

The
Free Presbyterian Magazine
and Monthly Record

Volume 78

March 1973

No. 3

Visit to Rhodesia

by Rev. William MacLean, M.A.

Ingwenya Mission
Rhodesia.
3rd January 1973

Dear Mr MacLeod,

I shall endeavour to comply with your request for a letter on my visit to our Mission in Rhodesia.

I crossed from Auckland to Sydney on Wednesday 13th December. On the following morning I boarded a Boeing 707 of the South African Airways for Johannesburg. After 17 hours of flying with a half hour stop over at Perth and again at Mauritius we landed at Johannesburg at 7.55 p.m. At the airport I was met by my nephew, George Nairn, who saw to my welfare while in the city. From Johannesburg I travelled the following day, Friday 15th, by plane to Bulawayo. Rev. A. Ndebele, members of the staff at Ingwenya, Mr and Mrs Jan Van Woerden and my cousin Murdo MacKay were meeting me at the airport.

On Saturday I was shown through the school buildings, the library and the church, and I visited the graves of the Rev. James Fraser and Mrs Nicholson whose memories will long remain green in Rhodesia, and the grave of the Rev. John Radasi who also with devotion and unflagging zeal laboured on the Mission here. On Sabbath 17th December I preached twice through an interpreter. The services are at 11.30 a.m. to 1 p.m. and again at 2 p.m. Rev. A. Ndebele was not present at the second service as he had to hold the usual afternoon service in Bulawayo. Although the school-boarders, 200 teenagers, were on holiday it was estimated that a congregation of about 300 was present. During the hour's interval between the two services the people remained on around the church without food or drink for the second service. On Monday my cousin who had been in Ingwenya for the weekend took me for a trip to Bulawayo. On Tuesday I had a service in Libeni at 3 p.m., and on Wednesday at the same hour in Gadadi, two of the out-stations

connected with Ingwenya and where services are regularly held. The prayer meeting was on Thursday at 8 p.m., at which I again presided. All these services were well attended. At the communion seasons in Ingwenya there are up to 600 people in the church and about 200 outside. The Fellowship Meeting on the Friday is now a regular feature of communion seasons in the congregations of the Mission. On Thursday we went into Bulawayo to meet Dr James Tallach who was expected to arrive by plane that day. His plane having been delayed by fog at London airport, he did not arrive until Friday. We were all pleased to see him, and to get the news of Scotland.

On Saturday 23rd Rev. A. Ndebele took Miss Marion Graham, Miss Margaret MacKenzie and myself to Zenka. We left about 7 a.m. and arrived about 10 a.m. Miss Katie Mary MacAulay had gone up two days earlier to prepare Zenka manse where we were to stay. In the afternoon two of the Zenka elders, Mr Paul Mayaye Ncube and Mr Ndebele, the minister's venerable father, and a deacon, Mr Sibanda, called to welcome me. They were of the opinion that I had come out as their new minister. Old Mr Ncube said, "It is the gospel we need. The gospel is the medicine for our souls. It is the gospel we need". His photo with his bicycle when he laboured as a lay missionary in the Shangani Reserve is in the "Life of James Fraser". It was he who said, "The whole Reserve will yet be lit up with the glory of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ". We had a cup of tea together. After they left, the ladies from Ingwenya said that the deacon, Mr Sibanda, was a trophy of grace, one of the fruits of Rev. D. M. Campbell's ministry in Zenka. On Sabbath the services were held in the open under the shade of a large tree, as the church could not accommodate the congregation. It was truly encouraging to see such a concourse of people coming to the means of grace. I preached twice through an interpreter. It is estimated that about eighty per cent of the congregations throughout the Mission were made up of young people in the 20-30 age group. On Tuesday Mr Ndebele who is Interim-Moderator of Zenka took us in the land-rover to Nkai, where I again preached at 3 p.m. It was at Nkai that the veteran John Mpofu whose photo is also in James Fraser's book laboured. It was his son, Alexander Mpofu, who visited Scotland and who died shortly after his return home. There are two communions held in Nkai with an average attendance of about 150. On Wednesday there was a meeting of the Rhodesia Presbytery in the church at Zenka at 9.30 a.m. I was pleased to meet Rev. Petros Mzamo again who with his elder had come through from Mbuma. The opening devotions, the singing, reading and prayer was in Sindebele, reminding one of the former days in the Outer Isles Presbytery when the opening devotions used to be in Gaelic. The Minutes were read in English and interpreted by one of the elders. I was associated with the Presbytery.

The two students Mr B. B. Dube and Mr Nathaniel Mpofu had their Presbytery examinations. The examination was very thorough. Each student was examined for two hours. They both acquitted themselves very creditably. They both appear to be very fine young men. May they be raised to be able ministers of the New Testament. It was 3.45 p.m. when the Presbytery adjourned. After a meal prepared by the Ingwenya ladies for members of the Presbytery, we set out in Mr Mzamo's land-rover for Mbumba. There are two communion seasons in Zenka held in the open with an attendance of about 600.

At Mbumba I was hospitably entertained in the home of Sister Jocelyn Cox and Sister Cathie Ann Turner. Miss Margaret MacKenzie was also there and Miss Catherine Tallach. Dr James Tallach's house is almost next door. He had his meals with us. The prayer meeting was on Thursday at 3 p.m. I preached to a congregation of about 150. Mr Mzamo had a service at the same time at one of the out stations. There are 13 stations connected with Mbumba, and 15 stations connected with Zenka where services are regularly held. After the prayer meeting I was shown through the hospital by Dr Tallach and Sister Cox. It appears to be a very modern hospital and well equipped — a veritable Bethesda, as the patients, some of whom never heard the gospel, hear from the Doctor and his staff of God's house of mercy — the refuge, the rest and the healing that is in the Lord Jesus Christ for sinners. I preached twice on the Sabbath to a large congregation. The church was packed to capacity, the majority being young men and women all smartly dressed. On Monday I again preached the New Year's service to a large congregation. There are also two communion seasons in Mbumba with an attendance of about 500 at each communion. There is one communion in the year at each of the following places: Donsa Dam with an attendance of about 200, Mano Mano attendance 100, Samarkantani with an attendance of about 100. In all there are eleven communion seasons one each month except in the month of December. Before leaving on Monday evening for Ingwenya I had the pleasure of visiting Rev. Petros Mzamo in the manse. In both manses and with both ministers I felt as if I were back in Scotland. Miss Catherine Tallach took me back in her car to Ingwenya. On Tuesday at 3 p.m. I had my last service in the Cameron school, one of the Ingwenya out-stations. The school is in memory of the late Rev. Neil Cameron's visit to the Mission. This evening Wednesday 3rd I will be leaving for Bulawayo to get the plane for Salisbury en route to London and Glasgow (D.V.). My cousin is kindly accompanying me to Salisbury.

