

THE
Free Presbyterian Magazine
AND MONTHLY RECORD

VOL. LXII.

June, 1957.

No. 2

Bishops for the Church of Scotland.

THE people of Scotland were made aware of the latest success of Episcopacy over Presbyterianism when the now annual Report of conversations between the Church of Scotland, Church of England, the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church of England, was made public on 30th April, 1957.

Many were shocked at the new proposals, which envisage "unity through mutual adaptation" in the relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches. These proposals will be debated by the governing Courts of the Churches involved, as in Scotland, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Our observations for this issue of the Magazine must of necessity go to the printers before the debate by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, which will have taken place in Edinburgh about the 22nd day of May.

The outstanding part of the proposals include the adoption of a form of Episcopacy by the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, with bishops chosen by each presbytery and initially consecrated by bishops from one of the Episcopal churches and by the presbytery acting through appointed representatives. Now, this bishop to be appointed over a presbytery is to be a permanent "Bishop-in-Presbytery," taking the place of the present Moderator of Presbytery who is appointed annually from among the ministers of the Presbytery. It is also stated that these permanent bishops will, of course, be members of the General Assembly, and that decisions on doctrinal and constitutional matters might have to require their consent.

The "peaceful penetration" method is being adopted to secure the gradual undermining of Presbyterianism in Scotland with a view to its ultimate elimination. As in the said Report, "No immediate action or decision is being asked from the governing bodies, beyond commending it to careful study and examination by the Churches according to their constitutional procedure." These terms delude no one,

with an informed mind and open eyes on the spirit and character of Episcopacy, in its determination to reimpose upon Scotland, the pre-Reformation state of affairs in the ecclesiastical realm. The present betrayal of Scotland by Church of Scotland dignitaries taking part in these disastrous conversations, have given the Anglicans the opportunity of inserting the bold proposal of bishops underneath the Presbyterian edifice; and this is only the commencement of the real, positive and active work of undermining and destroying the Presbyterian form of government still operating in the Church of Scotland.

The Anglicans are conceding practically nothing. This is what we expected and stated in so many words in our *Notes and Comments* in this Magazine a year or more ago, and so we find to-day that, "On the Episcopalian side, the development is proposed of a form of order in which the ministry and the laity would be closely linked together in decisions concerned with Church government and doctrine." This is very mild and ambiguous talk, when we think of the struggle and frustration evangelicals in the Church of England are meeting with at this very moment over proposed new Canons in their Church, which contain the very elements of popery. The Church of England laity are being brow-beaten and ignored, where their witness is voiced on the side of the retention of Reformation doctrine and practice as far as these are embodied legally in their Thirty-nine Articles. The Church of England laity have the greatest difficulty in even protesting, within the courts of their Church, against the celebration of the Mass, by Anglo-Catholic clergy in some of their parish churches. And on this point we said the other day to a Church of Scotland minister, who expressed his willingness to examine the question of the introduction of bishops into his Church, that the day may dawn, not so very far in the future, when the Mass might be celebrated in St. Giles' Cathedral in Edinburgh if things proceed the way they are doing. This may seem an extreme anticipation of things to come to some people. But it is happening under Episcopacy elsewhere in Britain, and why not in Scotland if the powerful Church of England and its High Anglican bishops get their way here.

Another serious revelation from these ill-conceived conversations is this: "From the Anglican side, it was clear to the conference that full inter-communion and unity could not be realised apart from Episcopacy." And so the unity of the Christian Church so much "cried up" by this Report, is to be a unity which cannot be realised unless the Anglicans obtain their own way and foist upon the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, Apostolic Succession and ordination of clergy by bishops, etc. The great theme and objective of unity is the one main plank of propaganda to the people of Scotland; and we have met this plea already in argument for allowing the proposal to introduce bishops to proceed unhindered. Let those interested in these

matters remember that the noise and clamour about Christian unity is about, not spiritual and gospel unity, but unity tied to Episcopacy.

Even at this time of writing, a few days after the publication of the said deplorable proposals, the unity envisaged, is even now in jeopardy, inasmuch as it already appears that the people of Scotland are sharply divided on the bishop question. At this present time, as far as we can gather, lay people in the Church of Scotland are shocked at the very thought of bishops; and it takes something quite unusual in ecclesiastical affairs to shock and rouse the indignation of the average Church of Scotland member or office-bearer. Such have expressed the view to us that the proposals about bishops will never be agreed to in their Church, but we have disagreed with their optimism. The fact is, that the mass of the lay people of the Church of Scotland are in darkness and ignorance about these conversations and undertakings with the Anglicans entered into on their behalf. And it seems that Free Presbyterians are more informed and aware of what has been going on, because of an interest in conserving the Witness for Truth and Reformation principles bound up with the Cause of Christ in the Scotland of John Knox, Andrew Melville and Alexander Henderson.

And a pertinent question arises to mind when we feel grieved and properly indignant at the betrayal of the Scottish Reformation today, and the question is—Will the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland revise its views on the inter-change of pulpits with Church of Scotland ministers?

In thinking of the legal aspect of the introduction of any Anglican office, form or procedure into the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, we were most agreeably interested in the action by Mr. J. H. Mackie, Conservative M.P. for Galloway, in his tabling in the House of Commons, on 30th April, 1957, the following motion: "That this House views with concern the proposals for the introduction of a modified form of Episcopacy into the Church of Scotland to be discussed by the forthcoming General Assembly, conflicting as they do with the Act of Security for the Presbyterian form of government of that Church, as laid down in the Revolution Settlement of 1690, the oath to maintain which inviolate has been the first act of every sovereign on accession to the throne since the Act of Union of 1707."

Mr Mackie acted with alacrity and knowledge when he tabled the above motion, and in such terms. One reputable newspaper stated that its appearance is significant as an indication of the feeling prevalent in some quarters. And surely the fundamental question of Her Majesty's oath on accession to the Throne has either been conveniently forgotten by those concerned in these conversations, or that they have further proposals to produce later on to alter the terminology of this particular Royal Oath. Suspicion is an obnoxious state

of mind when ill-founded, but we feel justified in entertaining suspicions regarding future activities of the Church leaders involved in these inter-Church conversations.

Much may be written, and much will be written on the many aspects of this matter, "Bishops for the Church of Scotland," and these are just two final observations we would make at this stage, and the first is, that Episcopacy will certainly get its way in the Church of Scotland, unless a majority of ministers and elders in the Assembly of that Church, speak and vote solidly *against a continuance of the conversations* concerned. Of course, a real leader is needed to unify and give power to an anti-Episcopalian movement. And the second is, that the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland has a legitimate interest in what happens relative to high ecclesiastical policy in the Church of Scotland. We are deeply concerned at every and any departure from Scriptural doctrine, government and practice, by the Church which holds and influences more people of Scotland than any other Presbyterian denomination, and more than all the other denominations together. We, as a small Presbyterian denomination, hold that we are in the direct line of the Scottish Church of the Reformation, and of the Disruption fathers, whose Bible, *Confession of Faith*, doctrine worship and Church government, we had, under God, conserved for us by the stand, Protest and Witness of the late Rev. Donald Macfarlane, in the Free Church Assembly of May, 1893. The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, thus holds in Scotland the faith of our godly fathers of the Reformation, who exposed and expelled from Christ's Church in Scotland in their day, the remnants of popery, and the system of Episcopacy with its attendant evils, and established Christ's Church in our land under the Scriptural and apostolic Presbyterian form of Church government. We therefore, and for other reasons also, feel it obligatory upon us to expose what is being imposed upon the people of Scotland in the name of Christian unity and which may well be a yoke and burden and a trouble to the people of Scotland, beyond the borders of the Church of Scotland itself.

May God arise and by His power through His Word, revive the Cause which is His own, in our beloved Scotland, the land of Reformers and Covenanters.

On Doctrinal Declension.

By the REV. DONALD MACLEAN, Portree.

I.—AUTHORITY OF GOD'S WORD.

THE vast majority of church-going people in Scotland are connected with the present Church of Scotland. They attend its services, take part in its worship and listen to the doctrines taught. To a greater or less extent, they take part in its activities and fondly hope that when

death will overtake them all will be well at last. It is obvious, therefore, that the Church of Scotland is either an organisation exercising an influence for the greatest good, or an instrument of the greatest harm. From the point of view of Biblical Christainity it would be an easy matter to show from the practices of this Church that it must be placed in the latter category. The practices of the true Church of Christ distinguish it from the world: indeed these very practices incur the hatred of the worldly-minded. "If ye were of the world," said Christ to His disciples, "the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world therefore the world hateth you."¹ The Church of Scotland is guilty of engaging in most worldly practices, and endeavouring to unite the world and the Church, thus manifesting the ignorance of divine realities reigning in the minds of both ministers and people.

Two instances of this may be mentioned. The Gateway Theatre in Edinburgh is run under the auspices of the Home Mission Board of the Church of Scotland. As the theatre and all it stands for belongs to the world that lieth in wickedness, such a circumstance occasions amazement in every Christian heart. At the recent anniversary of the opening of this theatre, it was stated that the Church of Scotland was the *only church in Christendom* which had a theatre in this sense! Such is the sad state into which Scotland has now fallen. Another practice indicative of this spirit is to be found in the erection of new churches, particularly in new housing areas. In these buildings, it is reported, a pulpit is erected at one end, while a platform is erected at the other. When the people are professing to be engaged in the worship of God they face the pulpit: when they are being entertained by some play or amusement they face the platform! This blatant attempt at facing both ways, and serving God and the world shews how little people at the present day understand of the essence of true godliness.

