend the Constitution and forthwith to take the measures required to put down such sedition and to bring the offenders to justice."

Our Lady of Lourdes a Reader of the "Scotsman."—

In the "Scotsman" of July 28th appeared the following obituary notice:—"Freeman.—At Sydney, Australia, 21st July, Catherine Gilhooly, wife of George Freeman, and dearly beloved daughter of late James Gilhooly and Mrs Gilhooly, 14 Livingstone Place, Edinburgh. Our Lady of Lourdes pray for her. R.I.P." An Edinburgh friend who sends us the clipping makes caustic comment in these words: "Evidently the person or persons who drew up this notice believed that 'Our Lady of Lourdes' reads the 'Scotsman.'"—"Churchman's Magazine."

The Love of Christ.

Comparisons can give but a very imperfect view of this love which passeth knowledge. Though we should suppose all the love of all the men that ever were, or shall be on earth, and all the love of the angels in heaven, united in one heart, it would be but a cold heart to that which was pierced with the soldier's spear. The Jews saw but blood and water, but faith can discern a bright ocean of eternal love flowing out of these wounds. We may have some impression of the glory of it, by considering its effects. We should consider all the spiritual and eternal blessings, received by God's people for four thousand years before Christ was crucified, or that have been received since, or that will be received till the consummation of all things; all the deliverances from eternal misery; all the oceans of joy in heaven; the rivers of water of life, to be enjoyed to all eternity, by multitudes as the sands of the sea-shore—we should consider all these blessings as flowing from that love, that was displayed in the cross of Christ.—*Maclaurin*,

Church Notes.

Communion.—November—First Sabbath — Oban; second, Glasgow; third, Edinburgh and Dornoch; fourth, Halkirk. January—Fourth Sabbath—Inverness. February—First Sabbath—Dingwall. South African Mission—The following are the dates of the Communion:—Last Sabbath of March, June, September, and December. Note.—Notice of any additions to, or alteration of, the above dates of Communion should be sent to the Editor.

Movements of Church Deputies and Missionaries.—The Rev. R. Mackenzie and Mr James Campbell reached the other side safely. They report they had a somewhat stormy passage. They sailed for Australia from Vancouver on the 17th October. Dr Macdonald sailed from Southampton on the 28th September, and the Rev. James Macleod sailed from Greenock on the 20th October for Canada.

Acknowledgment of Donations.

John Grant, Palmerston Villa, Millburn Road, Inverness, General Treasurer, acknowledges, with thanks, the following donations:—

SUSTENTATION FUND.—Miss C. S., P.O., Kinlocheil, £1; Donald Morrison, 710 Main Street, Saskatoon, Sask., £1; E. C., per R. Morrison, jun., Tarbert, 5s; o/a Lochcarron, in memory of a happy Communion Sabbath spent there, £1; B. K. T., per Rev. N. Cameron, £2 10s.

AGED AND INFIRM MINISTERS' AND WIDOWS' FUND.—Free Presbyterian, Farr, Daviot, £5.

HOME MISSION FUND.—Free Presbyterian, Farr, Daviot, £5.

JEWISH AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.—Rev. N. Cameron, Glasgow, acknowledges, with grateful thanks, the following:—"By a lover of the Sabbath in appreciation of the F.P. Synod's resolution against Sabbath profanation," £100; F.P. children's saved pennies, £3; Bridegroom, £1; B. K. T., £2 10s, for Dr Macdonald's Expenses to South Africa; Friend, £1; Free Presbyterian, Farr, Daviot, £12;

D. M., 710 Main Street, Saskatoon, £1 10s; S. F., Strathpeffer, £2; Mrs B., 78 Main Street, Callander, 16s; Mrs C. McK., for Rev. J. Tallach, 2s 6d; Do., for Missionary at Shangani, 2s 6d; from a Friend, "In memory of Mrs F. Macdonald, Braes, for Mrs Radasi's youngest child, 5s; as prize for scholar who can repeat best the last chapter of the Gospel of John, 5s; For Kaffir Catechisms, 5s; Friend of the Cause, Toremore, for Rev. D. Urquhart's expenses to Palestine, 10s; F. M., 30 Charlton Street, Grandville, N.S.W., for do., 10s. The following donations received o/a Dr R. Macdonald's expenses to the South African Mission:—Anon., Glasgow, 5s; Sister J. M. M., Nurses' Club, 203 Bath Street, Glasgow, 5s; Mrs P. C., Glenmorven, Drimnim, 5s; F. M., 30 Charlton Street, Grandville, N.S.W., 10s.

ORGANISATION FUND.—D. M., 710 Main Street, Saskatoon, Sask., £1 7s 8d.

The following lists have been sent in for publication:—

ACHMORE MISSION HOUSE FUND.—Mr John McArthur, 15 Achmore, Stornoway, acknowledges, with grateful thanks, the following donations:—A Free Presbyterian, Clydebank, per Capt. K., K. Macleod, £1; Anon., Argyle, 10s.

BONAR-BRIDGE CHURCH BUILDING FUND.—Rev. D. J. Matheson, Lairg, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the following donations:—J. B. M., Glasgow, £1; H. McL., Halkirk, 10s; Applecross Collecting Card, per Miss J. Macaulay, £4 17s 6d; Anti-Unionist, £1; C. G. A., Edinburgh, £1; "In memory of my parents," per Miss Matheson, Bonar-Bridge, £1.

EDINBURGH CHURCH PURCHASE FUND.—Mr A. Maclean, 16 Marchmont Crescent, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the following donations:—A Friend, per Mr Jas. Mackay, £5; Anon., Argyle, do., 10s.