My visit to the Mission in Rhodesia has been one of the happiest episodes of my life. It can be summed up in what the Queen of Sheba said when she visited King Solomon, "Howbeit I believed not the words, until I came, and mine eyes have seen it: and, behold the half

was not told me". Whenever I preached I felt drawn out in love to the Africans. They are a loveable people, kind and most courteous. It is a cause for thankfulness to see such gatherings of people and of young people at the services, and to meet among them those who gave evidence that they had passed from death to life. The footsteps of our God and King are to be seen in the forests of Africa where He has planted His vineyard, that shall yet extend from sea to sea according to the prophecy, "Princes shall come out of Egypt; Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands to God" (Ps. 68:31). It should be a cause of encouragement to the people of the Church at home and abroad and to the many friends in Holland whose financial support is so generous that the gospel in its purity is preached at the Mission, that the worship and ordinances are in accordance with the mind of the Lord as revealed in His Word and that Christ as the alone Saviour of sinners is lifted up and extolled. May ministers, doctors, teachers and nurses hear the Macedonia cry of Rhodesia, "Come over and help us", and be led to labour in this wonderful country.

In conclusion I would like to pay my warmest thanks to Miss Marion Graham, Miss Margaret MacKenzie, Miss Katie Mary MacAulay, and Miss Sheila MacLeod at Ingwenya, and to Sister Cox and Cathie Ann Turner at Mbumba for their great kindness and hospitality and to all for the gifts and mementoes of my visit to Rhodesia. The self-denial and devotion to duty in their respective spheres of the Mission staff can only evoke admiration and praise and a desire that their labours will be abundantly blessed.

"Therefore I wish that peace may still
Within thy walls remain.
And ever may thy palaces
prosperity retain."

With kindest regards,
Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM MACLEAN

Sermon

by Rev. Petros Mzamo

(The following sermon was preached by Rev. P. Mzamo on Thursday, 27th April 1972 preparatory to the communion service at Mbumba Mission.)

"And the Lord turned and look upon Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how He had said unto him, Before the cock crow,

thou shalt deny me thrice. And Peter went out and wept bitterly. Luke 22:61, 62.

Here we have the time when Peter denied his Master and the time when the Lord looked upon Peter. It was the time when the Lord Jesus Christ was standing before the judgment. Judas Iscariot had betrayed his Master to the High Priest; many false accusations had been brought against the Lord; many were united to say as much as possible against 'this man'; all the enemies of the Lord joined together as if to say, "If we miss this man we may not find him again; so let's use this time."

All were united against the Lord — even the ordinary people. It was the fulfilment of Psalm 2. What took place at this time was a fulfilment of Psalm 2: "Why do the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers took counsel together, against the Lord, and against His Anointed". They all joined together against the Anointed of God, the Holy One of Israel, against the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. "He came unto His own and His own received Him not." John 1:11.

The next thing we notice is that the kings and the High Priests never showed friendship to Christ; the whole world was against Him. Herod was against the child Jesus. From among the priests none showed friendship. They showed openly that they were against Him, that they were the open enemies of the Saviour.

Now we come to the Church and find the man Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve disciples. He belonged to the visible Church; he had its privileges. He held the position of treasurer, a position given to him. But here we see Judas Iscariot in his true colours. Although he was numbered among the twelve, in reality he was not of that number. He was a disguised enemy; he belonged to the enemy. He showed clearly that he was not a true Christian although he was of the Church, and had its privileges. He had never experienced a change of heart or sorrow for sin in a saving way — true repentance. He had betrayed the Lord, the Holy One of Israel. Judas Iscariot showed clearly that he was a hypocrite deep down, with no change of heart or nature. So now this must be exposed. He had never experienced true repentance. Jesus said that He had come to call sinners to repentance. Judas Iscariot never experienced this repentance, the work of the Holy Spirit, when the Holy Spirit pierces the heart of a sinner, showing his sin. Judas Iscariot was a stranger to this. Instead of turning away from sin, he went on in sin although he knew that he had committed sin. He took the money back to the High Priest. He appeared to be sincere, he appeared to be repenting, but deep down in his heart Judas Iscariot never truly repented unto eternal life, for he went

deeper into sin. He went out into the darkness and killed himself. He broke the commandment of the Lord. "Thou shalt not kill". He committed sin by breaking God's law in taking his own life.

No sin stands by itself. Impossible! One sin joins with another sin; and as you grow you are making chains of sin, links joined together tying you to eternal death.

Take note of the fact that Judas Iscariot was one of the twelve. He was very near to the Church, although he did not belong to the true Church of Christ. When the Lord constituted His table Judas was among the disciples. He was a hypocrite. It is a dangerous thing for a hypocrite to come to Church and sit at the Lord's Table; to have the privileges but to make it his chief occupation to betray the Lord, to betray the Lord to His enemies.

So let us examine ourselves. Are we true Christians, born again, born twice? Those twice born shall die *once*; such are the people of God. A hypocrite, born once, never experienced the New Birth.

Let us now go on to the case of Peter. Peter was truly of the Church of Christ, born twice, born into this world but also into the kingdom of God. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God". Only those born twice can see the Kingdom of God. Peter was different from Judas Iscariot: he was not a hypocrite; he had knowledge of the Saviour. "This is life eternal that they might know Thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." Peter had this knowledge taught by the Holy Spirit.

Peter committed sin. What sin? The sin of denying his Lord, his Saviour, his Redeemer. That was his sin. This shows us that there are certain sins committed by the Lord's people. The hypocrite, Judas Iscariot, could not deny Him as his Lord, because He was not his Lord. He was not the Lord of the priests. They said, "We will not have this man to rule over us". The Roman soldiers and the governors did not own Him as Lord. Judas Iscariot, deep down in his heart, never owned Him as Lord. He did not say as Thomas did, "My Lord and my God".