It should ever be remembered, however that as boils on the human body are evidences of poison in the blood stream, so these outward extravagances in practice are symptomatic of a deeper disease. The blood-stream of the Church is its doctrine. When the doctrine is pure and in accordance with the Word of God, then the practice may be expected to be a proper reflection of Christian conduct. When the stream of doctrine is contaminated by error, however, these outbreaks of inconsistent practice are inevitable. It is here one can find the primary cause for a professing Christian Church sinking to such a low level that the entertainments of the world have their part in its life, and not a voice raised in protest.

The 35th series of the Croall Lectures was delivered in 1949 by the Rev. W. D. Niven, D.D., LL.D., sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical

¹ John xv. 19.

History in the University of Glasgow, and a minister in the Church of Scotland. The lectures were published in October, 1953, under the title of *Reformation Principles after Four Centuries*. The present writer had intended to comment on this publication long before now, but pressure of other work prevented his doing so. The subject, however, appears to him to be of such importance that he feels it his duty to set before our people some of his impressions on reading a book which deals with matters of the greatest importance.

Professor Niven's lectures deal with two fundamental Reformation Principles—those of the Supremacy of the Word of God as the rule of faith and practice, and Justification by Faith alone. No one will deny the importance of these two principles. By returning to the Word of God as their only rule, the Reformers overthrew the false doctrine of Rome, cast out its idolatrous worship, and overturned the tyrannical form of government which had the Pope as its head. In its place they set up the Church of Christ, founded in its doctrine, worship and practice upon the Word of God, the precious light of which had shone into their souls by the unction of the Holy Ghost. By setting forth the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, the Reformers not only demonstrated God's way of salvation, but struck a mortal blow at the authority of the priesthood which was so largely founded on sinners obeying the priest in order to obtain the pardon of their sins. The very great importance of these two doctrines must appear to all, and any modifying of them on the part of the Protestant Church must be attended by the greatest dangers. Dr. Niven's book is an endeavour to show not only that a change of attitude has taken place, but also to indicate the present views of the Protestant Church in general, and the Church of Scotland in particular, on these two Reformation Principles.

It is evident that Dr. Niven welcomes the change and his book is written from this viewpoint. In his introduction, he mentions the ecumenical movement expressed in the World Council of Churches and wonders "wistfully whether there is any shade of hope that the *greatest breach of all* in which the Reformation of the sixteenth century eventuated can be healed."¹ These are ominous words and express the hope which lies deep in the hearts of many churchmen and which they know can never be realised as long as the Reformed Faith is held in its fulness. Whatever doubts we may entertain as to Dr. Niven's spiritual capacity for weighing the points at issue, we can approach this book with the knowledge that it contains a fair presentation of what is taught to the rising ministry in the Church of Scotland. In this connection, it is interesting to note that Dr. Niven thinks that the strong anti-theological movement with its slogan, "Back to Jesus," can be no longer maintained, "Because a Christianity which discards Paulinism turns out to be in many points vague and uncertain."² Put in

brief compass, the supporters of this theory held that Paul had superimposed ideas of his own upon the teachings of Jesus and, by discarding these teachings, they affected to get back to what they called "the simple gospel." Professor J. S. Stewart in his book *A Man in Christ*, also thinks that the idea should be abandoned and says, "Many of the assumptions on which the theory of a hiatus between Jesus and Paul rests can only be called precarious in the extreme."¹ As neither of these Professors, in our view, is a friend of the Gospel of Christ, their opinion on this point is of value if only from the controversial angle. The following quotation from Professor Stewart's books shows the darkness which floods his mind on spiritual truth, "God's wrath is God's grace. It is His grace smitten with dreadful sorrow. It is His love in agony. It is the passion of His heart going forth to redeem."²

In entering upon discussion of these two principles it is further to be noticed that it is not a fair method of assessing the principles of any movement to make use of isolated statements or views of its leaders. Every one knows that in the heat of controversy, statements were made by Luther and others which have given a handle to the enemies of the Reformation to charge the movement with unsound principles. But surely the proper method of discovering the Reformed position is to look at the principles as they became crystalized in the Confessions of the Churches. As far as Scotland is concerned, the Westminster Confession of Faith embodies the reformed doctrine and states these with a clarity and Scriptural fulness which has no been surpassed. It is these positions we are called upon to maintain and defend and it is from these positions that the Church of Scotland had sadly drifted with respect to the two points at issue.

In dealing with the canon of Scripture, Dr. Niven raises the question of the position of the Apocrypha. The books of the Old and New Testaments, contained in our Bibles, were considered by the Reformers to be given by the inspiration of God as the rule of faith and life. "The Books commonly called the Apocrypha not being of Divine inspiration are no part of the canon of scripture; and therefore are no authority in the Church of God nor to be any otherwise approved or made use of, than other human writings."³ This statement made the position clear and was set down in opposition to the view of the Papal church which, at the Council of Trent in 1546, included some of the books of the apocrypha in the canon of scripture. Obviously, it was most essential that a clear distinction should be drawn between human writings and the divinely inspired Word of God. Dr. Niven shows, however, that the climate of thought has changed and that there is a great desire now to read the apocrypha and give it a place that it did not have before. He mentions that in the *Revised Church Hymnary* there is a canticle from a passage of the apocrypha, "Let

¹ p. 276. ² p. 221. ³ C. of F., iii.

us now praise famous men." In passing, it may be remarked that this gives an instance of how error is often introduced through hymns. He also cites another verse from the apocrypha in the burial service of the Church of Scotland. "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God and there shall no torment touch them . . . they are in peace." He also discloses that the new translation of the Bible in Britain is to include the apocrypha. Giving such a place to the apocrypha is a distinctly retrograde step and many will conclude that it is part of the inspired Word of God. Is this not a step towards the position of the Church of Rome?

In his chapter on *The Bible and the Word of God*, Dr. Niven reaches the core of the controversy between the modernist and the Reformed Faith. The question is on the inspiration of God's Word and its consequent authority. It is clear, not as a mere theory but as a fact of history that loose teaching on the inspiration of God's Word weakens its authority in the consciences of men. It is this, above all else, which has emptied the churches in Scotland and turned our nation into a people whose ignorance of divine things is appalling. In discussing this subject, it is necessary to draw a distinction between inspiration and illumination. By the former we mean that God is the Author of Scripture and that the Holy Spirit so led men that they recorded infallibly and inerrantly His mind, giving us the Bible as the Word of God; "and therefore it is to be received because it is the Word of God."¹ That this is the Reformed position is clear from the Confession which says that the Old Testament in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek "being immediately inspired by God, and by His singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic." ² By illumination, on the other hand, we mean the work of the Holy Spirit enlightening the mind in the knowledge of divine things. This is referred to also in the Confession in the following words: "yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the *infallible* truth thereof (i.e., of the Scripture) is from the *inward* work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts."³ In other words, inspiration is a special influence of the Holy Spirit granted to the writers of the Bible to ensure that the mind of God was infallibly revealed there: illumination is the inward experience of that Word being applied by the Holy Ghost to the soul of a sinner. From these two positions it is clear that the inspiration of God's Word does not depend on the enlightenment of any sinner. For instance, does the fact that there are multitudes in India and China at the present time who have never even heard of the Word of God, make any difference to its inspiration. Surely not! It is therefore very necessary that this distinction be kept before our minds.

Dr. Niven raises many objections to this view of inspiration, but we have every confidence that these can be answered by any reverent

¹ C. of F., iv. ² C. of F., I. viii. ³ C. of F., I. v.

student of Scripture. Indeed, most of them have been answered already and they need not detain us at the present time. The view of inspiration expressed by Dr. Niven, and held by many, presents difficulties of a far more serious nature than any that can be raised against the Biblical doctrine. Briefly stated, this view is that the Scripture is not the Word of God but *contains* the Word of God, and that the Holy Spirit speaking in the heart and in the Church recognises, as it were, the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture. In other words there is a confusion here between inspiration and illumination. It is obvious that a man with this view may reject parts of God's Word as not being of Divine authority and, in practice, this is exactly what happens as Dr. Niven, himself, abundantly illustrates. Such a view means that, instead of the Word of God being a judge of the reality of such spiritual experiences as a sinner may have, spiritual experience becomes the judge of what is, and what is not, the Word of God! How can anyone truly determine what is indeed the Word of God upon such principles? If he contents himself with listening to the voice of the Church, he inclines to the popish position. If he listens to his own heart or what he imagines is the Holy Spirit speaking in his heart, how can he have any assurance that it is the voice of God, when the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked? This most serious departure from the Reformed Faith strikes at the whole authority of God's Word. In virtue of its inspiration, the Scripture was in the Reformed view, the only rule of Faith and Life. By departing from this view of inspiration, modernists have reduced the Word of God to be the supreme rule, which implies that there may be other rules having their place in the doctrine, worship and practice of the Church.

