

THE
Free Presbyterian Magazine
 AND
 MONTHLY RECORD

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

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

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Righteousness of God,	281
The Passover; by Dean Law,	285
The Sabbath; by the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn,	291
Novel Reading; by an American Author,	298
Dr. McCrie's Criticism of Sir Walter Scott on the Covenanters,	302
Memoir of the Rev. Neil Cameron,	309
Short Gleanings,	309
Nadur an Duine 'na Staid Cheithir Fille,	310
Notes and Comments,	317
Church Notes,	318
Acknowledgment of Donations,	319
The Magazine,	320

PRINTED BY N. ADSHEAD & SON, 11 UNION STREET
 AND 34-36 CADOGAN STREET, GLASGOW.

THE
Free Presbyterian Magazine
and MONTHLY RECORD.

VOL. XXXVII.

November, 1932.

No. 7.

The Righteousness of God.

THIS term is often used in Scripture. Sometimes it describes the divine attribute of God's infinitely just nature; at other times it is used in the sense of the righteousness that God requires and which has been provided in Christ for His people. It was this righteousness which the Apostle had in view when he declared that he was not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, because in it there was revealed the righteousness of God by faith. It is true that the infinitely righteous nature of God is revealed in the most solemn and arresting manner in what took place on Calvary's accursed tree, but this is not the righteousness that is imputed to sinners in the day of their justification, but the righteousness of Christ which God in His infinite wisdom provided for them in His wonderful salvation. By this righteousness is meant "all He became, did, and suffered to satisfy the demands of divine justice and merit for His people, the forgiveness of sin, and the gift of eternal life" (Hodge's *Systematic Theology*, iii., 142). This righteousness of Christ on the ground of which the believer is justified is the righteousness of God. It is so called to distinguish it from (1) the righteousness of man; (2) because it is the righteousness God required; (3) because it is the righteousness that God Himself provided through Christ.

1.—Man's righteousness. It will not be necessary for those who are familiar with their Bibles to stress the point that one

of man's great delusions is that he has a righteousness that is sufficient to take him to heaven. This is the rock on which the Jews suffered shipwreck. They refused to submit to God's righteousness and went about to establish their own righteousness. This, also, is the rock on which millions of so-called Christians in the Roman Catholic Church and in the Protestant Churches are making shipwreck for eternity. Whenever the question confronts the sinner—How can man be just with God? he makes an effort to answer it, and down through all the ages we have attempts made by man to answer that question and provide a righteousness that will be sufficient. In doing so man sets up his standard, and may, through strenuous effort and whole-hearted zeal, like Saul of Tarsus, reach the height of the standard he has set up, and be able to say with him "as concerning the law blameless." But alas! the man is building on a false foundation, and it had one tremendous defect—it is not God's high standard. When the sinner is made to realise that God requires him at all times, in all circumstances, and forever to love the Lord with all his heart, strength, mind and soul, and his neighbour as himself, his own righteousness is shattered and the falseness of the foundation on which he was building his hope for eternity is revealed as a thin covering over a bottomless chasm. No longer does he see a beauty in his own righteousness. He begins to realise how much it is in accordance with truth when the Scriptures describe it as filthy rags. No argument, however, from any man will bring this conviction to the sinner rejoicing in his own equipment for heaven. But when confronted with the high and broad claims of God's law, this dream fades away and leaves him hopeless and helpless. Such would be his case forever if God had not provided a righteousness as high and as broad to meet all the claims of justice—that righteousness is the righteousness of Christ revealed in the gospel.

2.—The righteousness God required. We have already seen that God required of man the love of all his heart, mind and soul to be given to his God. The task for man in his fallen

state, so far as his own efforts are concerned, is eternally hopeless—if this is the only way to heaven, man faces blank despair. Before him stands the high standard of heaven—all the love of his heart to be given to God—not for a second or two, but forever. What a rude awakening for the man who was complacently walking, as he thought, straight to heaven with a hope that was a lie. Like the Psalmist when awakened to realise the imperative claims of God's law he felt that God's commandment was exceeding broad. Nothing short of what God required would meet the sinner's case. But herein is Heaven's wonderful grace revealed that when man stood helpless and condemned God sent His own Son to provide the righteousness that He required. That righteousness was not needed by those who imagined they had sufficient of their own, at least as far as their sense of need was concerned, to take them to heaven, but oh! what an avenue of eternal hope it opened to those who faced the claims of that law with a dismay that would have been but the beginning of eternal despair had it not been for the revelation to them of God's righteousness in the gospel. All hope of getting to heaven by their own works was gone, and gone forever, when they were confronted with the claims of God's holy law. There were claims which were beyond their power to meet, a debt so great they could never pay it, and a penalty so awful that the very thought of it shut the door of heaven for ever in their faces if they were to meet it themselves. To a sinner in such a case the question—"How can man be just with God" is one of the most tremendous that was ever put to his conscience. But man's hope of getting to heaven by his own works must be effectively destroyed if the righteousness that God requires is to be real to him. The claims of that righteousness do not leave him with the faintest hope that now or forever he will be able to improve his case.

3.—The righteousness God provided. It is the glory of the gospel that it shows so plainly that the very righteousness which God required He provided through His own dear Son. He met the claims of God's law to its uttermost extent, and in

its height and depth. He paid the penalty that was forever beyond the sinner's power to pay. Such was the righteousness which the Just One dying for the unjust provided, and this righteousness is free to all who were given to Christ before the foundation of the world in the day of their effectual calling. It is not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His great mercy He saved us. The sinner's part in this wonderful provision is to receive the righteousness of God by faith. That is, as Halyburton puts it, when there is an acquiescence with God's way of salvation as set forth in the gospel, the sinner is receiving God's provision by faith. This way of salvation is suitable for all classes and conditions of sinners—learned and unlearned, rich and poor, civilized and uncivilized, for those who are not far from the kingdom and for those who have reached the utmost borders of the far country, for young and for old, for those who are in the full vigour of health and for those who are step by step swiftly going down the dark valley. It is this righteousness that is the theme of the epistle to the Romans. In it God's wonderful way of salvation is set forth—the sinner brought in guilty and condemned—a righteousness provided for such—its application and reception and finally the security of the justified sinner. The guilt is taken away not by an arbitrary sentence of the Judge of the whole earth but because the utmost claims of law have been met in the sinner's Surety, and hence the bold challenge—"Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" *i.e.*, in their justification, and the unanswerable reply is: "It is God that justifieth," and in this reply tremendous emphasis is laid on *God*. Guilt now being removed there is no condemnation—"Who is He that condemneth?" "It is Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen." This is the explanation of the removal of the sentence of condemnation—"it is Christ that died." Guilt is removed, the sentence of condemnation cancelled, and the seemingly inevitable and dreaded separation will never take place—"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" For an answer the Apostle takes a survey of all

possible agencies and circumstances that might cause separation and finds none. "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, "For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Roms., viii., 35-39). Of God's justified it may be truly said, as it was said of Naphtali: "O Naphtali, satisfied with favour, and full of the blessing of the Lord" (Deut., xxxiii., 23).

The Passover.

By DEAN LAW.

"It is the Lord's Passover."—Exodus xii. 11

THESE words send us back to the last night of Israel's bondage in the land of Egypt. The captives had suffered much, and long. The iron furnace had been heated by un pitying hate, and by unsparing hands. But God, in His high council, had decreed that a morn of deliverance should dawn. The appointed hour came. No power can now detain. Mad opposition becomes weak. The chosen people must go free.

Believer, stay your soul on the rock of the promises. They are as immovable as Him Who speaks them. At the set moment you shall march in triumph to your happy Canaan.

Let us, in thought, intermingle in the solemn scene. It was a night black in dismays,—terrible in judgments,—wild in affrights—keen in anguish. Throughout the whole of Egypt's empire every house was woe, every face was horror, every heart was

misery. Death forced all doors. Each eldest child was a lifeless corpse. There was no exception. The monarch and the slave alike bewailed, in bitter cry, their first-born's sudden and untimely slaughter.

It was a night, memorable too, in sweet displays of tender love. Israel's favoured sons were all assembled. But neither death nor fear was in their dwellings. They were equipped for departure from all cruelties and pains. They were feasting at a heaven-appointed board. They were rejoicing in a Gospel ordinance. They were partaking of a lamb slain. This exhibited, in loudly-speaking rites, all the certainties, and all the mercies of spiritual redemption. They realized present escape. They looked forward to future safety. They had much in hand. They had more in view.

Reader, let us with joy join these joyous companies. And may the Christ-revealing Spirit show Christ to us, as the substance, and truth, and glory of the spread feast!

God Himself selects the offering. His voice says, "They shall take to them every man a lamb" (verse 3). Thus Jesus is appointed, by heavenly wisdom, to be the one redeeming sacrifice. An elected Saviour is the strong foundation of salvation's pyramid. Blessed provision of our blessed God! Whither could we turn, if bidden to find or frame a guilt-removing victim? But grace meets every want. Hearken to the sure tidings: "Behold My servant, whom I uphold: Mine elect, in whom My soul delighteth" (Isa. xlii. 1).

Reader, God's only begotten Son is God's only appointed Redeemer. He only is called to bear His people's sins. For He only can sustain such load. He only is sent to make atonement. For He only has worthy blood to shed. He only is commissioned to bring in reconciliation. For He only can covenant with God, obey God, present Jesus in the arms of faith. Then your crimson stain is whiter than snow. Your soul is saved. Reject Him. And there remains no more sacrifice for sins.