But here Peter had denied his own Lord. He had already said that He would be his Lord. He had said in effect: "This is the One I desire to follow". He had said, "Behold we have forsaken all, and followed Thee." Peter had now denied his Lord. The sin of denying the Lord in this way is committed by His people. The world, the unconverted, have rejected the Lord. They say, "Away with this man". They reject Him, but the denial of Him, as in the case of Peter, is committed by the Lord's people.

Another sin only committed by the Lord's people is grieving the Holy Spirit, as in Ephesians Chapter 4, verse 30: "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption".

The world resist the Holy Spirit, but He does not dwell in the hearts of the unconverted. The Holy Spirit dwells in the hearts of His people and He is grieved when they fail in their duty, when they fail to pray, when they quarrel and fall into discontentment and misunderstandings. The Holy Spirit is grieved, for He is the Spirit of love, of peace. So Peter was here guilty of denying the Lord and of grieving the Holy Spirit.

Another thing we notice is that Peter was specially favoured of the Lord. The Lord took Peter, James and John to the Mount of Transfiguration. Peter saw the glory of the Church, Moses and Elijah and the Lord Jesus glorious in appearance — the Church glorified. Some of the disciples did not have this experience. In the garden of Gethsemane the Lord took Peter, James and John with Him. Peter was an eye-witness of the Lord's suffering in the Garden of Gethsemane. He saw the sweat of drops of blood. Peter saw it with his own eyes. Peter was really a believer; he gladdened the heart of the Lord when Jesus asked, "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" Several answers were given. They said, "Some say that Thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others Jeremias or one of the prophets." "One of the prophets" suggests indifference. But Peter gave a clear answer, showing the teaching of God: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The Lord answered, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." And He added that upon that rock, his profession, He would build His Church and the gates of hell would not prevail against it. Peter knew that He was the Christ of God; that He had come to save His people from their sins. Peter was taught by God Himself; he had received this revelation. Blessed is the one who has this knowledge: "I know this is the Christ. There is none other Saviour, save Christ alone". And yet, in spite of this, Peter denied his Lord: "I know Him not". He was saying that he was ignorant of his Master who had done so much for him. The Lord had said, "All ye shall be offended because of me this night". Peter had answered, "Though all men shall be offended because of Thee yet will I never be offended". He was saying as it were, "I will go with Thee to prison and to death". But the Lord said, "Verily I say unto thee, that this night before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice".

Now, coming to ourselves, are we not guilty of denying the Lord in many different ways. You are guilty of this sin perhaps not so much by word of mouth; but if you are living a life inconsistent with your profession, you are denying the Lord. You are living the life of the world, joined with the world in its activities which are against the Lord. These people are His enemies; so if you join with them by going to the dancing hall, night plays, what are you doing but denying the Lord saying, "I know not this man"?

People also deny the Lord by keeping quiet when they ought to speak. A chance is given to speak for the Lord when the Name of the Lord is blasphemed. If you are quiet, are you not denying the Lord? So that is the sin of Peter: he disowned the Lord; and yet the Lord owned Peter. He is still the same, and will be to the end. Though we would disown the Lord, if we are His people, He abideth faithful. The Lord owned Peter; He is interested in His people; He takes notice of everything, their words, actions, thoughts, just like a loving parent who notices what the child does. The little steps that the child takes the father notices. So it is with the Lord. If you are a child of grace the Lord takes notice of you. Though here the Lord was in the midst of trouble, he noticed Peter. The crowing of the cock could not open the heart of Peter, could not remind him of his sin. Peter heard the cock crow, but it was not its sound that moved him. He was not moved until the precious Lord, the Merciful One, turned and looked on him as if to say, "Peter, why did you deny Me when I am alone, when the whole world is against Me?" The Lord looked upon Peter because He was interested in him.

Ah dear friend, what are you doing with Christ? Are you careful not to disown the Lord? Here is the merciful One. Peter was written on his heart; and the look, those eyes turned on Peter, pierced Peter to his soul, to his heart. The darkness which had covered Peter's heart was removed by that look. He was brought to the glorious light of the Gospel. Those convincing eyes that pierced Peter! Peter remembered his sin. We cannot know our sins of ourselves; no angel can make us remember our sin. A divine work, the work of the Holy Spirit, must be wrought in us.

So on this day of confession of sin, do you desire that the eyes of the Lord Jesus Christ would look direct on you; as past the multitude they looked on Peter alone? Peter knew the meaning of those eyes. That's what you need, friend; that's what I need. As the Lord looked on Peter, I need that the Lord would look into my soul so that my sins may stand before me. These sins will be as mountains.

The more the Lord's people grow in grace, the holier they become, the blacker they will see their own sins, which will be as mountains in their sight. But the Lord has removed the sins of His people; He has thrown them behind His back, and will remember them no more for ever. There is only one thing that God forgets — the sins which He has forgiven. What about yourself? The holier one becomes, the more will one be aware of one's sins. Is that not what we would desire this day, a day of confession for sin? To confess them truly we must see them; and only one thing will do that, that is for the Lord to look upon you and upon me as He did upon Peter, that we may confess them before the Lord. By that look He put grace into Peter's heart,

for without grace we cannot confess sin. The sign of grace at this time in Peter's soul was that he went out and wept bitterly. Why? Because he had disowned his Master. His tears were tears of repentance. Blessed eyes which have shed such tears! Blessed cheeks where tears of repentance have run over! The wages of sin is death; sin is against God; sin dishonours Christ.

The Lord makes His people remember sin. Before Jesus left His disciples He opened their mind to understand the Scriptures. We need at this time to say, "Lord, look upon me. Put grace into my soul to confess sin". Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted. We need the Lord of Glory to look in mercy upon us in a convincing way, we need to see Jesus Christ and Him crucified. Then He would say as He said to Peter, when He sent the message to His disciples to go into Galilee: "Tell His disciples and Peter that He goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see Him". Peter must be there.

He remembered sin and confessed, and had godly sorrow; and the Lord met with Peter again in Galilee. The Lord is willing to meet with you at His Table. That man, that woman whose sins have been forgiven, blessed are such! Peter must be there — forgiven. We need that the Holy Spirit would give us grace to confess our sin — to give us the sorrow of the Lord's people which the world knows not of: "For godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation not to be repented of, but the sorrow of the world worketh death". Peter had the sorrow which "worketh repentance to salvation", but Judas Iscariot had sorrow which led him deeper into sin, into hell.