Dr. Niven then begins to illustrate how right he considers this new view to be by applying it to the question of life and faith. With regard to the former, he argues that there are other rules which have to be obeyed by the Christian such as Acts of Parliament and rules of Society. This, of course, is quite true, as was recognised by the Reformers, but the fact remains that such Acts, etc., cannot claim the obedience of the Christian if they are contrary to the general principles of God's Word. For instance, we all recognise that the Bible gives no rules for the filling up of an Income Tax form, but the Bible does require that, in doing so, we should be completely honest in declaring our income. It governs in the spiritual and moral realm and is the only rule to guide our consciences. The command to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's is, in other words, a scriptural principle. On worship, Dr. Niven rejects the principle that God is to be worshipped in the way "instituted by Himself and so limited by His own revealed will that He may not be worshipped according to the decrees or imagination of men, or any other way not prescribed in Holy

Scripture.”¹ With regard to doctrine, Dr. Niven contends that difficulties and obscurities in the Bible led to the rise of sects and to the formation of Confessions to state with clarity the Church’s beliefs. He seems to ignore the fact that heresies arose because of the darkness and the spiritual ignorance in the minds of men. He does, however, acknowledge that a creedless Church is almost a contradiction in terms.² The point is, that the Reformers held that their Confession was founded upon the Word of God, which was their *sole* rule and guide with regard to the doctrine they laid down. This appears more plainly when Dr. Niven comes to speak of the place to be given to tradition and conscience. The Reformers gave no place to tradition, and it is here that the importance of the real distinction between the Bible as the *only* rule and the *supreme* rule comes clearly into focus. If the Bible is just the supreme rule, then tradition can have its own place. Dr. Niven has to acknowledge that the Reformers “took the Word of God as the touchstone by which everything handed down from the fathers must be tested. Whatever contradicted the Word of God was rejected: what godly men of the past had achieved in the way of rejecting error and formulating truth they accepted.”³ This, of course, is vastly different from accepting tradition contrary to or unwarranted by the Word of God. He comes to the crux of the matter when he says, “By the Church of Scotland it is expressly declared that the Church has the right to change or modify her subordinate standard, as she may be led to do under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, provided that such change shall be agreeable with the Word of God, and the fundamental doctrines contained in the Westminster Confession, of which agreement the Church herself shall be the *sole* judge.”⁴ In other words, the Church is, in reality, the *only* rule as to what new views may be entertained. Dr. Niven further remarks, that, curiously enough, this has always been the view of the Quakers who evaluate by the “general sense” of the General Meeting any new view which an individual may obtain from his inner light. He might have added, curiously enough, that this view is also that of the Church of Rome which promulgates new views through the Pope and General Council.

The conclusion reached is quite consistent with the low view of inspiration already mentioned. As the individual accepts or rejects parts of the Bible dependent upon his subjective experiences, so Church Courts are to accept or reject new views of doctrine, worship and practice according to the spirit reigning in the generation at any particular time. This is a clean break from the Reformed Faith where we find it expressed, “The supreme judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be *no other but*

1 C. of F., xxi. i. 2 p. 49. 3 p. 66. 4 p. 69.

*the Holy Spirit speaking in the scripture."*¹ The new view, which was fathered on Scottish religious life through the Declaratory Act of 1892, has opened the door to a flood of unscriptural error and rendered the Church of Scotland one of the greatest menaces to the souls of men.

In another article, notice will be taken of the departure from the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone.

The Duty of Self-Examination.

A Sermon by REV. JOHN KENNEDY, D.D., prepared in view of the Communion.

"Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith: prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates," II. Cor. xiii. 5.

In writing this epistle to Corinthian Christians, Paul had before his mind the prospect of visiting them for the third time. This prospect was not altogether pleasing; for he had been informed of disorders which had broken out among them, and was aware that, through the influence of false teachers, they had begun to question his apostleship. In view of his promised visit he announces that, in dealing with offenders, he would follow the rule laid down in the Old Testament Scripture, and adopted and prescribed by Christ. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established" and that when he comes, he in the exercise of his authority, and in the use of his miraculous power as an Apostle, would "not spare." This he had formerly told them, and now a "second time" he tells them this, before his arrival, and does so as distinctly as if he were actually present. They provoked an unsparing exercise of his power by seeking "a proof of Christ speaking in" him. And they sought this, although Christ, through his ministry, had brought His power to bear upon them, and though they had thus abundant proof, that Christ speaking in him was "mighty" in them. Christ, though "the mighty God," once presented an aspect of infirmity, when "He was crucified through weakness;" but this passed away, for He now "liveth by the Power of God." He, in the infirmity of human nature, and because of His meek submission to the will of God, appeared, in His death, as if He were without strength, though He had even then the power of omnipotence as Jehovah the Son. But this apparent weakness was followed by a display of His power, as "the power of God," in His resurrection from the dead. Like Him "we also," says Paul, "are weak," while at the same time we are strong. "We" as "in Him," "are weak," for as in Him we must be so, in order that His "strength" maybe "made perfect" in "our weakness." As He lived by the Father who sent Him, and therefore appeared, in His dependence, to be weak, and

¹ C. of F., I. x.

as He lived to the glory of Him who sent Him, and therefore in His zeal and meekness resigned Himself into the power of His enemies, till at last they crucified Him; so we, living by the faith of Christ, are content to be meek and, in the measure in which His "love constraineth us," we meekly submit to all our trials. We thus, because in Christ, and for Him, seem to be despicably weak, but in the midst of our greatest infirmities we have Apostolic authority and miraculous power. Out of our infirmities has this power already broken forth, and unless offenders in Corinth repent, it shall be displayed by us in connection with the discipline which we purpose to administer.

There were two ways in which they might have proof of "Christ speaking in" him. This might be given them in a miraculous exercise of power, in attestation of his decisions in dealing with offenders. But he entreats them to render this unnecessary by reformation. The other way, and this he urges them to adopt, was to examine themselves; for if they ascertained that "Jesus Christ was in" them, they had thus a proof, which would be both profitable and pleasing to themselves, that Christ spake in him and wrought by him, to the effect of their conversion. The Apostle, while urging this for a special reason, in this instance has written, in the words of the text, an authoritative counsel, addressed to all who profess to "be in the faith," everywhere and at all times. Let us therefore prayerfully consider it.

In the text there is an important counsel addressed to professing Christians, and a solemn alternative placed before them. The Counsel is—"Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves"—and the alternative is, to have "Jesus Christ in" us, or to "be reprobates."

I. The Counsel—"Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. The action here commended is one bearing on ourselves—our "own selves." It is natural to us to have no liking for this. We are more prone to be examining others. We watch those around us, and are very ready to form an opinion regarding them. And our estimate may not always be a false one, though we are usually very unsparing in our judgments. Not caring to think of how it is as to our own hope, we are very ready to pronounce regarding the hope of others. But if they, in their views and practice, are like ourselves, we take kindly to them at once, because we cannot condemn them without condemning ourselves. And if we and they have the same kind of religious opinions and feelings and manage to make "a fair shew," without ever having been "born again," a very strong bond connects us, and our deepest dislike, and our severest condemnation, will bear on those who are truly godly. These "fair-shew" men prefer to associate with the world, than be companions of those who fear the Lord; and the further advanced they are in their profession, and the more active they are in their service, the more disposed will

they be to be persecutors of those who speak and live in reproof of their presumption. So was it in the experience of the "Man of sorrows," at the hands of the prominent religious sect of His day. But the text bids us to deal with our "own selves"—to turn our eyes within, and that with a view to "examine" and to "prove" ourselves.

To such exercise as this we require to be urged, because of a reluctance to engage in it. This reluctance arises from our love of ease. In the measure in which we are under the influence of this, we dislike to think of our case as such that we require to be at all anxious about it. We prefer to ignore, than to examine our spiritual condition. Many there are who thus continue "at ease in Zion" during all their life, the light which shines on the disembodied spirit being the first to shine upon their case, and to affect their feeling by the discovery it gives of their being for ever lost. Even the Christian needs to be preserved from sloth and slumber. Not always is even he affected by the tremendous importance of having a "hope" that "maketh not ashamed." Not always is even he impressed with the omniscience of God, the solemn reckoning of a judgment day, the deceitfulness of the old heart, the enduring truths of all divine scripture verdicts, the necessity of being prepared for, as well as entitled to, everlasting life in heaven, the instances of high attainments, without saving grace, recorded in Scripture, and the greatness of the claims involved in his profession. These considerations do not always move even him to faithful self-examination, and yet surely they ought so to affect and influence him. But the flesh is ravenous for ease, and these awakening things are put aside. A living soul is in a backsliding condition when this is the case. But the old heart's pride operates to the same effect. In the measure in which it is in us and unmortified, we shrink from going in amidst the state of things within us. We know that if we examine ourselves, we will find not a little to abase us in our heart and conduct. And we dislike this. To keep us from having to bow our heads, it is indispensable that we satisfy ourselves with a foregone conclusion that all is right. This is more comforting to our selfishness. But it will fare ill with us, if we pamper our pride by not examining and proving what we are—if we allow ourselves to think what we are in our profession, and not to try to know ourselves as we are in reality. And to the exercise of self-examination a cherished sin will utterly indispose us. We will be disposed to treat this as Rachel did her idol, or Achan his "wedge of gold." Some excuse will be found for sparing the "right hand" or the "right eye" that offends and the searching light of truth will be shut out from the conscience.

The man himself knows that it is there but O. what power he has given to it over him! He listens to the cry "spare me," which it utters, forgetting that it is written—"If ye live after the flesh ye shall die;

but if ye, through the Spirit, mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." And the influence of unbelief often operates to the effect of arresting, at the very outset the attempt to examine one's self. You, it says need not make any search into your case. There is nothing you can discover but that you are a graceless sinner. You may hold by this as a foregone conclusion; and it is nothing else than utter folly to search for grace in such a soul as yours. Thus unbelief acts in the case of those who are acquainted with the corruption of their hearts, and have been convinced of the iniquities of their life. But in others it puts forth its subtle influence in a different way. Owing to its power to intercept the soul, in which it reigns, from all enjoyment of gospel hope, and while the love of ease, pride and idolatry act in unison with it, the soul is led to the conclusion that it would be impossible to hope if the worst were known, and that it is wiser therefore to keep always on the surface. To this conclusion many come, and act accordingly, who cannot but know that their case is one which, if carefully examined, would be found quite inconsistent with their profession and their hope. And yet they choose to base their hope on a lie, rather than treat their souls according to the truth.