The lamb must be a male of the earliest age (verse 5). These are signs of vigour in unbroken perfection. Truly He, Who is

to save, must be mighty in strength. For think, what mighty hindrances oppose. Whose arm can hold back the descending arm of Divine wrath? Whose shoulder can sustain the weight of countless sins? Whose force can close hell? Whose power can open heaven? Whose prowess can trample down Satanic rage, Satanic spirits, and Satanic men? In none but Jesus can such sufficiency be found. In Him it abounds to the overflowing of almightiness. The Father's voice proclaims, "I have laid help upon One that is mighty" (Psa. lxxxix. 19). The pledge is given, "He shall send them a Saviour, and a great One" (Isa. xix. 20). The fulfilment is in Jesus, "The great God and our Saviour" (Titus ii. 13). He is the Lamb in all the energy of perfect strength.

The lamb must be "without blemish" (verse 5). Jesus, while man below, was pure, as God in heaven's brightness. Sin strove in vain to soil Him. Foul temptations thickly fell, but left Him spotless, as the light of day. The Father's eye, which cannot look upon uncleanness, delighted in Him, as the clear mirror of His own glory. In Him, human nature shone in the lustre of Divine holiness. In Him was sinlessness, which could atone for sin. In Him was righteousness, which satisfied the law.

The lamb must be set apart for four days (verse 6). Thus in heaven, through eternal days, Jehovah's eye inspected Jesus, as the foreordained expiation for the foreseen evil. Thus on earth, through the days preceding the cross, He was tested by every judge: and thus, universal consent crowned Him with the crown of untarnished blamelessness. Even Satan, speaking by blood-guilty lips, proclaimed that there was no fault in Him (John xix. 4).

It must be slain by the whole assembly of the congregation (verse 6). Not one voice was silent, when the awful cry went forth, "Crucify Him, crucify Him." Believer, not one sin of all your life was absent, when He was dragged to the cross. All your transgressions strained the cords. They concurred to drive in the nails, and to make deep the wounds. Your iniquities brought in that death. That death brings in your life.

The blood must be sprinkled on the lintel, and on the door-posts of each dwelling (verse 7). The blood shed must be used. It must be openly exhibited, as a distinguishing sign. If the destroyer find the preserving mark, the foot of vengeance must pass over. If there be no shield of blood, the arrows of death must do their deathful work. Reader, the Gospel moves poor sinners to appropriating efforts. Christ is uplifted that eyes may look to Him. He is an open refuge, that feet may fly to Him. His blood flowed, that it may be taken by the hand of faith. Do you live a blood-besprinkled life? Is your soul at all times fresh dripping from this stream? If so, you safely dwell beneath salvation's wings. Justice cannot drag you to execution. The curse cannot blight you. The law cannot condemn you. Vengeance cannot slay you. The blood upon you cries, Away, stand back, no foe can touch, where I protect. But are you thus marked as Christ's? If not, arise speedily, and flee unto the wounded Lamb. The day is far spent; the night of ruin is at hand. The destroyer is at your heels. Each house unmarked was a house unspared. Each soul unwashed will be a soul undone. A remedy applied alone can heal.

Not one drop stained the floor. The blood of Jesus is the most precious thing in heaven—in earth. The Father honours it with all heaven's honours. The saints in light praise it with all heaven's praises. The saints on earth joy in it with all heart's rapture. Satan flees before it. Shall godless men treat it with rejecting scorn? Let them beware: on the heart it is a seal of life: beneath the feet it is a stamp of hell.

The flesh must be roast with fire (verse 8). We have here the keenest image of the keenest torture. The pain of pains is to be slowly mangled by devouring flames. But this is a faint image of what Jesus verily endured. O my soul, deal closely with the sufferings of your suffering Lamb. Let the amazing facts be the very fibres of your constant thought. Daily visit the garden. Hourly study the cross. What is the sight, what are the sounds, which there confront you? The God-man Jesus lies crushed to the earth. He bends beneath a weight of woe. The saddest

groans proclaim the writhings of a tortured soul. Each pore weeps blood. Agony could not more agonise. A piteous cry confesses that the black horrors of desertion blackened around Him. These marks of extremest anguish have clear meaning. The Passover is roast with fire.

Believer, Jesus is tormented in your stead. All the wrath, which all your sins deserved, is outpoured on Him. The vengeance of God descends in all its fury. The curse of the law exacts its utmost. The flames of hell tightly grasp Him. He endures the very miseries, which all His people must have endured, if they had wailed for ever in the lake of fire. Faith sees it, and exclaims, I live, for Jesus died. I cannot suffer. Jesus has exhausted all. Wrath cannot touch me, because it has touched Him.

Each inmate of the house must feed upon the lamb (verse 8). So every one who would be saved, must verily partake of Christ. To hear of Him: to touch the emblems of His dying love: to know His merits: to commend His worth, will profit little. Faith takes Christ—Christ Himself, as its own. It makes Him the very juice and substance of the inner man. Here is the believer's never-ending banquet. He feasts on Christ now. He will feast with Christ for ever.

A bone of it may not be broken (verse 46). Jesus indeed was hardly used. But no wounds marred the proportion of His stature. They weakened not the pillars of His strength. He lives all-vigorous in salvation's might. He stands the unbroken, the unblemished column of His people's hopes. The marvellous fulfilment, too, of this command, proves Jesus of Nazareth to be the true Passover of God. When the soldiers "came to Jesus and saw that He was dead already, they brake not His legs" (John xix. 33). The unwitting heathen unwittingly accomplished the Jewish type. Infidelity, what can you reply? Know, that as no ignorance is like yours; so no ruin will be like yours.

It must be eaten with bitter herbs and unleavened bread (verse 8). These requirements shadow out the combined graces

of penitence and sincerity. Reader, do you boast of hope in Christ? It only dwells in a heart ground to powder under sense of sin. Tears are the magnifying medium through which the cross attracts. Faith has no root in rocky soil. It only blossoms in the moist garden of a weeping spirit. They come in sorrow's sackcloth, who receive Christ's justifying robe.

Do you boast that Christ is your feast? Where is your unleavened bread? Sin loved, sin cherished, sin retained, turns heaven's food into hell's poison. A searching eye comes in to see the guests. Leaven in the hands, leaven in their mouths, leaven in their hearts, is a fatal mark. They must go away to the cell of hypocrites.

It must be eaten in the attitude of haste, and with equipment for departure (verse 11). The loins must be girdled. The feet must be shod. The hands must hold the staff. Here is the believer waiting for his summons with wings expanded towards his far-off home. Earth's ties are all severed. Anchors are weighed. The eye is strained for the signal, "Come up hither." Reader, are you thus ready? It is miserable to have aught to do, when doing-time is past. He is a foolish servant who has to seek the key when his Lord knocks. He is a poor advocate who has to find a plea when he is called to plead. When death comes, have nothing to do, but just to die.

Believer, may you hear, in these poor lines, the Spirit calling you to this Gospel feast. It is His voice, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast; not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness: but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). I deeply feel that without His light, His grace, His power, we cannot see, or know, or love, or serve, or glorify our Lord. But may He vouchsafe to open our eyes, that we may behold the rich plenteousness of our paschal board! May He show us the glories of Jesus, as the Lamb slain! May He enable us to receive Him as our All! May He fill our hearts with the longing prayer, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

The Sabbath.

By the Rev. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN.

(Continued from page 265.)

VI.

AS far as we have hitherto examined the Word of Inspiration, it seems to utter a clear and harmonious testimony in favour of the Sabbath. The obligation to keep every seventh day whole and entire, as a day of holy rest unto God, is acknowledged and enforced through every period of the Church's history, from the beginning of the world to the ascension of Christ into heaven. The institution of such a day was a part of God's plan in creation, and came recommended by His authority and example to the very first inhabitants of the earth. The patriarchs, we have reason to believe, observed it; and the ancient world at large, amid innumerable corruptions, still preserved some manifest traces of its existence. When the chosen seed, at the close of the patriarchal age, were released from Egyptian thralldom and placed in separation from the world, the Sabbath was immediately restored to them, as indispensable alike to their purity and their wellbeing. It was shortly after proclaimed from mount Sinai as one of the Ten Commandments, which contain the sum of all duty to God and man, and which, as being of permanent and universal obligation, were engraved by the finger of God on the two tables of stone, and placed alone in the ark of the covenant. The prophets abound with allusions to the Sabbath; and not only when addressing those who lived under the Jewish dispensation, but also when predicting events which could not happen till Gospel times, they speak of its observance as a leading privilege and characteristic of God's faithful people. Finally, Christ Himself declared the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath, first at the commencement of His ministry, when He proclaimed the object of His mission to be the fulfilment, not the destruction, of the law of the prophets, in both of which the Sabbath is enforced; and again at the close of His ministry, when He directed His disciples to

pray during the distress which, forty years after His departure, should attend the siege of Jerusalem, that they might not be constrained even then to make the Sabbath a day of travel and flight.

So far every thing seems confirmatory of the law of the Sabbath. The obligation, instead of weakening, appears rather to gather strength as we proceed. The last word of Christ regarding it, is one of the most impressive intimations to be found in all Scripture of the tender respect that should be paid to its dutiful observance; and the earliest and the latest dispensations of God alike concur in doing honour to the day which He has blessed. Where, then, or by whom has its authority been impaired, or its obligation cancelled. The apostles alone remain of all that the Christian Church looks to for direction in duty; and do *they* indeed utter a different testimony? Can they possibly have taken it upon them, or have been commissioned from above, to qualify in this particular the Word of Christ, to nullify the law and the prophets, and make void an institution to which all ages have borne witness? The mere statement of the question must carry its refutation to every well-informed and pious mind; but we shall look for a moment at the few things which are commonly alleged on the opposite side, to array the apostles against the Sabbath.