You see the difference between these two sorrows: one leading to salvation, godly sorrow uprooting the sinner from the world to look unto the Lord, up to heaven; the other, worldly sorrow making a sinner look down.

May the Lord look upon us as on Peter. Then our souls will rejoice in the Lord.

"They of Italy salute you"

We met the Campani family for the first time on Saturday, 11th November, 1972. They live in a smallish house in the village of Fornaci Di Barga, where the father works in a local factory. The names of the parents are Emilia and Claudio, and their three children are called Renzo, Dario and Simonetta. The oldest child is quite an intelligent and mature eleven year old boy, while the youngest is a very lively five year old girl. Emilia's parents live in a house very near-by, and are often in the daughter's house, as is so much the custom in Italy.

The services are held twice on Sabbath in the kitchen of Emilia's house, though the term service requires some explanation here. There is first a prayer, then a reading, and after this the "sermon" begins. The "sermon" is liberally interspersed with interjections, comments and questions from the "congregation". If this approach is less formal than we are used to, it certainly makes it easier to know whether or not the message has been received. The numbers regularly at the services are very small, consisting only of this family group. We were encouraged, however, on the second Sabbath of our stay to meet a brother of Emilia's. He had taken along his two smallest children with him on his motor-bike, and arrived about half-way through the service. He sat down at the kitchen table with us and seemed quite willing to join in the discussion. We got a taste of typical Italian frankness when he said that he did believe in God, though not deeply, for he found religion difficult when things went against him in life. We met Ermete at two other services, and his wife at one. Also they both came on two week-day evenings, when we read and discussed the word of God. Again we saw that the kind of reserve common in Scotland was entirely lacking, and we discussed spiritual matters until late.

The church is tiny in Fornaci, but it has two mainstays — Emilia and her mother. Emilia is a kind and attractive person, but has difficulties of one kind and another because of her timid nature. Family concerns loom large in her mind, and she is sensitive to her position as a Protestant in a Roman Catholic village. She also worries about her children who have no alternative but to follow a course of education which is centered on the Roman Catholic religion. At one service reference was made to the passage in the 6th chapter of John which speaks of many disciples turning back from following the Saviour. Emilia felt this very keenly, and expressed her great fear that she too would turn back, as others she knows have done. On another occasion she referred to the Saviour's parable of the seeds bearing fruit in differing degrees. Her comment was that she would be pleased to be sure of bearing just thirty-fold fruit. She has many fears, but we believe they are the fears that only the godly know. Those at home would be serving well the church in Fornaci if they prayed that Emilia would become stronger in the Lord. Of course her greatest encouragement would be to see her own husband converted, and made like-minded with herself.

Emilia's mother is a very different type. She is a strong personality who has learned to develop cheerfulness and courage throughout a life that has been hard and in some ways disappointing. Her husband, a Communist, has no faith of any kind. One cannot but admire this old lady, showing a real christian deportment in the midst of many difficulties.

We distributed small amounts of literature (scripture portions and Gospels supplied by the Trinitarian Bible Society) in some of the places through which we passed. Also after arriving in Fornaci di Barga we did the same in surrounding villages which we found easily accessible by car. Generally we merely left literature on a doorstep, to avoid giving the opportunity to refuse it. However at Barga I found an elderly man sitting in the sun outside his house, and something like the following conversation ensued:

"We have come here from Scotland".

"Oh! which part — from Glasgow?"

"No, from further North." — "From Inverness?"

"No, further north still. Were you ever in Scotland?"

"I was born in Scotland — in Arran. That was in 1898, and I left Scotland in 1904."

"Could I leave this Gospel with you? It speaks about the Redeemer, the Light of the World."

"But there are many redeemers in the world: that of the Roman Catholics, of Jehovah's Witnesses, and many others."

"I know that these are different, but I am only for the Bible. I do not belong to a sect."

"Oh I see. Well, if you want just to leave that here that's all right."

Another contact we had was made entirely through Emilia, and the story behind it is rather interesting. Three years ago Emilia was in hospital for a short time. On Sabbath morning everyone in the ward went off to Mass except herself and the lady beside her, who was unable to leave her bed. Emilia took out her New Testament and the lady asked what she was reading. Emilia explained, and they read the scriptures together. When a priest came into the ward and Emilia had some discussion with him, the older lady found herself agreeing more with Emilia than with the priest. When they parted, Emilia promised to send the older lady a Bible which she had already lent to someone else, but the old lady said, "I am not sure that I will get it: can you not give me that New Testament now?" And so she did.

Spianate, where this elderly lady lives, is a small village about thirty miles from Fornaci. When we got there we found Emilia's friend in fairly poor circumstances, her invalid husband seated beside a large open fireplace which gave little heat for a winter's day. Emilia got a very warm welcome, though they had met only that one time in hospital three years before; obviously their friendship was very deep. After a time we spoke about the Bible, and the old lady showed us the Testament she had received from Emilia. Asked if she liked it she said that she certainly did, and that in summer she was in the habit of sitting out in front of the house to read it. We left a complete Bible with her so that she could read the Old Testament as well as the New. She was

very surprised to hear that there was nothing to pay. They had spoken earlier of a time when her husband had gone to the priest for alms. He was told that he would willingly be given alms, only he must first tell the year when Christ was born and when he died. He was not able to do so. We could not tell how much this woman knows about the way of salvation, but she certainly reads the word of God earnestly and we ask you to pray that it will be blessed to herself and to her invalid husband.

We also request prayer that some will be added to the church at Fornaci, as Emilia's husband, father, brother and sister-in-law. The devil and his poor servants would be glad to see nothing come of the church's mission in Italy, but we must pray that the Saviour's enemies will be clothed with shame, and that upon Himself shall the crown flourish.

Following the example of Mr MacInnes, Ullapool, I expect to send brief sermons to the Campani family, and also to the few other contacts that have been made (as the old man in Barga and the lady at Spianate). May the Lord Himself bless the seed which we have both sown in weakness. Isobel and I are grateful to those who remembered us in prayer while we were in Italy. May many continue to pray for the church there, that "a little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation".