We cannot wonder therefore, that those who have not the fear of God in their hearts should choose to abstain from all self-searching, and that they should be ready to decry it in the exercise of those who regard it as their bounden duty. O friend be not like these. Do not be content not to know what and whose you are, and whither you are going. How short a journey you would undertake without some care, both as to the way, and as to the end. And yet you rush on the journey to Eternity, not caring to enquire how it fares with you by the way, and what awaits you at the end.

But there is a kind of religion from which this duty is discarded, and which is assuming a pronounced position in these days. There are not a few who attain to an exercise of faith, because of the consciousness of which an assurance of being saved is enjoyed. This assurance they are anxious not to disturb. To maintain it the remembrance of their past faith, and the bustle of what they call Christian work, are sufficient. To look within is decried as legality. To search for evidence of faith being genuine is denounced as mysticism. "Look out," is the cry, which is good counsel to one who is searching in himself for a foundation of hope but evil counsel when addressed to one who is anxious to know whether he is "in the faith" and whether really "Jesus Christ" is in him. There is no allowance made for any uncertainty by those who thus decry the work of self-searching, and they attribute to the power of temptation the effort to engage in it. But the text prescribes the duty, and none but those who deny the power of godliness will evade it.

(To be continued.)

Episcopacy and Presbyterianism *

By REV. JOHN COLQUHOUN, Glendale.

VII.—THE NATIONAL RECOGNITION OF RELIGION.

The Establishment Principle in the Church of Scotland is not the same as the Establishment Principle of the Church of England for the former is a Scriptural Establishment while the latter is purely Erastian. In the Church of England there is no parity of the clergy. There are two Archbishops, one in Canterbury and the other in York, appointed by the Prime Minister for the time being. Along with these there are many bishops, archdeacons, and rural deans. In managing the affairs of the Church the various provinces have each a council or convocation, consisting of bishops, archdeacons, and deans. These councils are called by the Archbishop in pursuance of the Sovereign's mandate, and must have the Sovereign's license before they can deliberate, and the sanction of the Crown is necessary before the resolutions are binding on the clergy. This was the Erastianism which the protagonists of Episcopacy endeavoured to bring into Scotland,, and against which the Church of Scotland fought for generations, and triumphed at last, although before doing so, many of her true and noble sons and daughters suffered indescribable tortures and privations, and death in various ways, the remembrance of which recalls the inhuman barbarity of their persecutors.

The first General Assembly of the Church of Scotland met in the Magdalen Chapel, Cowgate, Edinburgh, in December, 1560, when six ministers and thirty-four elders met and constituted themselves the Supreme Court of the Reformed Church of Scotland. Previous to this the First Scottish Confession of Faith was read before Parliament, and with only three dissentient voices, was sanctioned by Parliament in so far as that was competent for them to do. After this John Knox and five others received a charge from the Privy Council to prepare a Form of Church Government. The result of this was the drawing up of the First Book of Discipline, setting forth the Presbyterian form of Church Government, which has ever since been a characteristic feature of the Church of Scotland. The contents of this Book were not derived from Geneva or France, as is often asserted, but from the New Testament. The first General Assembly had adjourned to meet in January, 1561, and, before that meeting, the First Book of Discipline had been presented to the Scottish Parliament at the end of 1560, and the Act of Secret Council approving it was signed on 17th January, 1561.

*In view of the proposal to introduce bishops into the present Presbyterian Church of Scotland, as published in May, and to be debated in the General Assembly of that Church, Mr. Colquhoun's articles are timely, and the former ones should be re-read by readers.—*Editor.*

In the First Confession of Faith we find the duty of the civil magistrate clearly stated in Chapter xxiv. : "Moreover, to kings, princes, and rulers, and magistrates, we affirm that chiefly and most principally the reformation and purgation of the religion appertains; so that not only are they appointed for civil policy, but also for maintenance of the true religion, and for suppression of idolatry and superstition whatsoever, as in David, Jehosaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah, and others, highly commended for their zeal in that case, may be perceived." To the same effect is the First Book of Discipline where under the Head of Ecclesiastical Discipline we find a line of demarcation drawn between those offences which are punished by the civil magistrate and those punishable by the Church. It may be difficult for us to see clearly why some offences should be punished by the civil law and others punished by the Church, but the fact that the line of demarcation has at all been drawn reveals that our forefathers believed that the civil magistrate had his own province in religious matters and the Church her province, and that neither may invade the province of the other. This was the view of John Knox when he said, in answer to Maitland of Lethington, "If the liberty of the Church should stand upon the Queen's allowance or dis-allowance, we are assured not only to lack Assemblies, but also to lack the public preaching of the Gospel. . . . Well, time will try the truth; but to my former words, this will I add, take from us the freedom of Assemblies, and take from us the Gospel; for without Assemblies how shall good order and unity in doctrine be kept?" *Knox's History*, II. p. 296. To the same purpose we read in the Second Book of Discipline, chap. x., sect. 4, that the place of the civil magistrate is "to assist and maintain the discipline of the kirk; and punish them civilly, that will not obey the censure of the same, without confounding always the one jurisdiction with the other."

In both Books of Discipline we see that it is the duty of the civil magistrate to see to it that provision is made for the ministers, schools and the poor, out of the patrimony of the kirk. What this patrimony was is clearly stated in the Second Book of Discipline, chap. ix., sec. 1, 2. "By the patrimony of the kirk we mean whatsoever thing hath been at any time before, or shall be in times coming given; or by consent or universal custom of countries professing the Christian religion, applied to the public use and utility of the kirk. So that under the patrimony we comprehend all things given, or to be given to the kirk and service of God, as lands, buildings, possessions, annual-rents, and all such like, wherewith the kirk is presented, either by donations, foundations, mortifications, or any other lawful titles, of kings, princes, or any persons inferior to them; together with the continual oblations of the faithful. We comprehend also all such things as by laws or custom, or use of countries, has been applied to the use and utility of the kirk; of the which sort are teinds, manses, glebes, and such like,

which by common and municipal laws and universal custom are possessed by the kirk."

Our Reformers show in these subordinate standards the clear view which they had of the province of the State and the province of the Church. They steered clear of the Popish dogma that the Church has jurisdiction over the State, and the Erastian view that the State has dominion over the Church, and having gone to the fountain-head, the Word of God, they were able to present to us the province of both Church and State with a clearness which has not been equalled by any other statement on this point which was framed by Reformers in other countries. Thus they showed that while members of the Church should give all obedience and respect to the civil magistrate in matters within his province, yet they cannot allow him to interfere in spiritual matters, where his enactments might clash with the dictates of a conscience, enlightened by the Word of God. In this connection we may be permitted to quote a masterly statement by the late Principal Cunningham, Edinburgh. "Our Saviour has enjoined His followers to 'render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's;' and this implies that there are some things which belong to the province of Caesar, or the civil magistrate, which are subject to his jurisdiction—with respect to which he has rightful authority—and is ordinarily to be obeyed; reserving, of course, the great principle which is of universal application, namely, that 'we must obey God rather than man.' It implies, also, that there are some things which are God's, in such a sense as not to belong to Caesar at all—not to belong to the province, or to be subject to the authority, of the civil magistrate. There is no great difficulty in settling what these things are, respectively. Caesar's things are the persons and the property of men, and God's things are the conscience of men and the Church of Christ. The civil magistrate has rightful jurisdiction over the persons and the property of men, because the Word of God sanctions his right to the use of the sword, and because jurisdiction in these matters is evidently indispensable to the execution of the functions of his office, the attainment of the great end of civil government, namely, the promotion of the good order and prosperity of the community. He has no jurisdiction over the conscience, for 'God alone is Lord of the conscience, and has left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men.' He has no jurisdiction over the Church of Christ, because 'Christ alone is its King and Head,'—and because, by His own authority in His word, He has made full provision for its government, for the administration of its affairs, through other parties, without vesting any control over it in the civil magistrate.'" *Discussions on Church Principles*, p. 208. Here we have in perhaps less fiery language the sentiments expressed by Andrew Melville when he told King James VI. that there were two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland, and clearly showed King James his place in the kingdom of King Jesus.

From all that has been written on this subject we see that our Scottish divines of the Reformation held that the Church is a separate institution in the land, invested with power of discipline, and was, in no way, in subordination to the State, and, therefore, that its courts met, and acted on the ground of a Divine warrant and not on the ground of any civil warrant; that should the civil magistrate neglect to convene a meeting of the General Assembly, or forbid it to act after it was convened, the General Assembly had every right to continue sitting and had the power to transact all business of a spiritual nature though the civil magistrate gave it no countenance, and that it has that right and powers as part of its Constitution. In matters ecclesiastical the Church decides all, there is no head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ, and the highest Court of the Church is not responsible to any Court on earth for its decisions. This view is clearly stated by Erskine of Dun in his letter to the Regent Mar. "There is," he says, "a spiritual jurisdiction and power which God has given unto His Kirk, and to them that bear office therein; and there is a temporal jurisdiction and power given of God to kings and civil magistrates. Both the powers are of God, and most agreeing to the fortifying one of the other if they be rightly used. The Kirk of God should fortify all lawful power and authority that pertains to the civil magistrate, because it is the ordinance of God; but if he pass the bounds of his office and enter within the sanctuary of the Lord, meddling with such things as appertain to the ministry of God's Kirk, then the servants of God should withstand his unjust enterprise; for so are they commanded of God."