They are, indeed, very few. First of all, the apostle writes, in the 14th chapter of Romans, "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." If these words referred to the Sabbath, we should certainly be warranted to infer from them that we are under no obligation to keep it sacred, and that to make no distinction of days in that respect is a part of our liberty in Christ. But the very slightest inspection of the apostle's reasoning may convince us, that it is of things strictly and properly Jewish that he is there speaking. The distinction of days is introduced in connection

with distinction of meats, which is the more immediate subject of discourse; and that this was a Jewish ordinance, a part of the ceremonial institutions, and ordained only till the time of reformation, admits of no doubt. How can we, then, in fairness doubt that the other distinction referred to, and coupled with it, was of the same character? The Sabbath, as we have already shown, was no distinctive part of the Jewish dispensation. Even as imposed upon the Jews, it was engrossed in that part of God's revelations to them which were not typical and temporary, but moral and permanent. But there were many other days, connected with the feasts and services of the ceremonial worship, which the Jews were commanded to keep sacred, and which, no doubt, were shadows of good things to come, and as such to be abolished in Christ, along with distinctions of meat and the other parts of a typical worship. So far as such days were concerned, a man might either regard them or not; the command had ceased to be imperative, and each individual might be left free to follow the dictate of his own conscience. But that the primeval institution of the Sabbath—that day which God had from the first hallowed and blessed, and at every successive stage of His dispensations had again reinforced, as essential alike to man's wellbeing and His own glory—that this day should have been included among these distinctions of a short-lived and shadowy ritual, as a thing to be dealt with according to every man's private inclination, it utterly opposed to sound principle and the fair interpretation of the apostle's discourse.

The passage in the 2nd chapter of Colossians, which has always been strongly urged by those who deny the obligation of a Christian Sabbath, is precisely similar to the one now considered. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days: which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is of Christ." The *therefore*, with which this authoritative declaration is introduced, connects all the things here specified with "the handwriting of ordinances," which the apostle declared immediately before had been nailed to the cross

of Christ, and taken out of the way. Now, that that was simply and exclusively the ceremonial ritual, the yoke of carnal services connected with the tabernacle worship is on all hands admitted. But this being the case, it follows by undeniable consequence that the Sabbaths, and other things here particularised as severally belonging to the handwriting of ordinances, must have been such days of rest only as were ordained by the Mosaic ritual—the days of stated and solemn observance specially connected with its peculiar rites of worship. These all went by the general name of Sabbaths, and, no doubt, were designed to fall into abeyance with the solemnities out of which they grew. But *the Sabbath*, properly so called, was no part of the handwriting of ordinances, and neither began nor ended with the ceremonial worship. It was not a legal ordinance, but a creation-gift from God to man, intended to continue so long as the present framework of nature might last; and in its original character, a memorial of things past, rather than of a shadow of things to come. We have no ground, therefore, to suppose it to have been here included by the apostle among the ordinances abolished in Christ.

The same line of remark is applicable to another passage of this apostle in the epistle to the Galatians, in which he complains of the Judaising Christians, as “observing days, and months, and times, and years.” Under this description, he evidently speaks of them as keeping up the observances which were peculiar to the Jewish economy. Of these the weekly Sabbath, as we have said, formed no part; and the apostle himself, so far from being opposed to all distinction of days in this respect, elsewhere refers to the solemn meetings for worship on the first day of the week, as an understood part of the Christian life and character (1 Cor. xvi. 2).

But the grand argument for the abolition of the Sabbath under the Christian dispensation, as connected with the authority of the apostles, lies in the change of the day from the last to the first day of the week. That this was done at the very commencement of the Gospel dispensation, by the direction of

the apostles, and by them acting under the divine influence of the Spirit of Christ, is admitted on all hands. Without their authority, the general abandonment of the last, and substitution of the first day of the week, were it only for the services of public worship, could never have been introduced into the primitive Church; and we may be well assured they would never have lent their authority to such a purpose, unless possessed of a clear warrant and direction from above. But then we are told this change completely alters the nature of the thing. The Sabbath which was expressly confined to the last day of the week, was thereby abolished, and a new institution, consisting in a certain pre-eminence of the first day, brought into its place. How far this latter day was designed to be kept sacred, we can only ascertain from those portions of New Testament Scripture which speak of it; but we are by no means to confound it with the older and much stricter institution, which it supplanted.

Now, in answer to this strain of reasoning, we would first of all reply, that even if we could assign no adequate reasons for the seventh day being dropped, and the first substituted in its place, a mere change of that kind could hardly outweigh with any serious mind the long chain of arguments we have produced in support of a Sabbath, reaching from the creation of the world to the destruction of Jerusalem. This is a chain which links together the law and the prophets, Moses and Christ, patriarchal, levitical, and Christian times. And we should certainly be the less disposed to set aside this large amount of evidence, and to view the change in question as of itself conclusive against the existence of a proper Sabbath, when we know that the first day, on being appropriated to acts of worship, received the name of *the Lord's Day* (Rev. i. 10.) Why called emphatically His, but to show that He now claimed the same propriety in it that He had hitherto done in the seventh? If this day, as a day—that is, as a whole, and not some particular portion of it—is His, in a sense in which other days of the week are not, how can it possibly be so, unless as being set apart

for employments and services peculiar to itself and more immediately connected with His own glory? The distinctive character of the seventh day was just that it was God's day, because peculiarly set apart by Him for sacred purposes; and this character appears, by the very name in question, to be transferred to the first day of the week.

We answer again, that while the appointment of a weekly Sabbath carries the appearance, from the very first, of having been designed for all classes and generations of men, it is the seventh portion of time, rather than the precise day of the week, on which the revelations of God concerning it have sought to fix our attention as the main thing required in the ordinance. It is the remembrance of a seventh day, as distinguished from other six days constantly going before and coming after it, which forms *the substance* of the Fourth Commandment; and that this seventh day was to be regarded as the last, rather than the first day of the week, appears only in what is assigned as the original ground of the appointment. We have no reason, but rather the contrary, to think that the Lord intended it to be always and solely connected with His own procedure in the work of the creation. At the giving of manna in the wilderness, when the Sabbath was restored after a period of oblivion caused by the hard bondage of Egypt, the seventh day was counted from the time of God's beginning to bestow the manna. And instead of binding them to keep it as a mere memorial of creation, He more frequently enforced it on their regard as a sign of the covenant which He made with them, and a memorial of His goodness in delivering them from the land of bondage. After all this, is it not preposterous to suppose that the mere change of the day from the last to the first of the week, so as more distinctly to connect it with another and better covenant, and render it the fitting memorial of a higher and more glorious work, should utterly destroy its obligation or alter its character?

For we answer once more, that the change was not made capriciously, but for weighty and important reasons connected with the new work and covenant of God, as distinguished both

from that to which it stood immediately opposed in Judaism, and from that to which more remotely, but still more essentially, it stood opposed in creation. The observance of the last day of the week, as peculiarly set apart for God's service, though belonging, like circumcision, to an earlier state of things, had yet come, in great measure, to be connected with the covenant made at Sinai. It was appointed to be a sign of that covenant, and the remembrance of the day as a memorial of creation, as, in course of time, to be maintained among the Gentiles, the observance of it came ultimately to be regarded as a public testimony, on the part of the Israelites, of their adherence to the covenant made with their fathers. For the same reason, therefore, that God discontinued circumcision, and introduced baptism in its place, was it necessary also to substitute the first, in the room of the last day of the week, as a day of holy rest to himself. The worship of God on the seventh day, having become blended with Judaism, could not serve as a proper sign and testimony to the world of the faith of the gospel; and without such a change as was actually made, one important end of the institution must otherwise have been lost.

But if we look back from Sinai up to the work of creation itself, a still stronger reason suggests itself for this change. As a memorial of that work, the Sabbath cannot be now what it originally was; for sin has entered with its destroying powers, and laid creation, we may say, in ruins. The once beautiful and glorious inheritance is now given up a prey to the spoiler; and a memorial of it, while it tells us indeed of God's first purposes of goodness towards His creatures, tells us at the same time how these purposes have been opposed, and nature's life and glory have been brought down within the gulf of death. We need, for our peace and wellbeing, another work and covenant of God, to repair the ruin of the first, and lay the foundation of a higher, even an imperishable glory. And as we have this in the work of Christ, so we have the memorial of it in the Sabbath, transferred from the last to the first day of the week. For on that day Christ arose again from the dead, resting from

all His labours in the mighty work of redemption—the first-fruits of them that sleep, the earliest example of revived and glorified humanity, and by the very act begetting all who believe on His name to the lively hope of an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away. How befitting, then, and how delightful the change! Instead of taking occasion from it to impair or destroy the Sabbath, it should but endear to us that blessed day the more. For it tells now, not so much of a paradise that has been lost, as of a better paradise that has been won—not so much of a covenant broken and a heritage spoiled, as of a covenant for ever ratified by the blood of Christ, and a kingdom that never can be moved. If the corruptible work and covenant of nature had by Divine appointment its sabbatical sign and memorial, must not this higher work and covenant much rather have it? And if we refuse now to enter into the fellowship of Christ's rest, by hallowing the day which He has set apart in His Church for spiritual rest and blessing, what is it in effect but to cut ourselves off from the hope of his redemption and declare our light esteem of His finished work?

We conclude, therefore, that it is now, as it ever has been the will of God, that one whole day in seven should be kept holy to Himself; that since the resurrection of Christ, this has been divinely appointed to be the first day of the week; and that this change, while it could do nothing to weaken the obligation of a proper Sabbath, was both necessary to make the observance of a Sabbath conducive to some of the ends for which it was appointed, and also gives to it a character which cannot fail greatly to enhance and endear its sacredness to every child of God.