J. T.

The Bible and Textual Criticism

by Rev. Donald MacLean, Glasgow

Readers of this *Magazine* would have read with interest the knowledgeable article on the above subject written by Rev. T. H. Brown, Secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society, in the July issue. His remarks were occasioned by an article written by Rev. Donald MacLeod, Associate Editor of the *Banner of Truth Magazine*, and minister of Partick Highland Free Church of Scotland, which appeared in that *Magazine* in June. Mr MacLeod was giving advice in that article to correspondents who were troubled by critical attacks on the Word of God, and who had asked him to recommend "reading material on the composition and compilation of the Scriptures." The advice given by Mr MacLeod was extremely unsatisfactory, as Mr Brown has shown, and the article showed a bias against the A.V. and the Greek text which lies at the back of the New Testament which is inexcusable. This prejudice is clearly seen in the reading material provided in his bibliography, in which he does not mention one book which puts the case for the A.V. with any conviction or fairness.

In the December issue of the Banner of Truth Magazine, Mr MacLeod returns to the attack, and in a long article of fourteen pages re-emphasises his position of prejudice against the A.V., and his consequent support of modern versions. It is only too evident that Mr MacLeod in this matter occupies a position far down the neo-evangelical stream, and that he is a thoroughly unsafe guide to any enquirer who wishes to reach a properly based conviction as to the authority of the Word of God.

Rev. Iain Murray, the Editor of the Banner of Truth Magazine, has recently become a Free Church minister. He found it necessary to make an editorial comment on the controversy which Mr MacLeod's articles are bound to provoke. He obviously feels a bit uncomfortable at providing so much space for Mr MacLeod to air views which he must know are extremely distasteful to his more spiritually-minded readers, and which must have been read with a profound sense of shock by those who love the A.V. and feed daily upon it by the teaching of the Holy Ghost. He excuses himself on the ground that there is a danger that those who recently professed commitment to the Reformed Faith will accept the position that the Greek text upon which the A.V. is based is the true text. He holds that this position is untenable, since there are many more manuscripts available for consideration now than there were in the days of the Reformers. In this he is at one with Mr MacLeod, who states his position at the conclusion of his article as follows: "Theologically, the New Testament is the same in all the manuscripts and in all the versions. The Received Text is a text of the Word of God and the B-Aleph text is a text of the Word of God; the A.V. is a version of the Word of God; but so also are the R.V., the R.S.V. and the New English Bible." This statement puts these modern versions on a par with the A.V., and the whole tone of the article is intended to convey the impression that they are superior. If this is so, why is there clear and irrefutable evidence of deliberate steps made in these versions to weaken the authority of God's Word, and to cast doubt upon some of the cardinal truths of revelation? Both Mr Murray and Mr MacLeod are fond of speaking of "mainstream Reformed theologians" but they are very selective in their choice. Both Warfield and Machen are mentioned as those who accept the principles behind the W.H. text. This does not for a moment mean that either of these theologians would accept the R.S.V. or the N.E.B. In fact an examination of the work of their fellow-professor and colleague, Professor O. T. Allis, demonstrates that they most likely would not

Abbreviations — A.V.: Authorised Version; R.V.: Revised Version, 1881; R.S.V.: Revised Standard Version; N.E.B.: New English Bible; W.H.: Westcott and Hort.

accept these versions. While Dr Allis himself supported the R.V., his review of the Old Testament section of the R.S.V. has the highly significant title, "Revised Version or Revised Bible." His conclusions are as follows: "No elaborate summing-up is needed. The evidence speaks for itself. It shows that the R.S.V. differs from the A.V. in one all-important aspect. It is not 'a faithful rendering of the original.' On the contrary, it treats the Old Testament with a freedom which is incompatible with that high regard for its trustworthiness and Divine authority which is so marked a feature of the version of 1611. This is the great reason that this 'revision', however excellent it may be in some other respects, cannot be satisfactory to Bible-believing Christians. It cannot be accepted by them as a 'standard' version. A version to be acceptable to them must tell them as accurately as possible what the *Bible* says, and not what some consensus of scholars, who, however learned, are after all mere mortals like themselves, think it ought to say." His conclusion with respect to the New Testament section of the R.S.V. is in the following words: "It may have been the hope of some of those who were actively connected with this undertaking that the Authorised Version could be transformed into an 'idiomatic' 'modern speech' version by a simple process of revision. If so they were doomed to disappointment, for in the R.S.V. the work of revision has been carried to such an extreme that the result is much more a new translation than a revision; and a new translation is what the Revised Standard Version should be called." Here we have a proper assessment of the true situation.

Mr Murray further proceeds blandly to hold to the belief that the A.V. "taken all-in-all has not yet been superseded in point of merit by any more modern version published in Britain." He must excuse us if we confess to some considerable doubt as to his belief in this matter. One cannot praise modern versions in one breath and the A.V. in the next. We shall endeavour to consider this point in this article, although it has been done before now times without number. Mr Murray also criticises Mr Brown's attitude, and asks what authority in the T.B.S.'s constitution support Mr Brown's views. We leave Mr Brown to answer this, but it should be quite obvious to any honest-minded person from the fact that the T.B.S. is fully committed to the Authorised Version in English, that it must also be committed to the Greek text upon which it is based. Mr Brown is therefore perfectly entitled to write in defence of it, and to continue his exposure of the falsities of modern versions. We have no fear that these efforts on Mr Brown's part will mean that "support for the T.B.S. will be sadly decimated," as Mr Murray states, but we have no doubt that these articles by Messrs MacLeod and Murray will lead to a falling-off in support for the Banner of Truth Magazine. Serious-minded Christians

have been deeply pained. Controversy has the effect of bringing out what is really in men, and this one is no exception. It is all very revealing, and in Mr Murray's case, many will feel that it is particularly sad.

It is not our intention in a Magazine of this description to go through all the points raised by Mr MacLeod on the question of Textual Criticism. His arguments are well known and have been refuted adequately by others. However, one or two matters require to be mentioned. The Christian who takes the Authorised Version in his hands in his private devotions, at family worship, and in the public worship of God, should have a clear and solid conviction in his mind that he has in his possession "the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever," and that the Greek text which lies behind the New Testament is that text which has been preserved by the providence of God for his use. This Greek text was substantially the text of the church of God from the fourth century downwards. It was the Greek text preserved in the Greek Church during the Byzantine period (312-1453). When the light of the glorious Reformation broke upon the church, this was the selected text, and continued to be so for three centuries, and was the basis of the Authorised Version. It was only with the rise of nineteenth century criticism that it began to be attacked in a concerted way. An attempt has been made by the opponents of this text to infer that it is not an independent witness but a revision at some point in the fourth century. This point is raised by Mr MacLeod who states, "Scholars therefore regard it as highly probable that the Majority text is in fact that of Tüchler's recension." The true facts are that there is no historical evidence for any such recension. The idea was a concoction of Hort's probably borrowed from Greisbach, in order to bolster up his own theory and to denigrate the Textus Receptus. (Received or majority text).