GLENDALE F.P. CHURCH.—Rev. James Macleod, Glendale acknowledges, with grateful thanks, the sum of £1 from D. McK., Ostle, for congregational purposes.

HELMSDALE CHURCH BUILDING FUND.—The Rev. W. Grant, Halkirk, sincerely thanks the Deacon's Court of St. Jude's, Glasgow, for their congregational contribution of £24 1s towards above fund; also 5s "Friends," Edinburgh, per Miss D. P., and 10s "Octogenarian."

NEWCASTLE CHURCH PURCHASE FUND.—Mr F. Bentley, 39 Osborne Avenue, Newcastle, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the following:—F. C. B., Newcastle, 10s; Collecting Card, per Mrs Porteous, Dunvegan, £1 10s; Friend of the Cause, Garve, £2; I. M. McK., Glasgow, 10s; F.P. Friend, per Mrs Dow, Newburn-on-Tyne, 10s.

TALLISKER CHURCH BUILDING FUND.—Mr A. Nicolson, Struan House, Struan, acknowledges, with sincere thanks, the sum of £1 from "Friend of the Cause," Ullapool Postmark.

THURSO CHURCH FUNDS.—The Rev. W. Grant, Halkirk, gratefully acknowledges receipt of 10s from a "Friend," per Mrs B. Swanson, Thurso.

ROGART CHURCH BUILDING FUND.—Mr John Murray, Muie, acknowledges, with grateful thanks, £1 from F.P. Friend (Stobo postmark).

THE LATE REV. D. MACFARLANE'S MEMORIAL STONE FUND.—Anon., Glasgow, 10s; Anon., Argyle, 10s; I. M. B., Glasgow, 10s; Mr Macpherson, 8928 Commercial Avenue, Chicago, 12s 3d; Miss M. Grant, Larig View, Aviemore, 2s 6d; Three F.P. Friends, Inverness, 7s 6d; Friend, Fearn, Ross-shire, 5s; Mrs Macpherson, Badachro House, Gairloch, 5s; John Weir, Glenellen, Tarbert, Lochfyne, £1; "Caithness," £1; Miss M. Maclellan, 50 Palmerston Place, Edinburgh, 5s; A. McP., Helmsdale, 5s; Duncan Mackintosh, Burnside, Aviemore, 5s; Miss A. Macleod, 24 Amslie Place, Edinburgh, 5s; Friend, Plockton, 5s; F. and L. Maclean, Balemore, Lochmaddy, 5s; F.P., Daviot, 10s; D. Maclean, Docherty, Dingwall, per Mr Samuel Fraser, £1; Miss A. Macdonald, Dingwall, per do., 5s; Three Friends, Dingwall Congregation, per do., 10s; Miss S. A. Urquhart, Balblair, per do., 10s; Mrs D. Maclellan, Strathdearie, per Mr Ken. Matheson, 10s; Mrs Macrae, Temperance Hotel, Dingwall, per do., 5s; Donald Dingwall, Culbokie, East, per do., 5s; Two Friends, Glasgow, 10s; McEwan Brothers, Canada, per Rev. N. Cameron, 15 dollars; Friend, per do., £1; Friend, per do., £1; Friend, Glasgow, per do., 10s; M. M., per do., 5s; R. C., per do., 5s; H. McL., per D. McL., per do., 10s; Mr McK., Clydebank, per do., 10s; A. L., Tayvallich, per do., 5s.

The Magazine.

3s 6d SUBSCRIPTIONS.—Mrs A. Campbell, R.J.D., 3 Brattleboro, Vt., U.S.A.; A. Gillies, Fladda, Raasay; Peter Stewart, Craigs-corrie, Beaully; Mrs L. Macleod, Inverkirkaig, Lochcarron; Mrs A. Morrison, 13 Lingerbay, Leverburgh; Miss M. J. Maclean, 8 Park Circus, Glasgow; M. Gillies, 710 Kylemarc Avenue, Winnipeg; Mrs A. MacBeth, Corran House, Shieldaig; Peter Cameron, Chapelton, Boat of Garton; Alex. Macpherson, Docharn, do.; N. Mackinnon, collector, Tarbert, Harris.

4s SUBSCRIPTIONS.—Mrs Burns, 78 Main Street, Callander; Mrs Macpherson, Badachro House, Gairloch; Wm. Macpherson, Baelenancradbh, Bonar-Bridge; J. Mackenzie, Macandie's Buildings, Saltburn, Invergordon; J. Shaw, Talnar, Kincaig; Mrs Oman, Milltown of Evelix, Dornoch; Ken Macrae, Cuaig, Arrina, Strathcarron; Miss A. Macleod, 24 Amslie Place, Edinburgh; Miss C. Stewart, P.O., Kinlochell; Donald Morrison, 710 Main Street, Saskatoon, Sask.; John Macleod, Holman, Raasay.

OTHER SUBSCRIPTIONS.—Hugh Grant, Brushgrove, Clarence River, Australia, 10s; Miss J. Macdonald, 14 Pashley Street, Balmain, N.S.W., £1; Miss M. Macleay, Old Dornie, Achiltibuie, 5s; Donald Macdonald, 13 Cove, Inverasdale, 10s; Mrs Kitchen, 9 Jessie Block, Jessie Avenue, Winnipeg, 4s 1d; Mrs D. Sutherland, Bendal Farm, Portmahomack, 7s; Mrs Chas. Grant, Sunnyside, Dornoch, 7s 6d; Mrs J. Mackenzie, Millburn, Letters of Lochbroom, 4s 6d.

FREE DISTRIBUTION.—Mrs C. McK., 2s 6d.