Novel Reading.

BY AN AMERICAN AUTHOR.

FEW persons suspect how many novels are written, and printed and sold. There are about five thousand five hundred offered for sale in this country. If a man were to read one

a week for seventy-five years, he would not be through the list. There are, of course, many novel-readers. Something on a great scale will be the result. What will it be; good or evil? Let us see.

It is natural to enquire, Who write novels? A few pious persons have written works which are sometimes called novels. But they are too serious for the gay, and too gay for the serious. So they are seldom read. Others are written by moral persons, who really seem anxious to teach some truth in an easy way. But nearly or quite all such are thought dull; and so they lie, covered with dust, on the shelves of the bookseller, are sent to auction, and used as waste paper. The popular novels of our day are, to a great extent, written by men who are known to be lax in principle. England and France contain no men who are more free from the restraints of sound principles than their leading novelists. They are literal and "literary debauchees."

But do not novels contain many good things which cannot be learned elsewhere? I answer, they do not. It is confessed that they never teach science. It is no less true that they pervert history, or supplant it by fiction. This is throughout true of Walter Scott, who has excelled all modern novelists in the charms of style.

The literature of novels is commonly poor, and that of the best cannot compare with the standard English and French classics. Even Scott's best tales are intended to ridicule the best men, and to excuse or extol the worst men of their age. Like Hume, he was an apologist of tyrants, whose crimes ought to have taken away both their crowns and their lives. I beseech you not to read novels. I will give you my reasons.

1. Their *general tendency* is to evil. They present vice and virtue in false colours. They dress up vice in gaiety, mirth, and long success. They put virtue and piety in some odious or ridiculous posture. Suspicion, jealousy, pride, revenge, vanity, rivalries, resistance of the laws, rebellion against parents, theft, murder, suicide, and even piracy are so represented in novels as

to diminish, if not to take away the horror which all the virtuous feel against these crimes. Almost all that is shocking in vice is combined with some noble quality, so as to make the hero on the whole an attractive character. The thief, the pirate, and especially the rake are often presented as successful, elegant and happy. Novels abound in immodest and profane allusions or expressions. Wantonness, pride, anger, and unholy love are the elements of most of them. They are full of exaggerations of men and things. They fill the mind with false estimates of human life. In them the romantic prevails over the real. A book of this sort is very dangerous to the young, for in them the imagination is already too powerful for the judgment.

2. Novels beget a *vain turn of mind*. So true is this that not one in a hundred of novel-readers is suspected, or is willing to be suspected, of being devout. Who by reading a novel of the day has ever inclined to prayer or praise? Novel-reading is most unhappy in its effects on the female mind. It so unfits it for devotion, that even in the house of God levity or tedium commonly rules it. Thus practical atheism is engendered. The duties of life are serious and weighty. They whose trade is to trifle and to nourish vanity, cannot be expected to be well informed, or well-disposed respecting serious things. However much novel-reading may weep over fictitious misery, it is found that they generally have little or no sympathy with real suffering. Did you ever know a mother to send away a sick child, or a daughter to neglect a sick mother, for the purpose of finishing a novel? If irreligion and impiety do not flourish under such influences, effects cannot be traced to causes.

3. The price of these books is often low, yet the cost of them in a lifetime is very great. Miss W. borrowed some books, yet she paid seventy dollars in one year for novels alone. Doing this for fifteen years, she would spend one thousand and fifty dollars. Yet her nephews and nieces were growing up without an education. Mrs. L. stinted her family in groceries that she might have a new novel every month. Mr. C. pleaded want of means to aid the orphan asylum, yet he paid more than

sixty dollars a year for novels for his daughters. Novels have, in the last five years, cost the people of the United States from twelve to fifteen millions of dollars. For one, they have paid thirty thousand dollars. This waste is wanton. No good is received in return.

4. Novel-reading is a great *waste of time*. Nothing is so valuable as that which is of great use, yet cannot be bought with anything else. We must have time to think calmly and maturely of a thousand things, to improve our minds, to acquire the knowledge of God, and to perform many pressing duties. The business of life is to act well our part here, and prepare for that solemn exchange of worlds which awaits us. He whose time is spent without economy and a waster on trifles will awake and find himself undone and will "mourn at the last, when his flesh and his body are consumed, and say, 'How have I hated instruction and my heart despised reproof.'"

5. The effects of novel-reading on *morals* are disastrous. Many young offenders are made so by the wretched tales which now abound. In one city, in less than three months, three youths were convicted of crimes committed in imitation of the hero of a novel. Here is a court of justice in session. Blood has been shed. Men are on trial for their lives. All the parties involved are intelligent and wealthy. The community is excited. Crowds throng the court-room from day to day. The papers are filled with the letters which led to the tragical end of one, and the misery of many. The whole scene is painful in the highest degree. Among many witnesses is one of manly form, polished manners and hoary locks. Even the stranger does him reverence. His country has honoured him. He must testify, and so sure as he does, he will tell the truth; for his honour and blood are concerned. He says: The husband of my daughter was "honourable, kind and affectionate," and if my daughter has been in an unhappy state of mind I attribute it to the impure works of "Eugene Sue and Bulwer." All these cases have been judicially investigated and published to the world. They have filled many a virtuous mind with horror, and every judicious parent with concern.

Nor is novel-reading a wholesome recreation. It is not a recreation at all. It is an ensnaring and engrossing occupation. Once begin a novel, and husband, children, prayer, filial duties are esteemed trifles until it is finished. The end of the story is the charm. Who reads a novel a second time? Some say others do it, and so may we. But others are no law to us. The prevalence of an evil renders it the more binding on us to resist the current. Novel-reading makes none wiser, or better, or happier. In life it helps none. In death it soothes none, but fills many with poignant regrets. At the bar of God no man will doubt that madness was in his heart when he could thus kill time and vitiate his principles.

Dr. M'Crie's Criticism of Sir Walter Scott on the Covenanters.

DURING the month of September, both from Press and platform, we have had a deluge poured forth to the memory of Sir Walter Scott; even St. Gile's Cathedral, which heard the gospel from the lips of Knox, opened its doors to commemorate the hero of the hour. Scott's fame rests chiefly on his eminence as a writer of romances—a very poor foundation at best. It is true that his works now no longer enjoy the popularity they once had. They are too tame for the taste of the moderns, who like something more spicy with its appeals to the morbid instincts of our fallen nature. Scott, no doubt, had many estimable qualities as a man, but we consider it our duty to call attention to one of the greatest dis-services ever he did to Scotland, all the more so, especially for the sake of teachers, scholars and others, that in all the eulogies poured forth we have seen no reference to the unjust attack he made on the Covenanters. The world has its idols, and to them it will pay its homage, but it is the memory of the righteous which will be held in everlasting remembrance, and we have no doubt but

this will hold true of the Covenanters notwithstanding all that Sir Walter Scott did to hold them up to ridicule and contempt.

The famous criticism of Dr. M'Crie, levelled at Sir Walter Scott's treatment of the Covenanters and their persecutors in *Old Mortality*, though now almost forgotten, is of sufficient interest to have it recalled when so much is being written about the famous writer. The authorship of the romances which were coming from the press had not yet been divulged when *Tales of My Landlord* appeared. And in this connection it is interesting to note that Dr. Andrew Thomson, St. George's, Edinburgh, in writing to Dr. M'Crie urging him to write a review of *Old Mortality*, indicated that it was his opinion that Walter Scott was the author of these works. Dr. M'Crie, at his friend's suggestion entered on the congenial task of defending the Covenanters and exposing their persecutors. No one was better equipped for the task. M'Crie had just sprung into literary fame by his *Life of Knox*, which had captured the literati of Edinburgh and given M'Crie a place as a recognised historian of Scottish Reformation history.

In a letter to Dr. Thomson, though hesitating to embark on the task, M'Crie indicates his intention to undertake the work. "After a slice of the fattest and nicest bit," he writes, "of the flesh of Cleishbotham, Claverhouse, Dalziel, and other savage wild animals, I have, I confess, a greater longing to be at them, and I could instantly fall on without waiting for your formal concurrence and directions." He fully recognises he has quite a task on hand, but the man who resurrected the fame of John Knox was not the one to stand by when the reputation of those he revered was held up to ridicule, and the character of their persecutors held forth as praiseworthy. The first part of the Review appeared in the *Christian Instructor* for January, 1817, and it was continued in the two succeeding numbers for February and March. Though the articles appeared anonymously, the author was immediately spotted by the public. The review, though written when he was suffering from a severe illness, was in keeping with the thoroughness that characterised all M'Crie's

historical writing. It created a sensation when it appeared, and it did much to wipe out from the minds of many who had read *Old Mortality* as pleasant history, that they had been reading history at all. It produced the impression on the minds of its readers who had read *Old Mortality* that instead of the novel presenting an entertaining piece of fiction founded on history, that it was in reality a libel and a ridiculous caricature of the opinions and actions of the Covenanters. M'Crie, in defending the Covenanters, is careful to point out that neither in their words nor in their actions did they speak and act wisely at all times, but to condemn them as a band of fanatics only to be laughed at was more than he would allow. To him they were men engaged in a titanic struggle for civil and religious liberty, and if, at times, they acted unwisely this might to a great extent be traceable to the oppression from which they suffered.