It is further a fact that not all modern scholars accept the conception of a recension. One scholar, Jacob Geerlings, whom we are told has done extensive work on certain "family" branches of the majority text, has stated flatly concerning this text that "Its origins, as well as those of other so-called text types probably go back to the autographs. It is now abundantly clear that the Eastern church never officially adopted or recognised a received or authorised text, and only by a long process of slow evolution did the Greek text of the New Testament undergo the various changes that we can dimly see in the few extant uncial codices identified with the Byzantine (i.e. Majority) Text." Thus the Westcott and Hort view is abandoned. It is no longer tenable. On the contrary, this scholar thinks that this text goes back to the autographs. Another point of major importance is that the majority of the manuscripts witness to this text, and a very telling point is made by Professor Z. Hodges when he points out that "the further removed in the

history of transmission a text becomes from its source, the less time it has to leave behind a large family of offspring. Hence in a large tradition, when a pronounced unity is observed between, let us say, eighty per cent of the evidence, a very strong presumption is raised that this numerical preponderance is due to direct derivation from the very oldest sources. In the absence of any convincing contrary explanation this presumption is raised to a very high level of probability indeed. Thus the Majority text upon which the King James Version is based has in reality the strongest claim possible to be regarded as an authentic representation of the original text. This claim is quite independent of any shifting consensus of scholarly judgment about its readings, and is based on the objective reality of its dominance in the transmissional history of the New Testament text. This dominance has not, and — we venture to suggest — cannot, be otherwise explained.” We therefore contend that the text which lies at the basis of the New Testament of the Authorised Version is the one which fulfils the statement of the Confession of Faith: “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.”

But Mr MacLeod will have none of this. Padding after his hero, Warfield, he adopts a different view of the matter. Says Warfield, “Just because we believe in God’s continuous care over the purity of His Word, we are able to look upon the labours of the great critics of the nineteenth century — a Tregelles, a Tischendorf, a Westcott, a Hort — as well as those of a Gregory and a Basil and a Chrysostom, as instruments of Providence in preserving the Scriptures pure for the use of God’s people.” Says Mr MacLeod, “The God who works all things according to the counsel of His will, seeing the end from the beginning, knew and foreordained that in the 19th century there would take place a revision of the text of Scripture etc.” Now we know that God foreordained the rising of these men and the work they intended to do, but it is a very grave assumption to think that He approved of their work. God foreknew the rise of Pharaoh — indeed, He stated that His glory was to be shown forth in that connection — but that did not make Pharaoh the servant of God or the friend of the church. He was the greatest source of its bondage. Upon what authority did Warfield conclude that these naturalistic critics were friends of the Word of God? Upon what authority did William Cunningham praise Greisbach’s text, saying it “is more pure and correct, approaches nearer to the original text of the inspired authors than the *textus receptus*, and I am disposed to think that this opinion is correct.” Mr MacLeod

¹ Which Bible pp. 16. 21.

describes Dr Cunningham as "a master dogmatician" and with this we agree. We certainly do not agree that he saw all "the doctrinal implications of academic contentions and conclusions." In fact, any reading of his life shows that he, like other leaders in the Free Church, did not properly grasp the serious implications of Criticism. Even Rabbi Duncan, who far outstripped Cunningham in personal piety, had as his assistant A. B. Davidson, the notorious higher critic, who poisoned the minds of the rising ministry in the Free Church to such an extent that when his most brilliant pupil, Professor Robertson Smith, was relieved of his Chair for his God-dishonouring critical views, two hundred and thirtyone members of an Assembly of over six hundred voted against the Motion and in favour of Robertson Smith. We have no confidence in Cunningham's judgment in this particular matter, as he must have known that Griesbach was a German rationalist who wrote in 1771, 'The New Testament abounds in more glosses, additions and interpolations purposely introduced, than any other book.' Scrivener, whose skill in Textual Criticism far exceeds that of Cunningham, states this: "The plain fact is that while disciples were regarding Griesbach's system as self evidently true, their wiser master must have had many a misgiving as to the safety of that imposing structure his rare ingenuity had built upon the sand." "Griesbach's text can no longer be regarded as satisfactory, although it is far less objectionable than such a system as his would have made it in rash and unskilful hands." Hort, too, spoke of the Received Text as "vile", as Mr MacLeod tells us, and made known his attitude to the authority of Scripture in the following words: "For ourselves we do not introduce considerations which could not reasonably be applied to other ancient texts." In other words, to him the Bible was just like some other ancient document, and his approach to it was exactly the same. We see no reason for holding these critics to be pious and Godly men, and we certainly have no reason to conclude that they viewed the Word of God as the supernatural oracles of the Holy Ghost. We part company here with Warfield and others like him. When men lay hands on the Word of God and take to do with the Divine oracles, we need to be convinced first of their piety, and only secondly of their scholarship.

Let us see now where this strange interpretation of God's providential care of His Word leads us if we are to believe that the truth of Scripture had been more or less lost for fifteen centuries until it was produced by W.H. In the encircling gloom of the spreading apostasy overtaking the English-speaking church of the nineteenth century, one manuscript was found on a shelf of the Vatican library and is called B, while another was found deposited in a wastepaper basket in the Convent of St. Catherine at the foot of Mount Sinai, and is called Aleph. These two manuscripts were exalted to be the basis of the text of the English

New Testament and were intended to displace the text behind the A.V. from which they differed in 5,700 places. Surely this is straining credulity too far, and we reject it utterly. Let us continue along the line and discover what happened to the W.H. text. Does this text now form the basis of modern versions? Let Mr MacLeod answer. "Contrary to much evangelical opinion, modern editions of the New Testament are not based on these two codices alone but on an eclectic text arrived at by collation of all the available manuscripts." The W.H. text has been left behind, and a new system adopted. Upon what principles does this new system operate: Mr MacLeod does not tell us, but in the introduction to the N.E.B. we are informed, "There is not at the present time any critical text which would command the same degree of general acceptance as the Revisors' text did in its day . . . The present translators therefore could do no other than consider variant readings on their merits" so they adopted those "*which to the best of their judgment seemed most likely to represent what the author wrote.*" In other words, the text was determined by the personal opinions of those who prepared it. Since most of those concerned with the R.S.V. and the N.E.B. were liberals and unbelievers in the true doctrine of Biblical inspiration, does Mr MacLeod think that the people of God will accept that the Providence of God left the Divine oracles in such unhallowed hands? Yet his doctrine of providential preservation leads him to this manifestly absurd position.