This was the view of the leading Reformers who took a leading part in setting up the Reformed Church of Scotland. The Parliament which met in July, 1560, ratified the Scottish Confession of Faith and abolished the Papal jurisdiction, sent Sir James Sandilands to France in order to get the royal assent of Francis and Mary to these Acts, and, as Knox says, "This was done rather to show our dutiful obedience than to beg of them any strength to our religion which from God hath full power, and needeth not the suffrage of men." This favour was refused until in 1567, on the abdication of Queen Mary in favour of her son, King James VI., and the appointment of a Regency, the Acts of 1560 establishing the Protestant religion and abolishing the Papacy were ratified on behalf of royalty by the Regent. Thus we find in 1560 and again in 1567, Parliament acknowledging the jurisdiction already belonging to the Church, but, in this, nothing was conferred on the Church but what belonged to her of right, and which she exercised during the seven years previous to 1567. This period was a time of great prosperity to the Church. At the Assembly of 1560 six ministers attended out of a possible twelve, and in 1567 there were two hundred and fifty-two ministers, along with 154 exhorters and 467 readers engaged in the religious instruction of the people.

Truly the Church was blessed by her Glorious Head though frowned upon by a royalty which refused to acknowledge her spiritual independence, and was waiting for a vehemently desired opportunity for destroying her.

Though it was held firmly by the Church in Scotland, down through the ages since the Reformation, that the civil magistrate had no right to interfere in the affairs of the Church as far as spiritual matters were concerned, yet our Reformers showed their vehement desire that the civil magistrate should acknowledge the Church and give it his protecting care, and it was in perfect consistency with that principle that Sir James Sandilands was sent to France to obtain the royal assent to the Acts abolishing the Papal jurisdiction and setting up the Reformed religion. The background of that principle is clearly set forth by the elder Dr. McCrie when he says, "The true religion is substantially the same in every age; and notwithstanding accidental changes in outward situation and particular ordinances, the Church of God has been essentially the same in every period since her erection. For a long time she appeared principally in the domestic and patriarchal state, afterwards she was advanced to the national state, and since the coming of Christ her boundries have been enlarged to receive all nations. When her members were 'a few men in number, yea very few, when they went from one nation to another, from one kingdom to another,' God 'reproved kings for their sakes,' and inclined their hearts to protect and favour them. When He had 'increased them with men like a flock," and settled them in 'the lands of the heathen,' He 'raised up judges who delivered them,' and rulers, whom He 'commanded to feed them.' And, with reference to the times of the New Testament, when 'the abundance of the sea shall be converted, and their forces come unto' her, He hath promised, that 'kings shall be her nursing fathers; her officers peace, and her exactors righteousness.' This is connected with the 'advancement of the interests of the mediatorial kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is *in*, but not *of* this world, and *as* subservient to which the kingdom of providence is committed to Him.' The kingdom of Christ is erected in an external form in the world; and in this respect, as it is subject to injury, restraint, and persecution from men and powers of the earth, so it is capable of receiving, and stands in need of protection, encouragement, and countenance from them. To these it has a divine claim. Though the institution of civil magistrates is from God '*as the supreme Lord and king of all the world*,' and '*not properly from Christ as Mediator*'; yet, '*a right to have the kingdoms of this world rendered subservient and tributary to his spiritual kingdom, in the visible Church, belongs to Him as Mediator*.' And as He, by His power, in the management of the kingdom of providence committed to Him, will bring them into this state; so it is the duty of these kingdoms, and their rulers, to be *actively* 'subservient and tributary' unto His kingdom, by advancing

its interests. 'The shields of the earth belong unto God,' who 'is gone up with a shout,' and who 'reigneth over the heathen,' and He has a right to their service." *Statement*, by Thomas McCrie, D.D., 1871 edition, pp. 132-133.

William Huntington and Miss Morton.

Some time afterwards Miss Morton writes to Mr. Huntington as follows:—

My dear Father in Christ,

Since it has pleased God to convince me of the desperate evil of sin, the terrors of the law, and the horrors of a guilty conscience, which I laboured under for many months, it is with no small consolation I acquaint you of the essential and joyful change I still experience and enjoy in my soul.

From a deep sense of my lost state as an undone sinner, I have been brought to the foot of the Saviour's cross, to receive through the merits of His atoning blood, both pardon and peace; and have found Him a prayer hearing and a prayer answering God. What sweet invitations do I read in His word, for the vilest of sinners to approach Him—having felt myself such, and, on the other hand, my need of a Saviour, "to me then is the word of this salvation sent." He has granted me pardoning and quickening grace, so that by continually pleading His promises, praying fervently for an increase of faith, and begging of Him to remove unbelief, and dispel every doubt and fear (which I really believe He will grant in His own due time through His beloved son Christ Jesus) though I have often groaned all this out, without words to utter it, yet He well knew the state I was in, and took pity on me.

The horror, dejection and guilt, which I felt is removed while joy and peace is springing up in my heart. I feel a pardon and forgiveness of my sins, by the application of His atoning blood. I know He is exalted to give repentance to just such sinners as I am; and having experienced a heartfelt sorrow for sin, and the foolish vows that I made, I humbly trust, that a godly sorrow, which worketh repentance to salvation "that needeth not to be repented of," is now given me. Blessed be God, I know mercy to be His darling attribute, to those who feel this need of mercy. Have I not a right then to claim Him as my Saviour? Surely I have, for the Spirit itself beareth witness with my spirit that I am His child. I find that I can approach a throne of grace with a humble boldness, a strong confidence, and a full persuasion that God is my Father in covenant. Methinks I find sweet access to Him; for I have had conspicuous answers to prayer lately, and have found a fervency in requesting those things he has since

granted me. How delightful is prayer to the soul when God gives a Spirit of grace and supplication. Here all grievances are redressed, as you observe. When the heart is overwhelmed with affliction and distress, here is the bosom of a gracious Saviour to pour them into, who, being "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," tried and tempted like unto us, knowing our infirmities, and whereof we are made, can sympathise with us, when confidence in the creature will prove vain. When we are enabled, in times of trouble, to pour out our complaints before Him, how it eases the troubled mind, and we are encouraged to this, for He hath said, "He will be enquired of." He commands us to persevere in wrestling hard with Him by fervent prayer, and He delights in answering prayer; for he "said not to the seed of Jacob, seek ye me in vain." Knowing him, therefore, to be faithful to His promise, may God incline our hearts to seek His face daily, and to come moment after moment for a fresh supply of His grace. May we feel more and more real spiritual poverty; for "the rich" he hath declared, "shall be sent empty away."

When a dear Redeemer is thus all in all, what a heartfelt union there is between Christ and the soul, and sweet communion with Him, at a throne of grace! I have lately found Him the sweetest companion I ever conversed with in my life so that I wean daily from every other object. Truly happy is that soul that can lay His hand upon his conscience and say Jesus is precious to me! I know, as God-Man, He is all-sufficient to save me; and He has promised that He will cast out none that come unto Him; and blessed be His name He has made me willing in the day of His power to close in with him. O that I could love Him more! O that I could cleave closer to Him, live more dependent on Him, and glorify Him more in my life and conversation!

I confess, Sir, that I had awfully fallen, to the great dishonour of the Gospel, by turning Papist; but though I had heard the truth before, yet I never understood it clearly, nor did I ever feel the power of it, till God struck me under your ministry, and in a most singular manner stopped me in my mad career of returning to France, which very shortly would have taken place.

It really was by a thorny path that the Lord led me, but He has brought me forth by a right way, and I now know of a truth that I shall shortly arrive "to a city of habitation." The Lord increase my faith. . . .

I did not think of sending you so long a letter, but I am in a sweet frame of mind at present, and happy in heart, I therefore let my pen glide on as you see—and now conclude: praying for a growth in grace, in knowledge, and in understanding, and a greater love to Jesus Christ: while I remain yours sincerely in Gospel affection.

ELIZABETH MORTON.

The late Mr. Neil Shaw, Wollongong, Australia.

The subject of this obituary sketch was born in Milivaig, Glendale, Isle of Skye, in the year 1878, and passed away at Mount Ousle Road, Fairy Meadow, Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia, on the 24th November, 1956, having thus attained to his seventy-eighth year. After his marriage he settled in Edinburgh for about ten years, when he emigrated to Australia in the year 1912. Due to the reserve and reticence that characterise Scottish Highland Christians generally relative to their spiritual experiences, we are not in a position to say when, where, or by what means, the great supernatural change, Scripturally known as being born again, took place, but his life, walk, and conversation were such as to make it unmistakably clear that he had been with Jesus, and had savingly learned of Him. His practically consistent life manifested him as an open epistle of Christ, known and read of all men. If the frequency and warmth of spiritual affection with which he spoke of the late Rev. James S. Sinclair's ministrations during Mr. Shaw's residence in Edinburgh were not the means of his conversion, it is at least very evident that he was built up and edified under that worthy minister's faithful preaching. He was a more or less frequent correspondent with Mr. Sinclair till the latter's much-lamented death in the prime of life.

Both the late Rev. Donald Beaton, Oban, and the late Rev. Finlay Macleod, Dornoch, with the present writer, wondered at the strange mysterious dispensation of Divine Providence that cast the lot of such worthy men as Mr. Neil Shaw, and the late Mr. Donald Beaton, King Country, New Zealand, in such extraordinary circumstances of isolation from a public Gospel ministry, as to render membership and office-bearing in the visible church impossible, though otherwise so eminently qualified for such an office in the church. Like other like-minded men in similar circumstances in our overseas Dominions, the Most High seemed to make up for them in such isolation, what was denied in public Gospel privileges and ordinances. Their uncompromising fidelity to the Bible, as the inspired and infallible Word of God, and their supreme standard of faith and morals; the Westminster Confession of Faith as their subordinate standard, and the distinctive Scriptural testimony of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland as dearer to them than their lives, are proof that supernatural grace is equal to maintaining the soul in a state of marvellous spiritual health in the most uncongenial environment. In thus writing, however, we are far from condoning deliberate abandoning of public Gospel privileges and ordinances for the most comfortable temporal circumstances this world can afford. If necessity, however, compels such isolation in the dispensation of Divine Providence, the Lord will make up in private what is denied in public.