Scott was strongly prejudiced against the Covenanters. It was, therefore, impossible that he could do justice to them. In a letter to Southey, he says: "I had many Cavalier prejudices instilled into me, as my ancestor was a Killiecrankie man." His mind is further revealed in the letter from which the foregoing words have been quoted. "As for my good friend, Dundee," he writes, "I cannot admit his culpability in the extent you allege; and it is scandalous in the Sunday bard to join in your condemnation, and yet come of a noble Graeme! I admit he was *tant soit peu* savage, but he was a noble savage; and the beastly Covenanters against whom he acted hardly had any claim to be called men, unless what was founded on their walking upon their hind feet. You can hardly conceive the perfidy, cruelty and stupidity of these people, according to the accounts they themselves have preserved." The man who gave vent to such sentiments ruled himself out of court in the minds of all unprejudiced men as an interpreter of the sayings and actions of the Covenanters, yet it is from his pages thousands have formed their opinions of the Covenanters. The condemnation of a whole body of men without one word of qualification shows a narrower outlook than the men he was condemning.

Scott was severely hit by M'Crie's criticism, and though at first he assumed an air of high superiority and announced that he had no intention of reading the review, as the following extract shows, yet so damaging was the effect that Scott had to make some reply. He thus refers to M'Crie's attack and his determination not to read it: "The author of a very good Life of Knox, has, I understand, made a most energetic attack upon the score that the old Covenanters are not treated with decorum. I have not read it, and certainly never shall. I really think there is nothing in the book that is not very fair and legitimate subject of raillery. . . . As for the consequences to the author, they can only affect his fortune or temper—the former, such as it is, has been long fixed beyond shot of these sort of fowlers, and for my temper I considered always that by subjecting myself to the irritability which much greater authors have felt on occasions of literary dispute, I should be laying in a plentiful stock of unhappiness for the rest of my life. I therefore make it a rule never to read the attacks made upon me." This ostrich-policy, however, had to be set aside on this occasion at least, as Lochart informs us in his Life: "He soon changed his purpose, and finally devoted a very large part of his article for the *Quarterly Review* to an elaborate defence of his own picture of the Covenanters" (vol. iv., 34). Scott did his best in his reply to parry the keen thrusts of his well-equipped opponent, but M'Crie was more than a match for him in a field where he was very much more at home than the novelist.

Dr. M'Crie met Sir Walter after the review appeared, but there was no apparent resentment on the part of the novelist to the historian; in fact, according to Dr. M'Crie's version, there was the same frankness and cordiality as before. Reference has already been made to M'Crie's qualifications for dealing with the subject in hand. Though a minister of one of the smallest Presbyterian bodies in Scotland—the Constitutional Presbytery—he had risen to fame by his masterly Life of John Knox. The mastery of the subject displayed, the skill with which the historical material was marshalled and the whole

dignified treatment of the subject placed M'Crie at once in the front rank of Scottish ecclesiastical historians. This was the man who entered the lists against Sir Walter Scott. M'Crie showed that Sir Walter relied too exclusively on his imagination for his facts. Unfortunately, for the sake of truth, thousands read *Old Mortality* who never heard of M'Crie's review, to say nothing of reading it.

Sir Walter, in his effort to make the persecutors of the Covenanters appear as gentlemen with many estimable qualities, instead of the fierce, ruthless soldiers of the popular imagination, had a task that was far beyond his pen. A journalist, recently in hitting off a fellow-journalist who had been endeavouring to paint a certain politician in a whiter hue than his opponent deemed just and honest, described the process as a case of whitewashing black sheep. The fact that the process is unknown does not rob the figure of its significance as suggestive of impossibility. It was such a task Sir Walter undertook when he essayed to put in a good word for the persecutors. This was one of the openings in his armour which M'Crie took full advantage of, and he had quite sufficient material at his hand to show up Claverhouse, Johnston of Westerraw, Turner, Bannatyne, Dalziel, Grierson of Lag and others of the same fraternity, in rather a lurid and an unholy light. He made use with great effect of the shootings of John Brown of Priesthill and Andrew Hislop; and showed that it will take more than all the water in Scotland to wash the bloodstains from the hands of the persecutors; for powerful though the pen of Scott was, this was a task beyond its power.

It is rather difficult to select any particular passage from the Review as characteristic of the style and indicative of the use M'Crie made of his historical material. The impression left on the mind of the reader is one of respect for the minuteness of the historian's knowledge and his skill in making use of the vast material that he has at hand for the purpose of proving his contention. The following passage may be quoted as showing how he deals with Sir Walter's plea for Claverhouse, as set

against the vindictive spirit shown by Dalziel: "The author frequently quotes proverbs, and he may perhaps have heard of one which is not without its meaning—Better a black devil than a white. Where two characters are noted or even suspected for cruelty, we would far sooner throw ourselves on the mercy of him who is of severe brow and harsh manners than of him whose real dispositions are concealed under a smiling countenance and the most fawning address. We have in our eye facts directly bearing upon the case under consideration. Dalziel was guilty of great cruelties; yet there is at least one instance which shows that his innate severity, hardened by a long course of barbarous service, was not altogether unsusceptible of humane impressions, and that he could treat even a puritanical prisoner with generosity. John Paton was a captain in the Presbyterian army at Pentland, and on that occasion had fought sword in hand with Dalziel, whom he had encountered on the field. When he was brought into Edinburgh as a prisoner after the battle of Bothwell, a soldier upbraided him with being a rebel, to whom he mildly replied, 'I have done more for the king than perhaps you have done,' referring to the battle of Worcester, where he had fought for Charles. Dalziel, overhearing the conversation, said, 'Yes, John, that is true,' and, turning to the soldier, struck him with his cane and told him that he would teach him other manners than abuse such a prisoner. He then expressed his sorrow for Paton's situation, said he would have set him at liberty if he had met him on the way, and promised that he would yet write to the king for his life. Paton thanked him, but added, 'You will not be heard.' 'Will I not,' replied the General, 'if he does not grant me the life of one man, I shall never draw the sword for him again.' It is said that he obtained a reprieve for Paton; but he was not able to procure his life. Now, we know of no instance of Claverhouse doing an action of this kind, except in the fictions of the tale before us. We have mentioned it to show that the Presbyterian writers, who have recorded it, were not disposed to overlook any act of clemency towards them

on the part of those who had been the instruments of their greatest sufferings, and also to show how grossly our author has blundered in the comparison which he has drawn between the characters of these two officers."

In his last article M'Crie summarises his criticism. "We flatter ourselves," he says, "that we have satisfactorily established the two leading positions that we advanced at the beginning of the review—the gross partiality which the author has shown to the persecutors of the Presbyterians, and the injustice which he has done to the objects of persecution. We have produced undeniable proofs of the former, in his withholding a just view of the severities and cruelties which they perpetrated, softening them in the representations which he has given, and exhibiting the character of some of the chief oppressors in such a light as to recommend them to the admiration of his readers. We have examined his representation of the Presbyterians or Covenanters, and have found it, in numerous instances, to be unfair, false, and grossly exaggerated. Instead of being the ignorant, foolish, and violent fanatics which he has held them out to be, we have shown that information was extensively diffused among them; that they were a sober and religious people; that their contendings and sufferings were directed to the support of the kindred cause of religion and liberty; and that the instances of extravagance and violence really committed were confined to a few, and exorted by grievous and insufferable oppression. We have also shown that the work is disfigured with profaneness, and that the author has used freedoms with religion that the sacred language of the Scriptures, unjustifiable in any book, but altogether inexcusable in one that is intended for popular amusement. . . . It appears to us that there is something extremely presumptuous and assuming in the very attempt to select the characters and proceedings described in this Tale as a subject for ridicule and burlesque; as if, in the opinion of sensible men of all parties, they were completely indefensible, and as if the truth of the facts which the author has brought forward, and the view which he has

taken of them, were already placed beyond all reasonable doubt or contradiction. We trust, however, that the good sense of our countrymen, the information which they possess, and the regard which they still cherish to the cause of religion and freedom, will counteract the poison."

M'Crie's Review was reprinted in volume iv. of the collected edition of his works (Edinburgh, 1857).

Memoir of the Rev. Neil Cameron,

THE printers inform us that this book is expected soon to be ready for distribution. It consists of three chapters of Mr. Cameron's autobiography with two additional chapters bringing the events of his life down to the date of his death in March last. In addition, there is a collection of letters written to friends in times of bereavement, etc. The two biographical sketches of Ewen Cameron, Camusallach, and Allan Macpherson, Laga, which first appeared in the Magazine, are re-printed in this volume. It also contains the reprint of two lectures on church matters, four English and two Gaelic sermons. The book is nicely printed and bound. The price is 3s. 6d., or post free, 3s. 10½d, which is very low for a book of over 300 closely printed pages. Parcels are being sent out to our ministers and missionaries, from whom prospective purchasers may get copies and thus save themselves the cost of postage. The book may be also ordered through the Editor, Free Presbyterian Manse, Oban.

Short Gleanings.

CHRIST THE JUDGE OF ALL.

There are five things in this Judge which make His wrath more dreadful. 1. He is such a Judge, that the power of the most powerful cannot daunt. 2. He is such a Judge, that the wealth of the most wealthy cannot bribe. 3. He is such a Judge, that the wit and subtilty of the wisest and most subtle

cannot delude. 4. He is such a Judge, that there is no appealing from His sentence. 5. He is such a Judge, that there is no repealing of His sentence—Job xix. 25.—*Caryl*.

SATISFYING THE THIRST.

When a man goes thirsty to the well, his thirst is not allayed merely by going there. On the contrary, it is increased every step he goes. It is by what he draws out of the well that his thirst is satisfied. And just so, it is not by the mere bodily exercise of waiting on ordinances that you will ever come to peace, but by tasting of Jesus in the ordinances—whose flesh is meat indeed, and His blood drink indeed.—*McCheyne*.

Nadur an Duine 'na Staid Cheithir Fillte.

CEANN II.