It is too early for Mr MacLeod and his friends to pronounce the funeral oration of the A.V. and the Received Text. We ourselves, quietly and confidently wait for a better day when the Lord will raise up men of piety and scholarship to undertake a new translation. In the present dark state of the church, we do not possess men of this calibre. We do not doubt but that when the Lord in the midst of the years will remember mercy and revive His work, such men will be raised up. Then we believe the Received Text will be truly valued and vindicated.

In giving advice to his unfortunate enquirers, with regard to new versions, Mr MacLeod says, "Preference should be given to versions prepared by groups of scholars, acting under ecclesiastical auspices, rather than to the work of individual translators. This will save us from the idiosyncrasies of individuals and assure us that the version, before publication, has been subjected to thorough communal criticism." He fails to mention the obvious fact that this will not save the reader of a new version from the unbelief and infidelistic views of the members of these committees. For instance, in connection with the R.V. of 1881, we have already pointed to the views of Hort, and Westcott is not one whit better. Further, there was added to this committee a Unitarian. A Unitarian is one who denies the doctrine of the Trinity. He is one who has no right to be called a Christian at all. He is one who by his

own profession is spiritually blind. What is to be thought of a committee that would invite such a man to serve on it in order to translate "the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever"? With regard to the R.S.V. let us notice just one or two points about the members of that committee. Here is the view of Dr Bowie: "The incarnation of the Divine in Jesus was not some lonely miracle. It was the flowering in Him of that which in some measure is meant to come true in all of us." Dr Burrows says that the idea of Divine inspiration must be definitely abandoned, and he holds that "what is ultimately authoritative for us is that which commands the assent of our own best judgment, accepted as the witness of the Spirit within us." Dr Grant holds that "the fiery-tempered, jealous, vindictive Yahweh of the early Old Testament documents is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." Dean Weigle states "for many years I have not taught as if Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or the Book of Isaiah had but one author, or Job or Jonah were historical." Another of the translators was Dr Harry M. Orlinsky, a Jewish scholar of the Jewish Institution of Religion of New York. Here again we must ask the question, What can be said of a committee which adopts a Jew as a member of its panel of translators? A Jew is described in the Scripture as one who when he reads the Old Testament has a veil over his heart. Of what possible value can such a man be except to pervert the Word of God in an anti-Christian sense? Of course, we immediately recognise that a godless Gentile and an unconverted Jew are equally blind to the glory of Divine revelation, and should therefore have nothing whatever to do with translating the Divine oracles. Yet this is the version to which evangelicals, we are told, are turning!

The desire for the N.E.B. sprang from the Church of Scotland. It was desired that a committee of competent scholars be set up to make this new translation. Here again, these scholars, the majority of them, were of a liberalistic tendency, and the fact that the director of the translators was such a person as Professor C. H. Dodd is ample evidence that the liberal, modernistic line would be followed in the translation. He states categorically: "God is the author, not of the Bible, but of the life which the authors of the Bible partake, and of which they tell in such imperfect, human words as they could command. The importance of this fairly obvious and elementary distinction is that it exposes the fallacy of arguing from an admission that the Bible is 'the Word of God' to the conclusion that it must possess God's own infallibility . . . Thus the words of the Epistle to the Romans carry just as much weight as we are prepared to allow to Paul as a religious teacher." It should be abundantly plain that far from encouraging people to read versions prepared by such committees, a faithful servant of Christ would issue the most vigorous and stern warnings to avoid them.

The people of God are not textual critics. They do however have their own criteria for judging the value of professed versions of the Word of God. Through the unction from the Holy One they have been spiritually enlightened, convinced of their sins and misery, stripped of their own self-righteousness, and made to feel lost and utterly unable to deliver themselves from the just reward of their sins. In this sad and low condition, the Gospel of the glory of the blessed God brought to them, in the power of the Holy Ghost, a Saviour of Whom it is written, "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost." (Matthew, xviii, 11). As they viewed by faith this most glorious and suitable Saviour, the peace of God which passeth all understanding flowed into their souls. They tasted and saw that God was good, and that who trusts in Him is blessed. The new song arose from their broken hearts as they sang the praises of Him Who loved them and washed them from their sins in His own blood. If they pay attention to Mr MacLeod and his neo-evangelical friends, and turn to the Gospel of Matthew in the R.S.V., look up chapter 18, and look for verse 11, then to their astonishment they will find that it is not there. It has been relegated to a footnote: "Other ancient authorities add verse 11, For the Son of man came to save the lost." This is only one instance of how a soul to whom the words of Scripture have become the words of eternal life, a soul to whom the words of Scripture have become the voice of the Son of God, a soul who feeds upon Divine Truth, is shocked and shattered and pained by men who remove from the treasured record of God's Word, words so indescribably precious.