Mr. Neil Shaw was as uncompromising a Free Presbyterian as one could meet. Its interests, at home and on the foreign field, were the main concern of his life. Being a deeply exercised Christian, the church at home and abroad, and especially our African Mission, lost a true praying friend the day Mr. Neil Shaw passed from time to his everlasting rest and reward. Though meek, gentle, and courteous, in his temperamental disposition, he was as firm as a rock where and when Scriptural principles were in dispute. While he could understand outsiders being prejudiced against the distinctive Scriptural testimony of our church, because of spiritual ignorance, he had no patience whatsoever with a professing Christian born and bred in the church who disturbed by disputation its internal peace and harmony, and that of our church courts. He always attributed such agitation to lack of spiritual discernment and consequent lack of appreciation of our unspeakably precious privileges as a church, in the midst of surrounding backsliding, and a prevailing flood of errors and heresies.

He was a frequent and liberal giver to the various funds of the church, but it is as a truly praying man and deeply-exercised Christian that he will be most missed. Though in failing health for a number of years, he had a heart attack a fortnight before the end, from which he never rallied, yet he remained conscious, and conducted family worship from his death-bed till the end. His mortal remain rest in Woniora Cemetery, Sutherland, near Sydney, awaiting the resurrection of the Great Day. We take this opportunity of extending to his widow, after fifty years of happy married life, to his four sons and three daughters grand-children, and other relatives, our sincere heart-felt sympathy with the sincere desire and prayer that his mantle, or even a double portion of it, may fall on them.—*John P. MacQueen.*

Searmonan.

LEIS AN URR. TEARLACH C. MAC AN TOISICH, D.D.

SEARMON IX.

“Oir a ta mise tre’n lagh marbh do’n lagh, chùm gu’m bithinn beo do Dhia.” Gal. ii. 19.

Faodaidh na briathran so bhi air beachdachadh orra mar bhriathran a tha nochdadh a mach ni’s fhaide an obhair inntinn, na an t-atharachadh, a tha air a chur an ceill anns an earrann a bu cheann-teagaisg dhuinn anns an t-searmon chaidh air thoiseach air an aon so.

1. Ann a bhi feorach, an toiseach, ciod a tha air a chiallachadh le “bhi marbh do’n lagh,” thugadh-mid an aire nach eil e air a chiallachadh gu sònraicht’, ’s ni’s lugha ’n a sin a mhàin mu lagh na’n deas-ghnàthaibh, ach gu’r ann gu h-àraidh mu lagh na modhanan a tha’n t-Abstol a labhairt an so; an lagh sin mu’m bheil Maois a labhairt mu

fhìreantachd mar so, “ An duine a nì na nithean sin, gu’m bie e beo leo,” lagh na’n oibribh, na an lagh ’n a chumadh cùmhnant. Tha e na nì ro-riatanach gu’m bitheadh an t-eader-dhealachadh air a thuigsinn eadar an lagh mar chùmhnant agus an lagh mar riaghailt ùmhlachd. Thainig an lagh gu bhi gabhail cumadh cùmhnant mar thoradh air riaghladh àrduachdaranail Dhè; ach buinidh e gu do-sheachaint’ do’n lagh, bho nàdur Dhè, agus bho nàdur a chreutairean reusante, gu’m bitheadh e anns ’n a h-uile suidheachadh ceangailte mar riaghailt ùmhlachd. Bha’n lagh, mar ch mhnant, mar a bha e’n toiseach air a thoirt seachad, a gealltuin beatha do Adhamh air chumha ùmhlachd iomlan, agus a bagradh bàis mar pheanas air easùmhlachd. Agus a nis tha e toirt breith air a pheacach mar pheacach a chùm peanais. Tha’n lagh mar riaghailt a cur fodh chùmhair a pheacaich mar bu chòr dha ìmeachd, cha’n ann a chùm bitheadh beatha aig, ach a chùm gu’n glòraicheadh e Dia. Tha e air a shaoradh bh’uaith mar chùmhnant; ach cha’n urrain e bhi air a shaoradh bh’uaith mar riaghailt. ’S e a shonas agus a shochair a bhi fodha mar lagh Chrìosd.

Tha bhi “ marbh do’n lagh ’ a ciallachadh dà nì.

(1) Saorsa bho ùghdarras a tha dìteadh. Tha’m peacach a thaobh nàduir fodh a mhallachd uamhasaich: “ Oir a mheud ’s a ta do oibrigh an lagha, tha iad fodh’n mhallachadh: oir a tae sgriobhta, is mallaicht’ gach neach nach buainnaish anns na h-uile nithibh a ta sgriobhta ann an leabhar an lagha chùm an deanamh.” Tha a mhallachd so a luidh air, agus ga cheangl thairis gu bhi, ’n a lànachd, a fulung a pheanas, mar a saor Fear-tabhairt an Lagha bh’uaithe e; oir is e a mhallachd so a tha toirt buaidh, agus a bheir buaidh, ann am peanas na bhitheas caillte tre’n t-siorruidheachd. Agus co’s urrain innse ciod a tha’n corruich Dhe? Co’s urrain innse ciod a th’ann a bhi fulung “ dioghaltas teine siorruidh.” Tha bhi “ marbh do’n lagh,” uime sin, a gabhail a stigh saorsa, làn agus shiorruidh, bho mhallachd an lagha. Is e so sochair a chreidmheach tre aonadh ri Crìosd, am Fear-urrais; oir “ shaor Crìosd sinne a mhallachadh an lagha, air dha bhi air a dheanamh ’na mhallachadh air r son;” agus, uime sin, “ Cha’n eil a nis a nis dìteadh sam bith do’n dream sin a tha ann Iosa Crìosd;” agus tha làn ùghdarras aca a ràdh, “ Co a chuireas coire sam bith a leth daoine taghta Dhè? Is e Dia a dh’fhìreanaicheas. Co a dhìteas? Is e Crìosd a thuair bàs, seadh tuilleadh fòs, a dh’eirich a ris, agus a ta air deas laimh Dhè, neach a ta mar an ceudna adeanmh eadar-ghuidhe air ar son-ne,” Feumaidh an aire bhi air a thoirt dha mar an ceudna, gu’m bheil an creidmheach air a shaoradh bho ùghdarras reachdail an lagha mar chùmhnant: ’s e sin, am feadh agus a tha e fodha mar riaghailt, am feadh agus a tha e fodh fhiachaibh neo- chaochluidheach gu bhi gràdhachadh Dhè le uile chridhe, agus le uile anam, agus le uile neart, agus le uile inntinn; agus am feadh agus a tha e air earalachadh gu bhi iomlan mar a tha Athair a ta air neamh iomlan, gidheadh cha’n eil ùmhlachd iomlan ni’s fhaide air iarruidh air mar chumha beatha. Thuair e

cheans còir air beatha anns an fhìrenatachd iomlan agus neo-chrìochnach eifeachdach sin a dh'ardaich an lagh—còir a bhitheas air a h-aideachadh aig an latha mhòr. Agus a nis tha dhaimh ris an lagh air atharrachadh tre a chòir ann am fìreantachd an Fhir-urrais. Tha e marbh dha mar chùmhnannt, a bhitheas e beo, agus a chuireas e mach a chumhachd tre'n t-siorruidheachd, gidheadh dhà-san tha e marbh. A nis e so sochair choichionn nan creidmheach—araon sochair nan uile dhiubh, a mhuinntir a tha lag ann an creidimh agus a mhuinntir a tha làidir, an naoidhean agus an duine iomlan; cha'n eil eadar-dhealachadh ann. Agus anns an tomhas anns an gabh iad a stigh e mar an sochair, sguiridh iad do eagal a bhi aca roimh'n lagh mar chùmhnannt; bithidh iad air an togail os ceann creidimh tràilleil 'n uair is urrain iad a ràdh, "Is e Crìosd a thuair bàs."