TRUAIGHE STAID NADUIR AN DUINE.

(Continued from page 274.)

1. Dhuibh-sa a ta fathast ann an staid neo-iompaichte sheir-minn a' chaismeachd; agus bheirinn rabhadh dhuibh gu sealltainn ribh féin, am feadh fathast a ta earbsa ann! sibhs' a' chlann feirge! na gabhaidh fois ann an staid thruaigh so; ach teichibh a chum Iosa Crìosd, an aon didein. Deanaibh cabhag agus teichibh d'a ionnsuidh! Tha staid na feirge 'na h-aite comhnuidh ro theith gu mairsinn innte, Micah ii. 10. "Eiribh agus imichibh, oir cha'n i so 'ur comhnuidh." O pheacaich! am bheil fhios agad e' ait am bheil thu? Am bheil thu faicinn do chunnart? Chaidh am mallachd a stigh gu t'anam. Is i fearg do thrusgan. Tha na neamha a' fàs ni's dhuibhe 's ni's duibhe os do cheann. Tha'n talamh sgèth dhìot. Tha'n slochd a' fosgladh a beoil air do shon! agus nam biodh snathain do bheatha air a ghearradh air an àm so, tha thu gu 'n dochas o so a nach gu sìorruidh. A chuideachd, nam faiceamaid sibh a' cur cupain do phuinnsein ri 'r beul, nach ruitheamaid agus nach spionamaid as 'ur lamhan e. Nam faiceamaid an tigh r'a theine nu'n cuairt duibh, 'nuair a bha sibh 'nur trom-chadal a stigh, ruitheamaid d' ur n-ionnsuidh agus

spionamaid a mach sibh as. Ach, mo thruaighe tha sibh deich mìle uair ann an tuilleadh cunnairt. Gidheadh cha'n urrainn sinne tuilleadh a dheanamh ach 'ur cunnart innseadh dhuibh; cuireadh a thabhairt, earail, tagar, agus guidhe oirbhe, gu'n amhairceadh sibh ribh féin; agus bròn a dheanamh air son 'ur dìth-mothachaidh agus rag-mhuinealais, 'nuair nach urrainn sinn a thoirt oirbh rabhadh a ghabhail. Mur biodh dochas air son 'ur leigheis, bhiodhmaid 'nur tosd, agus cha phiannadh sinn sibh roimh an àm. Ach ged a tha sibh caillte agus ar 'ur dìtheachadh, tha dochas ann an Israel do thaobh an ni so. Uime sin, eigheam ribhse, ann an ainm an Tighearn, agus ann am briathraibh an Fhàidh Sech. ix. 12. "Pillibh gu Iosa Crìosd, a mach á staid so 'ur naduir.

Brosnuchadh. 1. Am feadh 'sa tha sibh anns an staid so, is eigin duibh seasamh no tuiteam a reir an lagha, no coimheangal nan oibre. Nan tuigeadh sibh so gu ceart, rachadh e tre 'ur eridheachan mar mhiltibh do shaighdean. B' fhearr do neach a bhi 'na thrail do na Turcaich, fuidh bhinn a bhi air a chur do shoithichean ramhach, no fuidh dhaorsa do na h-Eiphtich, na bhi fuidh choimheangal nan oibre a nis. Bha'n cinne-daonna uile air an tabhairt fuidhe ann an Adhamh, mar a chuala sinn roimhe: agus tha thusa, a' d' staid neo-iompaichte, fathast far an d' fhàg Adhamh thu. Is fìor, gu bheil coimheangal eile air a thoirt a stigh; ach ciod sin duitse, nach 'eil fathast air do thabhairt d' a ionnsuidh? Is eigin duit a bhi fuidh aon de 'n dà choimheangal sin; an dara cuid fuidh 'n lagh, no fuidh ghràs. Tha 'n uachdranachd a th' aig do pheacadh os do cheann, a' taisbeanadh gu soilleir nach 'eil thu fuidh ghràs; tha thu uime sin, fuidh an lagh, Rom. vi. 14. Na bi smuaineachadh gu 'n do chuir Dia a thaobh an ceud choimheangal, (Mat. v. 17. 18.; Gal. iii. 10.) Cha do chuir, "Ardaichidh e an lagh, agus cuiridh e urram air." Tha e air a bhriseadh gun amharus air do thaobhsa; ach is amaideach a bhi smuaineachadh, gu bheil thu uime sin air d'fhuasgladh uaithe: Cha'n 'eil, is eigin duit seasamh no tuiteam leis, gus an urrainn thu do shaorsa a thaisbeanadh o Dhia féin, an Ti

as fear-tagraidh anns a' choimhcheangal sin; agus so cha'n urrainn thu' dheanamh, a chionn nach 'eil thu ann an Crìosd.

A nis, a chum beachd a thoirt duibh air 'ur truaighe, anns a' chor so, thugaibh fa'near na nithe so a leanas; (1.) Le so tha sibh air 'ur ceangal thairis do bhàs, a thaobh bagraidh a' bhàis anns a' choimhcheangal sin, Gen. ii. 27. Air do 'n chumha bhi air a bhriseadh, tha sibh buailteach do 'n pheanas. Mar sin tha e 'gur fagail fuidh fheirg. (2.) Cha'n 'eil slaint air son fuidh'n choimhcheangal so, ach air chumha a ta neo-chomasach dhuibhse choimhlonadh. Is eigin do cheartas Dhé dioladh fhaotainn air son na h-eucoir a rinn sibh cheana. Sgrìobh Dia an fhirinn so ann an litrichean mora fola a Mhic féin. Seadh, agus is eigin duibh umhlachd iomlan a thabhairt do 'n lagh 'sam àm ri teachd. Mar sin a deir an lagh, Gal. iii. 12. "An duine a ni iad gheibh e beatha annta." Thig ma ta, O pheacaich! feuch an dean thu fàradh leis an ruig thu gu righ-chaithir Dhé. Sin a mach do ghairdean, agus feuch ma 's urrainn dhuit itealaich air sgiathaibh na gaoithe, greim a ghabhail air na neoil, agus dol a steach troimh na neamha faicsinneach sin! agus an deigh sin gu 'n streap sibh, no gu 'm bris sibh troimh bhallachan iaspeir na caithreach a's airde: Ni thu na nithe sin cho luath 's a ruigas tu neamh ann ad staid nadurra, no fuidh 'n choimhcheangal so. (3.) Cha'n 'eil maitheanas fuidh 'n choimhcheangal so. Is e maitheanas sochair a bhuineas do choimhcheangal eile, ris nach 'eil gnothuch 'sam bith agadsa; Gniomh. xiii. 39. "Agus trid-san a ta gach neach a chreideas air a shaoradh o na h-uile nithibh o nach 'eil e 'n comas duibh bhi air bhur saoradh le lagh Mhaois." Air do shonsa, tha thu ann an lamha fir-féich an-ìochdmhoir, a bheireas air seornan ort, ag ràdh, "Ioc dhomh na bheil agam ort!" agus tilgidh e ann am prìosan thu, gu fantuinn an sin gus an ioc thu an fheorling dheireannach; mur bi thu co glie as gu 'm faigh thu urras ann an àm a ta comasach air freagradh air son t' uile fhiacha, agus air saorsa thabhairt dhuit. Is e Iosa Crìosd a mhàin as urrainn so a dheanamh. Tha thu fantuinn fuidh 'n choimhcheangal so, agus

tha thu tagair: Ach ciod an steidh air am bheil thu tagar? Cha'n 'eil aon ghealladh air trocair no air maitheanas anns a' choimhcheangal sin. Am bheil thu tagair trocair air sgath trocair? Thig ceartas a steach eadar thusa agus trocair; agus tagraidh e bagradh bristidh coimhcheangail Dé, nach fheudar aicheadh, (4.) Cha'n 'eil aite air son aithreachais anns a' choimhcheangal so, as urrainn còmhnaidh a dheanamh ris a' pheacach. Oir co luath 'sa pheacaicheas tu, tha 'n lagh a' leagail a mhallachd ort, a tha mar chudthrom marbh nach urrainn thu air sheol sam bith a thilgeadh dhìot; cha 'n urrainn, ged a bhiodh do cheann 'na uisgeachan, agus do shuilibh 'nan tobraichean deoir, a' gul a là agus a dh' oidhche air son do pheacaidh. Is e sin "an ni nach robh an comas do 'n lagh a dheanamh do bhrìgh gu robh e annhunn tre 'n fheoil, Rom. viii. 3. A nis tha thu a' d' Esau mi-naomha eile, a reic am beannachd; agus cha'n 'eil àit aithreachais ged dh'iarr thu e gu durachdach le deuraibh, am feadh 'sa ta thu fuaidh 'n choimhcheangal sin. (5.) Cha ghabhar an toil an ait a' ghnìomh fuaidh 'n choimhcheangal so; ni nach d' rinneadh air son deadh-thoil, ach deadh oibre, tha 'm mearachd air a cheann so a' sgrios moran. Cha'n 'eil iad ann an Criosd, ach tha iad a' seasamh fuaidh 'n cheud choimhcheangal: agus gidheadh tagraidh iad an t-sochair so. Tha so dìreach mar gu'n deanadh aon feisd d'a theaghlach féin, agus an deigh dhoibh suidh aig a' bhòrd, gu'n tigeadh seirbhiseach duine eile a ruith air falbh o mhaighstir, gu h-an-dàna air aghaidh, agus gu'n suidheadh e 'nam measg: Nach d' thugadh maighstir na feisde achmhasan do 'n choigreach sin, "a charaid, cionnus a thainig thusa steach an so?" Agus, a chionn nach buin e do 'n teaghlach, àithnidh e dha falbh air ball. Ged a ghabhas maighstir ri deadh-thoil a leinibh féin air son a' ghnìomh, am feud seirbhiseach tuarasdail duil a bhi aige ris an t-sochair sin? (6.) Cha 'n 'eil gnothuch agaibh ri Criosd, am feadh 'sa tha sibh fuaidh 'n choimhcheangal so. Le lagh Dhé, cha'n urrainn bean a bhi posda ri dà fhear aig an aon àm: 's eigin an dara cuid gu'n dean bàs no litir-dhealaich an ceud phosadh a sgaoileadh, mu'n

urrainn dhi neach eile a phosadh. Mar sin is eigin duinn a bhi air tùs marbh do 'n lagh, mu 'n urrainn dhuinn a bhi air ar posadh ri Criosd, Rom. viii. 4. 'Se 'n lagh an ceud fhear-posda. Tha Iosa Criosd, an neach a thogas na mairbh, a' posadh na bantraich, a bha 'n deigh a cridhe bhriseadh agus a bhi air a marbhadh leis a' cheud fhear-posda. Ach am feadh 'sa tha'n t-anam anns an tigh maille ris a' cheud fhear-posda, cha 'n urrainn e dàimh-phosaidh a thagar ri Criosd; no sochairean coimhcheangal-posaidh, anns nach 'eil e fathast air tionnsgnadh. Gal. v. 4: "Cha 'n 'eil tairbhe 'sam bith ann an Criosd dhuibhse, a ta air bhuir fireanachadh tre 'n lagh, thuit sibh o ghràs." Is iad sìth, maitheanas, agus an leithide sin de shochairean, sochairean choimhcheangail nan gràs. Agus cha'n fheud sibh smuain-eachadh air a bhi a' seasamh a mach o Chriosd agus o choimh-cheangal a' phosaidh ris, agus a bhi fathast a' tagar nan sochairean sin; ni's mò na dh' fheudas bean aon duine a bhi tagar sochair ceangal-posaidh a chaidh a dheanamh eadar duine eile agus a bhean féin. 'San àite mu dheireadh, Faic an litir-dhealaich, a thugadh mach ann an cuirt nan neamh, an aghaidh nan uile a ta fuidh choimhcheangal nan gnìomh, Gal. iv. 30. Cha bhi mac na banoglaich 'na oighre maille ri mac na mna saoire. Coimeas ris a so rann 24. Cha 'n fheud oighreachan na feirge a bhi 'nan oighreachan gloire. Iadsan air am bheil cumhachd aig a' cheud choimhcheangal gu am fogradh a mach á neamh, cha 'n urrainn an dara coimhcheangal an toirt a steach ann.

Cunnail. Cha 'n 'eil e air an aobhar sin comasach dhuinn a bhi air ar tearnadh. *Freagradh,* Cha 'n 'eil, fhad 'sa tha sibh anns an staid sin: Ach, nam b' aill leibh a bhi mach as a' chor uamhasach sin, greasaibh a mach as an staid sin. Ma bhios mort-fhear fuidh bhinne bàis, cho fhad 'sa bhios e beò an taobh a stigh de 'n rioghachd, ruigidh an lagh air a bheatha; ach ma 's urrainn dha teicheadh, agus faotainn thar chuantaidh gu rioghachd uachdaran eile cha'n urrainn ar lagh-ne ruigheachd air an sin. Is e so bu mhaith leinn sibhse dheanamh: Teichibh a mach á rioghachd an dorchadais, "gu

rioghachd Mic a ghràidh-san; a mach á uachdranachd an lagha, gu uachdranachd a' ghràis: an sin cha bhi uile mhallachdan an lagha, no choimheangail nan gnìomh, comasach gu bràth air ruigheachd oirbh.

Brosnuchadh 2. O sibhse chlann na feirge! Tha bhur staid truagh; oir chaill sibh Dia, agus is call do-labhairt sin! “Tha sibh as eugmhais Dhia anns an t-saoghal,” Eph. ii. 12. Ciod sam bith a dh' fheudas sibh a radh as leibh féin, cha'n urrainn sibh a ràdh gur leibh Dia. Ma dh' amhairceas sinn air an talamh, theagamh gur urrainn sibh innseadh dhuinn, gur leibh am fearann, an tigh, no an treud spreidhe sin. Ach amhairceamaid suas ri neamh, an leat an Dia, an gràs, agus a' ghloir sin? Gu cinnteach, cha'n 'eil cuid no crannehur agad 's a' chùis sin. 'N uair a tha Nebuchadnesar a' labhairt mu bhailtibh agus mu rioghachdaibh, O cia mor-chuiseach a ta e labhairt. Babilon mhòr, a thog mise! mo chumhachd! mo mhorachd. Ach tha e 'g innseadh sgeula bochd, 'n uair a tha e labhairt mu Dhia, ag radh, bhur Dia-sa! Dan. ii. 47. agus iv. 30. Mo thruaighe; a pheacaich, ciod 'sam bith a th' agad, dh' imich Dia uait. Och truaighe an anama a ta gun Dia. An do chaill thu Dia! Mu chaill, (1.) Dh' fhalbh sùbh agus brìgh gach nì a th' agad anns an t-saoghal! an duine gun Dia, ciod 'sam bith a th' aige, is aon e a ta falamh, Mat. xxv. 29. Bheir mi dùbhlán do'n duine neo-iompaichte, teachd gu sasuchadh 'anama, ciod 'sam bith a ta e sealbhachadh, a chionn nach e Dia a Dhia-san. Fad uile laithe a bheatha, tha e 'g itheadh ann an dorchadais: Anns na h-uile staid tha mi-thaitneas uaigneach a' leantuinn a chridhe mar thanasg. Tha nì eiginn a dh' easbhuidh air an anam, ged is maith a dh' fheudta, nach 'eil fhios aige ciod e, agus mar sin bithidh e gu bràth, gus am pill an t-anam gu Dia, tobar an t-sòlais. (2.) Cha'n urrainn thu nì ceart 'sam bith a dheanamh air do shon féin, oir dh' imich Dia uait. “Dhealaich anam uait,” Ier. vi. 8. cosmhuil ri cìos as an alt, an crochadh ris, do nach 'eil duine faghinn feupn, mar a tha 'm focal ann an sin a' ciallachadh. Air dhuit Dia a chall, chaill thu tobar gach maith; agus le sin, gach uile

ghràs, gach uile mhaitheas, agus uile fheartan tearnaidh a Spioraid. Ciod uime sin is urrainn thu 'dheanamh? Ciod an toradh is urrainn dhuit a thoirt a mach ni's mò na's urrainn a' gheug a ta air a gearradh o'n fhreumh? Eoin xv. 5. "Dh' fhàs thu mi-tharbhach." (Rom. iii. 13) mar ni salach breun, a mhàin iomchuidh air son an othraich. (3.) Thainig am bas an aird gu t' uinneagan; seadh, agus shocruih e air t'aghaidh. Oir tha Dia, "aig am bheil beatha 'n a dheadh-ghean," (Salm xxx. 5.) air imeachd uait; agus mar sin dh' imich anam t'an-ama air falbh. Nach meall breun an corp 'n uair tha 'n t-anam air falbh! Ni's breine gu mòr na sin, tha t'anam anns a' chor so. Tha thu marbh am feadh a ta thu beò. Na h-aicheadh e, do bhrìgh gu bheil do chainnt air stad, gu bheil do shuilean air dunadh, agus gach gluasad spioradail annad air sgur. Tha t' fhiar-chairdean a tha faicinn do staid ri bròn, a chionn gu'n d' imich thu gus an fhearann thosdach. (4.) Cha'n 'eil fìor-charaid agad am measg uile chreutairean Dhé; oir a nis air dhuit deadh-gl an a' Mhaighstir a chall, tha'n teaghlach uile air eiridh a' d' aghaidh! Tha choguis 'na namhaid dhuit: Cha labhair am focal gu bràth gu maith umad: Tha luchd-muinntir Dhé a' gabhail gràin diot cho fhad 'sa tha iad a' faicinn an staid 'sam bheil thu, (Salm xv. 22.). Tha fiadh-bheathaiche agus clacha na macharach ann an coimheangal a' t' aghaidh, Iob v. 23.; Hos. ii. 18. Tha do bhiadh, do dheoch, agus t'eudach a' gearan air bhi seirbhiseachadh an truaghain a chaill Dia, agus a ta 'g am mi-ghnathachadh gu eas-onoir a thoirt dha. Tha'n talamh ag osnaich fodhad; seadh, tha'n cruthachadh uile ag osnaich agus am pein a' saothreachadh le cheile air do shon-sa, agus air son do leithid, Rom. viii. 22. Cha bhi gnothuch 'sam bith aig neamh riut; oir, "Cha teid air chor 'sam bith a steach innte ni air bith a shalaicheas," Taisbean xxi. 27. "Tha mhàin ionad nam marbh air gluasad shìos air do shon," gu do choinneachadh aig do theachd, Isa. xiv. 9. 'Sam àite mu dheireadh, Tha'n t' ifrinn air toiseachadh cheana. Ciod a ta deanamh ifrinn, ach a bhi air ar druidealh a mach o lathair Dhé? Imichibh uam a

shluagh malluichte! A nis dh' imich sibh o Dhia cheana, leis a' mhallachd oirbh! An ni sin a ta sibh a' ròghnachadh a nis, is e a bhios 'na pheanas duibh an deigh so mur pill sibh. Mar is i staid gràis, staid gloire 'na ceud-thoiseach; mar sin is i staid gun ghràs, ifrinn 'na ceud-thoiseach; ni, ma mhaireas i, a thig gu foirfeachd air a cheann mu dheireadh.