(2) Tha bhi "marbh do'n lagh" anns an dara àite a ciallachadh toirt suas sùil ri beatha bh'uaith, na bhi'g amharc ris air son beatha. Aon uair bha e tur eadar-dhealaicht' ri sin. Is e aon de na dòighean neonach anns am bheil diomhaireachd na h-aindiadhachd anns a chridhe cealgach air fein, am feadh agus a tha'm peacach 'n a luidhe fodh mhallachd an lagha, agus a tha e gu moralta eu-comasach air fìor ùmhlachd a thoirt dhà, gidheadh 's ann dha ionnsuidh a tha mhiann, tha e'g amharc ris air son, dion agus beatha—'s e sin, tha e'g earsbsa ann an ni-èigin dhe chuid fein ann an cruth ùmhlachd, a ròghainn air a bhi'g earsbsa ann an Crìosd. Ach thrèig an creidmheach ann an Iosa gach uile bhonn dòchais dhiubh sin, agus rinn e fìreantachd an Fhir-shaoraidh mar aon dhìdean. Cha'n abair mi nach bi e faireachadh oibreachadh na fein-fhìreantachd agus an uamhair—ni-h-eadh, nach e so prìomh earrann corp a pheacaidh agus a bhàis fodh'm bheil e'g osnaich, agus ris am feum e bhi cathachadh gu latha a bhàis; ach tha mi ag ràdh, a thaobh gach buaireadh a chuireas am prionnsabal mallaichte so fodh chomhair, agus Sàtan a labhairt troimhe, gu'm freagair a nàdur nuadh, "N'r leigheadh Dia gu'n deanain-sa uail, ach ann an crann-ceusaidh ar Tighearn Iosa Crìosd, tre'm bheil an saoghal air a cheusadh dhomb-sa agus mise do'n t-saoghal." Ann an gnothuch mi bhi air gabhail rium le Dia, tha mi tilgeadh gach ni bh'uam, chum agus gu'm bithinn air m'fhaotainn ann Crìosd. Agus mar is motha bhitheas adhartas ann an naomhachd, agus mar is farsaing a bheachdean air luachmhorachd obhair n Spioraid ann an naomhachadh an anama, 's ann a is motha theid e stigh ann am faireachadh Phoil. "Seadh gun amharus, agus tha mi a meas nan uile nithean nan call, air son ro-oirdheirceis eolais Iosa Crìosd, mo Thighearna; air son an d' fhuiling mi call nan uile nithean, agus that mi a meas gur aolach iad chum gun coisnean Crìosd, agus gu faighear ann-san mi." Nis, bithidh e coltach gur e am mothachadh so a "bhi marbh do'n lagh" a bh'aig an Abstol gu sònraicht' 's an amharc an so.

(R'a leantuin.)

Notes and Comments.

Sir Compton MacKenzie and Ireland.

During the agitation and noise by the R.C. priest John Morrison, in South Uist last March over the Government's intention to set up a Rocket Range in South Uist, Sir Compton MacKenzie, a Roman Catholic, and well-known writer, supported the agitation for an inquiry into the matter. No satisfaction being obtained as to the possibility of the Government abandoning the project, Compton MacKenzie suggested, quite seriously, that the people of South Uist should emigrate from the Western Isles of Scotland to Ireland. He meant, no doubt, Southern Ireland, the Roman Catholic Irish Republic. This suggestion from a man who frequently gives his opinion of public matters, by pen and on the wireless, ought to have known better from the economic and practical facts which are well known, than to suggest the Irish Republic as a place of refuge for the people of South Uist. They would need more than the ministrations of the Irish priests to keep them and their families alive. It is common knowledge that unemployment figures are high, and that new industries are not doing well in the Republic; and that about 50,000 emigrate annually from there, many to Britain and Canada. Yes to Britain, the hated land! Although the R.C. Irish do not object to the work and wages they obtain in Britain. After priest John Morrison said he thought Sir Compton MacKenzie was joking about emigration to Ireland; Sir Compton from his home in Edinburgh said: ". . . I was perfectly serious with my suggestion." This fact reveals a serious lack of information and common sense and responsibility on the part of a public man affecting to have the good of the people of South Uist at heart. Even priest John Morrison said on this question: "So many people are leaving Ireland to go to Canada and even Britain." The moral for the people of South Uist is, never take Sir Compton MacKenzie's advice without scrutinising it well! And now the people of South Uist have accepted the situation brought about by the establishment of the Rocket Range in their midst.

Minister gives strange answer to Animal lovers.

Speaking at the Annual Meeting of the Scottish Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, in Edinburgh, last April, Rev. Dr. Selby Wright, said that he was sometimes asked by people who have lost their favourite cat or dog if they would see them again after their death. He was reported as answering: "That is a question that is extremely difficult to answer from the point of view of the Church, without being over simple or complicated." Dr. Wright quoted also a line of an Irish poem, viz., "Would God be wasting a dog like Tim." When a professed minister of the Church of Scotland speaks like this on such a topic, it reveals the sad and miserable state of such as to their beliefs and lack of understanding in the truths of God's Word.

The people cannot but be deluded who give an ear to such men, who cannot give a clear, Scriptural answer as to the radical differences between human beings and the irrational beast.

Ulster and the Crown.

Recently in the House of Commons Mr. Phillip Bell (Con., Bolton, E.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations in view of the increasing tension in Ireland, if he would initiate discussions with the Republic of Eire and the Government of Northern Ireland upon the Republic joining the Commonwealth on the basis of the proposals recently made by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, Sir David Campbell, Ulster Unionist, Belfast, said; "Is the Minister aware that the great majority of the people of Northern Ireland have a deep sense of loyalty to the Crown, and that no proposals which would take them out of the United Kingdom or transfer their allegiance to a Republic can have the least hope of being accepted." We record these statements to let our readers see the endeavours being made by Roman Catholics even in the House of Commons to undermine the link between Protestant Ulster and the British Throne. Ulster should have a place in the prayers of the Lord's people on this side of the Irish Channel.

Africans Prohibited from Worshipping with Europeans.

In the Parliament of the Union of South Africa, at Capetown there was introduced recently a Bill styled the Native Law's Amendment Bill. When it becomes law and operates, Africans will be prosecuted and punished for attending Church services in areas where white people live, although there be no Church in the area for non-Europeans. The South African Government Minister concerned is reported as having said that he would only use his powers when native Church attendance became a "public nuisance." Mr. Marais Steyn of the United (Opposition) Party asked the question: "How can the Minister say in a Christian land that the act of Worship can be a nuisance?" To the enlightened Christian mind, guided by the clear principles of the Scriptures and Gospel doctrine, the various laws and procedure adopted by the South African Government in recent times to further apartheid, are truly repugnant. We can state this without losing sight of difficulties which may be present in the Union on the racial question. It has been said that even many supporters of the Nationalist Government of the Union of South Africa, are ashamed of the aforesaid Bill. No doubt many such belong to the Dutch Reformed Church and are familiar with their Bibles; although the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa has been to a great extent behind apartheid. A Dutch Reformed Church convention declared that mixed congregations should be permitted where non-European congregations do not exist. This is indeed a poor, faulty and one-sided declaration from professed Christian men. Do they not read that in the

heavenly assembly before the Throne of God and of the Lamb, the redeemed from among all nations shall appear there. Surely fellowship in the Gospel of Christ and divine Worship here by those of different nationalities, is an earnest of the eternal fellowship to be participated in by all the redeemed in glory and it is certain that God will not look with complacency upon the un-Christian actions of the present South African Government whatever plausible arguments they may employ to bolster up their extraordinary policy and practices.

Evolution Protest Movement.

The mind of the rising generation is being poisoned and warped by the evil doctrine of evolution. It is taught at school, college and over the air as though it were an indisputable fact. In reality it is only a theory which many learned scientists discount. It may be defined as "the hypothesis that millions of years ago lifeless matter, acted upon by natural forces, gave origin to one or more minute living organisms, which have since evolved into all living and extinct plants and animals including man." As generally presented it is wholly opposed to the Biblical doctrine of a special creation, such as is presented in Genesis, and endorsed in all the subsequent Scriptures, besides being incompatible with the truth of the Gospel. It promotes unbelief and moral degeneracy.

The Evolution Protest Movement is scriptural and scientific. It offers 40 pamphlets for 7/6 on every aspect of this error. *Evolution*, is an invaluable little handbook (96 pages, 1/- post paid), is a mine of information, giving over 200 verdicts from leading men of the world in every branch of science, militating against this evil theory. The minimum subscriptions of 5/- per year entitles members to the news letters and booklets as printed. The Honorary Secretary is: A. G. Tilney, Esq., B.A., Stoke, Hayling Island, Hants. *The Reformation Link*, March, 1957.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

"Nor should it be forgotten, as sufficient forever to silence the advocates for the abolition of capital punishment, that God has not only given an unrepealed command which He might have been pleased to rest on His Own authority and will alone, but He has condescended to give the ground and reason of it; and so long as both the command remains unrepealed, and the reason remains a fact, so long is the proposed abolition of capital punishment a daring insult against the Most High. God has given us the reason why the shedding of man's blood must be avenged by the murderer's death—'for in the image of God made He man.'"

Jonah, his Character and Mission (page 225) by Dr. Hugh Martin, D.D.

Church Notes.

Communions.

January—Fourth Sabbath, Inverness. *February*—First Sabbath, Dingwall; third, Stornoway; fourth, North Uist. *March*—First Sabbath, Ullapool; second, Ness and Portree; third, Finsbay and Lochinver; fourth, Kinlochbervie; fifth, North Tolsta. *April*—First Sabbath, Portnalong and Breasclete; second, Fort William; third, London and Greenock; fourth, Glasgow and Wick. *May*—First Sabbath, Kames and Oban; second, Scourie; third, Broadford and Edinburgh. *June*—First Sabbath, Tarbert, Applecross, Coigach; second, Shieldaig; third, Lochcarron, Glendale, Helmsdale, Dornoch and Uig; fourth, Gairloch; fifth, Inverness. *July*—First Sabbath, Lairg, Raasay and Beaully; second, Staffin, Tomatin and Tain; third, Halkirk, Rogart, Flashadder and Daviot; fourth, Achmore, Bracadale, North Uist and Plockton. *August*—First Sabbath, Dingwall and Vancouver (Canada); second, Portree and Stratherrick; third, Bonar, Finsbay and Laide; fourth, Vatten, Stornoway and Thurso. *September*—First Sabbath, Ullapool and Breasclete; second, Strathy; third, Tarbert and Stoer. *October*—First Sabbath, Tolsta and Lochcarron; second, Gairloch and Ness; third, Applecross; fourth, Greenock, Lochinver and Wick. *November*—First Sabbath, Oban and Raasay; second, Glasgow and Halkirk; third, Edinburgh, Dornoch and Uig. *December*—First Sabbath, London.