Ri leantuinn.

Notes and Comments.

Church Controversy in the "Northern Chronicle."—

Two articles, one from the pen of Rev. Andrew Sutherland and the other from Rev. P. M. Chisholm, both former Free Presbyterians but now of the Free Church, have recently appeared in the columns of the "Northern Chronicle" (Inverness), and have given rise to some controversy. Mr. Sutherland has, to his own satisfaction, most effectively disposed of all differences between the Free and Free Presbyterian Churches, and sees the way open for union. Mr. Chisholm is convinced that the question of immediate union is premature, not only with the Free Presbyterians, but also with the other two bodies with which, according to the Convener of the Free Church Union Committee, so much progress has been made towards that end. Mr. Chisholm holds that "an attitude of self-denial and tractableness must precede any union worthy of the name, and until then no argument or concession will rectify the evil of what is a pontifical attitude of superiority-complex rather than the settlement of detail, presently rampant in the Free Presbyterian Church, and possibly to some extent in the other Churches." In regard to Mr. Sutherland's contention, he should not forget that no number of telescopes placed to Nelson's blind eye could make him see the signal. As to Mr. Chisholm, questions have been asked: "Was it a superiority-complex that made him leave the Free Church and join the Free Presbyterian? And was it

another attack of superiority-complex that made him cause such disturbance in the Free Presbyterian Church and then leave and wander in an ecclesiastical no-man's land for a time. And what kind of complex was it that brought him back to the Free Church after all his witnessing for Second Reformation attainments? What kind of complex kept him from joining the Reformed Presbyterians?" These are rather pointed questions and whatever answers the new psychology might give, they seem to point in the direction that Mr. Chisholm is the last man that should speak about superiority complexes in churches or individuals. We may remind our readers that at last Synod a committee was appointed to deal with questions such as have been raised in the Press correspondence. The committee is at present at work on the task allotted to it, and will (D.V.) present its report at next Synod.

Church Notes.

Communions.—November—First Sabbath, Greenock and Oban; second, Glasgow and Halkirk; third, Edinburgh. South African Mission—The following are the dates of the Communions:—Last Sabbath of March, June, September and December. *Note.*—Notice of any additions to, or alterations of, the above dates of Communions should be sent to the Editor.

Call to Glasgow.—The call to Rev. R. Mackenzie, M.A., from St. Jude's congregation, which was signed by 869, came before a meeting of the Western Presbytery held at Achanalt on Tuesday, 11th October. Mr. Mackenzie placed himself in the Presbytery's hands, as he had no light on his path of duty. The Presbytery, therefore, refused to put the call into his hands. The Commissioners from the Southern Presbytery appealed against this decision to the Synod. A *pro re nata* meeting of Synod has been called to meet at the Free Presbyterian Church, Inverness, on Wednesday, 2nd November, at 11 a.m., to deal with the appeal.

Acknowledgment of Donations.

Mr. John Grant, 4 Millburn Road, Inverness, General Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks the following donations :—

Sustentation Fund.—M. B., Borreraig Parks, Glendale, £1; Mrs H. N., 8 Roy Block, Fort William, Ontario, 15s 3d; Friend, Abroad, £2.

Home Mission Fund.—A Sincere Wellwisher, 10s.

Colonial Mission Fund.—A Friend Abroad, £3.

Jewish and Foreign Missions.—A Friend Abroad, £5; A Sincere Wellwisher, 10s; Anon, Combric, £1; Interested, Tomatin, o/a Mrs Radasi and family, £1; C. M. W., per Rev. N. McIntyre, £5 11s 9d; "Friend, Vancouver," per Rev. Jas. McLeod (omitted to be acknowledged in July 1931), £3.

The following lists have been sent in for publication :—

Braes (Portree) Church Building Fund.—Rev. D. M. Macdonald, Portree, acknowledges with sincere thanks Collecting Card, per Mr. D. MacAulay, Contractor, Inverness, £3; Friend, 10s, per Mr. D. Nicolson, Elder, Braes.

Dingwall Congregation.—Mr. S. Fraser, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks a donation of £20 from the Misses C. and C. Urquhart, Springfield, Resolis, in memory of their mother the late Mrs Urquhart for the Funds of the Congregation.

Greenock Manse Purchase Fund.—Rev. James McLeod acknowledges with grateful thanks the following donations:—Nurse M., Greenock, £1; Mrs A. McN., 10s; Friend, Octavia Terrace, Greenock, 10s; Friend, Dumbarton, 10s; Miss M. McN., 10s; the following per Mr. J. Urquhart—F.P., Kilmacolm, 10s; Friend, Kilmacolm, 10s; Friend, Kilmacolm, 10s.

Finsbay Church Building Fund.—Mr. S. Mackenzie, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks the following donations:—Hull postmark, £1, per Mr. John Morrison; A. McL., Glasgow, 10s, per General Treasurer.

Plockton Church Building Fund.—Mr. Alex. Gollan, Treasurer, gratefully acknowledges the following donations:—Miss F. M., Temperance Hotel, Kyle, per Rev. N. McIntyre, £1; I. M., Cuaig, per Mr. D. Matheson, Missionary, 10s; Mrs F., Glasgow, £1; Mrs S., Glasgow, 10s; A. M., Glasgow, 5s; Miss McD., Glasgow, 5s; Mrs G., Partick, 10s; M. G., Lochgilphead, £1; A. F., Ardrishaig, 10s; Friend of the Cause, Glasgow, £1; Mrs B., Callander, 10s; Miss A. U., Resolis, £1; Miss C. U., Resolis, £1; Collecting Card, per Miss MacGillivray, Oban, £6 1s.

Raasay Manse Building Fund.—Mr. Wm. MacSween, Missionary, acknowledges with sincere thanks the following donations:—Friend, Gairloch, 10s; Friend, Kames, £1; A. McP., Gairloch, £1; Miss B. G., West Kilbride, 10s.

Staffin Church Building Fund.—Mr. A. Mackay, Missionary, acknowledges with grateful thanks the following donations:—

Friend, Raasay, 10s; Friend, Edinburgh, 10s; J. M. D., Glasgow, 6s; Mrs B., Glasgow, £1; R. M. D. and Mrs M. D., Carrickfergus, £1; M. M. D., London, £1.

Elgol Church Building Fund.—Mr. James MacKinnon, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks the following—Collecting Card, Luib Congregation, per Miss McLean, £1 7s; W. M., Glasgow, per Mr. Neil McLeod, 10s.

Uig (Stornoway) Manse Building Fund.—Mr. Norman Mackay, Treasurer, 31 Valtos, acknowledges with grateful thanks the following donations:—Friend, Raasay, £2; A. McA., Kyles, Scalpay, per Rev. M. Gillies, 10s; Miss I. M., Cuaig, Applecross, per Rev. N. McIntyre, 10s; the following per Rev. R. MacInnes, A. McL., North Tolsta, £1 10s; J. McA., Breasclete, 10s.

South African Mission Clothing Fund.—Mrs. Miller, West Banks Terrace, Wick, acknowledges with grateful thanks a donation of £1 from Miss M. McC., Kames.

The Magazine.

3s 9d Subscriptions.—Hugh McLeod, Hawthorn Cottage, Hill of Fearn; C. M. Cameron, Aultnasuth, Kyle; Miss M. A. Carmichael, Lonbain, Arrina; Miss C. Nicolson, Monzie Castle, Crieff; Mrs C. A. Mackley, 45 Collygate Road, Nottingham; Miss Grace Ross, 1 Gower Street, Brora; Miss J. MacAulay, Beaumont Crescent, Portree; Kenneth Cameron, P.O., Soay, Mallaig; Mrs MacLennan, 6 Strathfillan Terrace, Crianlarich; James McCuish, Grenitoh, Lochmaddy; Duncan McLean, 33-12, 209th Street, Bayside, N.Y.; Malcolm McLeod, 6369 11th Avenue, Rosemount, Montreal; Mrs Andrews, 24 Craven Road, Lancastergate, London; John McLeod, 61 Grant Street, Glasgow, C.3; Miss Fraser, St. Giles, Kingussie; Alick Nicolson, Middletown, Raasay.

5s Subscriptions.—Colin Macdougall, 35 School Street, Port Ellen; Miss E. MacGregor, Pultney Street, Ullapool; Mrs D. McLeod, Box 656, Prince Rupert, B.C.; John Mackenzie, MacAndie Buildings, Saltburn, Invergordon; Mrs Angus McLeod, Achina, Bettyhill; Miss Chris. MacKenzie, Seafield House, Lochinver; Mrs M. MacKenzie, Newpark, Clashnessie; Alex. McVicar, Littlestruth, Lochmaddy.

Other Subscriptions.—Mrs J. Mackay, 1 Achmore, Lochs, Stornoway, 2s; Ken. MacRae, Cuaig, Arrina, 4s 5d; Mrs J. A. MacKenzie, Pierhead, Shieldaig, 10s; Mrs Cameron, Lednaberichen, Skelbo, 4s; Alex. Finlayson, Dulton, Ontario, 4s 6d; M. Murray, Mission House, Isle of Soay, 3s; Mrs F. MacRae, Craighill, Kyle, 4s; John Mackintosh, 13 Elgol, Skye, 4s; Murdo McLeod, Borsam, Finsbay, 7s 6d; Mrs R. Russell, Docharn, Boat-of-Garten, 1s 9d.

Free Distribution.—Miss C. Nicolson, Monzie Castle, Crieff, 6s 3d; John McLeod, 61 Grant Street, Glasgow, 8s 9d; Misses Fraser, St. Giles, Kingussie, 9s 3d.