SPECIAL NOTICE: All changes in above Communion dates to be notified to Editor, for 1957 (D.V.).

Applecross Communion—Change of Date.

The Kirk Session of the Applecross Congregation have decided that the date of their second Communion will be altered from the third Sabbath of October to the fourth Sabbath of September, with effect from next September, the Lord willing.—*D. J. Gillanders, Session Clerk.*

New Church, Dingwall.

Mr. D. Matheson, "Carminish," Achany Road, Dingwall, Clerk to the Deacons Court of the Joint Congregation of Dingwall and Beaully intimates that Town and Country Planning permission has now been obtained for the erection of the new Church at Dingwall and he expects that work will have commenced by the time this magazine is issued. Further donations are accordingly earnestly requested and loans free of interest or otherwise are particularly solicited from anyone who may feel disposed to provide funds in this way, loans being repayable say in four to five years or as may be arranged, and being

acknowledged by simple receipt signed by Mr. Matheson as Clerk to the Deacons Court of the Joint Congregation of Dingwall and Beaully and as Treasurer of the Dingwall Section of the Joint Congregation."

Deputy for Australia and New Zealand.

We are glad to inform our people here and abroad that Rev. D. J. Matheson, Glasgow, has secured a passage for himself and Mrs. Matheson who accompanies her husband, on the "Southern Cross" of the Shaw Saville Line and hopes, D.V., to sail from Tilbury Docks, London, for Auckland, New Zealand, on Wednesday, 29th May, 1957. We pray that the Lord may preserve them both throughout their 9 months' absence from this country, and that the divine blessing may accompany Mr. Matheson's labours as Church Deputy among our people in New Zealand and Australia.—A. F. MacKay, Convener of Dominion and Colonial Committee.

New Student.

The Southern Presbytery of the Church met at Glasgow on 30th April, 1957, accepted Mr. Alexander Macpherson (formerly on African Mission Staff) as a student for the ministry of the Free Presbyterian Church, subject to confirmation by the Synod.

Acknowledgment of Donations.

Mr. J. Grant, 4 Millburn Road, Inverness, General Treasurer, acknowledges with grateful thanks the following:—

Sustentation Fund.—Mr. J. G., Lochview, Tarbert, Argyll, £3; Mr. W. S., Skelpick, Bettyhill, £2; M. M. Melvich, £2; A Friend, o/a Inverness Congregation, £1; A Friend, o/a Lochinver Congregation, £4 6/-; N.S. Wales, Australia, o/a Stoer Congregation, £3; Miss B. McK., Seaforth, Ontario, £4.

Home Mission Fund.—Friend, N.S. Wales, £1; Mr. Wm. S., Skelpick, £1; Mr. T. M. Eston, Sask., £5; Anon, o/a Beaully Congregation, £1; R. H. C., Stevenston, £1.

Aged and Infirm Ministers and Widows and Orphans Fund.—A Friend, N.S. Wales, Australia, £2.

Dominions and Colonial Missions.—Mr. T. M. Eston, Sask., £5.

Organisation Fund.—Mr. T. M. Eston, Sask., £5.

Publication Fund.—Mrs. C. M., 47 Warrender Park Road, Edinburgh o/a Trinitarian Bible Society for Jewish children, £1.

Jewish and Foreign Missions.—Mr. T. M. Eston, Sask., Canada, £20; Miss E. McK., Kincairdine, Ontario, £11 11/3; Mr. R. H. C., Stevenston, Ayr, £2; Mr. Wm. S., Skelpick, £1; A Friend, Edinburgh, £1; A Friend, N.S. Wales, £1 10/-; Anon Friend, U.S.A., £35 14/3; Miss McK., Seaforth, Ontario, £4.

Mission Transport Fund.—Achmore Congregation, per Mr. J. M. MacArthur, £12; Friend, N.S. Wales, £2 10/-; A Friend, Inverlochy, per Mr. A. Colquhoun, 10/-; Mr. D. Campbell, 6 Lionel, Port of Ness, £4; Mr. J. D. McAulay, Inverness, £5.

Magazine Free Distribution Fund.—Miss C. U., Achterarder, 6/-; Mr. D. M., Altavaig, Tarbert, 6/-; Mr. J. D. McA., Inverness, 10/-; Miss I. C., Drimnin, Oban, 10/-; Miss B. J. McK., Seaforth, Ontario, 6/-.

The following list sent in for publication:—

Bayhead (North Uist) Congregation.—Mr. A. Macdonald, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, £2 o/a Sustentation Fund, from R. McDonald, Ahmhor; also £2, Friend, Diabaig, per General Treasurer.

Broadford Church Building Fund.—Mr. J. McLean, Treasurer, acknowledges with grateful thanks the following: Mr. R. D. Nicolson, Penefiler, £2 10/-; Mr. R. McCuish, Toward Lighthouse, £5; C. C., per Mary A. McLeod, and J. Macmillan, Raasay, £33 15/-; C. C., per A. Robertson, Tain, £17; D. MacKinnon, Elgol, per J. Nicolson, £10.

Dingwall Church Building Fund.—Mr. D. Matheson, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks the sum of £5 from Mr. and Mrs. McIntyre, Dingwall, also £1 from Mr. A. Macpherson, Helmsdale, “in loving Memory of the late Rev. D. Macfarlane, per Rev. W. G.

Glendale Congregation.—Mr. A. McLean, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks £1 from “Friend,” per Mr. D. M. R., o/a Home Mission Fund.

Halkirk Congregation.—Rev. W. Grant gratefully acknowledges £1 o/a Publication Fund, from Mrs. M. (Barvas).

St. Jude's Glasgow.—Mr. Wm. D. Fraser, Treasurer, 34 Dunearn Street, acknowledges with grateful thanks: Sustentation Fund, A. M., £2; Edinburgh Friend, per Miss McSwan, £1; “Shawlands,” £2; Thos. Clark, Elderslie, £3; Home Mission Fund, A. M., £2; “Shawlands,” £1; Jewish and Foreign Missions Fund, A. M., £3; Home of Rest Fund, A. M., £2.

Inverness Congregation.—Mr. Wm. MacKenzie, Treasurer, thankfully acknowledges: “A Friend,” Inverness post mark, £2, o/a Church painting Fund.

Fort William Manse Building Fund.—Mr. Ian Matheson, Treasurer, “Tanera,” Union Road, Fort William, acknowledges with grateful thanks: Friends, Uig, Lewis, £3; Mrs. S. (of Stornoway) Golspie, £3; D. McNicol, Spean Bridge, £1; Friend, Stornoway, £1 10/-; Friend, Applecross, 10/;

Friend, Inverness, £1 Friend, Glasgow, £1; "In loving Memory," £5; Friend, Edinburgh, £1; Friend at Communion, £3. The following per Mr. M. McRaid; Friend, Glasgow, £1; Miss McColl, £2; Friend, Edinburgh, 10/-; Friend, Argyllshire, £5, per A. Colquhoun.

North Harris Congregation.—Mr. D. Morrison, Treasurer, acknowledges with grateful thanks, £100 from the Executors of the late Malcolm Mac Aulay, Elder, 1 Ardhasaig, for Congregational purposes; also £10 from Anon., Tarbert, Harris, post mark towards Manse Repair Fund.

Lochcarron Congregation.—Mr. R. McRae, Treasurer, thankfully acknowledges £2 from Mr. K. G. Kishorn, o/a Sustentation Fund.

London Church Building Fund.—Rev. J. P. Macqueen acknowledges with sincere thanks £8 from Mrs. C. Canty, New Zealand; Mrs. A. McP., Glasgow, £5; Mr. R. McC., Toward Point, £5; Mrs. N. Murray, 74 Cross, Port of Ness, per Rev. Wm. McLean, £5; Mrs. A. Finlayson, 67 Cross, per Rev. Wm. McLean; £2 from Friend, Diabaig, per General Treasurer; £3 from "Interested," Inverness post mark, per Mr. J. C. Campbell, Treasurer. The following o/a Congregational Fund; A Skye Friend, £2; Dr. E. Cameron, Finchley, London, £2.

Plockton Church Building Fund.—The Treasurer gratefully thanks the following donors: "In loving Memory," £50; Miss C. U. Gask, £2; Mr. R. McC, Toward Light House, £5; Montana Friend, 10 dollars; Friend; 5/-; Kyle Congregation, £17.

The debt on the Church at Plockton has now been cleared off. We did not expect when it was opened two years ago, that it would be freed of debt so soon. We take this opportunity to thank all those who, under the hand of the Lord, helped to pay for this handsome and comfortable building.

A. Beaton, *Interim Moderator.*

Raasay Congregation Car Fund.—Mr. John Gillies, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks the following: Mr. J. McB., £1; M. McL., £5; Morag and E. McL., £2; A. McL., £2; J. McL., £2; E. McS., £1; Mrs. A. N., £1; R. McL., £2, all Inverarish. Jas. G., Balachurn, £2; J. G., Balachurn, £7; C. McL., Glasgow, £1; R. McL., Glasgow, £2; D. McK., Portree, £1; A Friend, East Suisnish, £1 10/-; Mr. and Mrs. Jas. N., Mill Place, £2; Mrs. E. N., Suisnish, 10/-

Valtos (Uig) Meeting House Repairs Fund.—Mr. M. MacLennan, Treasurer, acknowledges with grateful thanks, £1 from Friend, N. Tolsta, per M. S.; £1 from N. Tolsta Friend, per D. M.; also Friend, £1; from Miss M. Matheson, Drumbuie, £3 for Congregational purposes.