This, of course, does not worry Mr MacLeod in the slightest. When faced with a list of omissions by Mr Brown, he states: "The first thing that strikes us is that many of the variations listed here are quite trivial . . ." So Mr MacLeod thinks it is a trivial matter that the Christian Church should be deprived of the last twelve verses of the Gospel according to Mark, and that the whole of the incident of the woman taken in adultery, amounting also to twelve verses, should be omitted from the sacred record! We find this quite inexcusable. We wonder also if Mr MacLeod knows that these two particular sections are restored in the recently issued Common Bible. The R.S.V. omits both the passages. The N.E.B. includes the passage in Mark, omits the passage in John, and publishes it separately at the end of that Gospel. This chopping and changing in different versions of these important parts of the Word of God indicate clearly the confusion which these new versions raise in the minds of readers. As mentioned, the Common Bible now restores the two parts to the text of God's Word. This Common Bible is the first edition of the Bible since the Reformation to have the approval and blessing of the Protestant, the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches. This edition includes the Apocrypha bound

up with the Bible, despite the fact that these books have always been rejected as not forming part of the canon of Scripture. The words of the chairman of the R.S.V. Bible Committee, Herbert G. May are of great significance in welcoming this Bible, demonstrating the real purpose of the original edition of the R.S.V.: "The R.S.V. Common Bible, bearing the approval of the three great branches of the Christian Church, is *the natural culmination of the ecumenical role played by the R.S.V. since its inception.*" This ecumenical role is intended to break down the distinction so clearly drawn at the Reformation between the true church of God and the church of Rome. This tendency is further emphasised in the N.E.B. where Matthew, xvi, 18 is made to read, "And I say unto you: You are Peter, the Rock; and on this rock I will build my church and the forces of death shall never overpower it." This translation quite clearly teaches that Peter is the rock upon which the church is built, in contradistinction to the true teaching of the Word of God that Christ alone is the Rock and Foundation of the living church of God.

In the context of the above list of omissions, we come across a very strange idea advanced by Mr MacLeod in which he declares that many of the variations listed are "wholly devoid of theological significance." We are all aware of the modernistic view of the inspiration of the Bible, which avers that the Bible is only authoritative when it speaks of redemption, but does not carry the same authority when it speaks of historical or scientific data. This concept is pure rationalism. Surely there is a strain of rationalism running through this concept advanced by Mr MacLeod, and if accepted, it leads to very serious consequences. Professor Dodd, referred to above as the Director of the N.E.B. translators, holds the rationalistic view that we can know very little about Moses. Here are his words from his book entitled 'The Authority of the Bible,' page 36: "We have no literature which can with any probability be attributed to that period. Moses has left us no writings. We know little of him with certainty. But it is scarcely questionable that the Hebrew religion, before the time when its literature begins, had felt the impulse of some tremendous personality. Tradition calls him Moses, and so may we. We are not however in direct touch with him, but only with men who drew their inspiration from the impulse he communicated."

If challenged on this particular point, Dr Dodd, if he cared to take up Mr MacLeod's concept, could very well say, "There is no theological significance in the fact whether there was such a person as Moses alive at any time." Such a denial of the person of Moses, of course, affects the reliability and the historicity of the Word of God. There are multitudes of other instances in which the argument could be used that whether these instances are retained in the Divine record or not is of no real theological consequence, and that therefore their omission would

be trivial. We cannot abide such trifling with the Scriptures.

But are the omissions of no theological significance? One of these is the substitution in Luke, ii, 43 of the words "His parents" for "Joseph and Mary." Says Mr MacLeod, "What heretical purpose is served, what doctrine is jeopardised, . . . by substituting 'His parents' for 'Joseph and Mary' . . ." Mr MacLeod must be exceedingly naive if he does not see that there is quite clearly doubt cast upon the virgin birth of the Saviour in connection with these particular words. Let us remain with the R.S.V. for the moment. Matthew, I, 25 in the A.V. reads, "And knew her not till she had brought forth her first born son; and he called His names Jesus." The R.S.V. reads, "But knew her not until she had born a son; and he called His name Jesus." By the use of the word "firstborn" the A.V. makes it perfectly plain that Mary had no child before the Saviour was born, thus emphasising that the son born was not born by ordinary generation, but by extraordinary generation. The R.S.V. omits the word "firstborn" and therefore casts doubt on this doctrine. Luke II, 33 in the A.V. reads, "And Joseph and His mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of Him." The R.S.V. reads, "And his father and mother marvelled at what was said about him." The clear and unmistakable impression given by these words is that Joseph is the natural father of the Saviour. Consequently, when we come to the portion which Mr MacLeod dismisses as being of no theological significance, viz. Luke II, 43, the A.V. states, "And Joseph and His mother knew not of it." The R.S.V. says, "His parents did not know it." Here again while the A.V. clearly states and maintains that Joseph was not the natural father of Jesus, the R.S.V. confuses and clouds the issue by implying that Joseph and Mary were His natural parents. It is highly significant in this connection that even taking the R.S.V. translation as transcribed, we find the Saviour rebuking His mother on this very point. "And when they saw him, they were astonished; and his mother said to him, 'Son, why have you treated us so? Behold your father and I have been looking for you anxiously.' And he said unto them, 'How is it that you sought me? Did you not know that I must be in my Father's house?'" Here Mary uses the expression, "your father and I" and the Saviour corrects her by pointing to the One Whom His Father really was. Are these not points of theological significance?

Mr MacLeod also speaks of "another suspicion prevalent in some evangelical circles, namely, that whenever editors depart from the Received Text it is in the interest of what we might call a lower theology." Mr MacLeod states quite categorically, "This is quite untrue." Here, of course, we begin to despair of Mr MacLeod altogether. We wonder where he was when these versions were issued, for instance the R.S.V. in 1946 (N.T.) and 1952 (O.T.). Was he still at school, when he

is apparently ignorant of the wide wave of protest occasioned by the publication of that version, and the many articles demonstrating its lower theology, leading to a person of Professor Allis's stature designating it as "a revised Bible, rather than a revised Version?" Does Mr MacLeod really think that he will get anyone to believe that a version that had as its ecumenical purpose the bringing together of Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant churches on the basis of a common Bible, was not issued in the interest of a lower or consensus theology? We are persuaded that none whose eyes are opened to the dangers of the present day will agree with him.

In this Magazine, and in the Young People's Magazine, the present writer has handled the subject of the mis-translations of the Word of God which point to a lower theology, both in the case of the R.S.V. and the N.E.B. It is sad to have to refer to points which are so evident once more, and this will only be done in a few instances. Low views of theology inevitably spring from low views of Divine inspiration. The A.V. clearly teaches the doctrine of inspiration in the following words in 2 Timothy iii, 16: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." The clear teaching here is that God is the Author of Scripture. The R.S.V. weakens this by stating "All scripture is inspired by God." It is a well-known fact that the members of the committee of this version did not hold to the doctrine of plenary inspiration. Dr Moffatt, one of its members, in discussing the difficulties which the translator faces, says "Once the translator of the New Testament is freed from the theory of verbal inspiration, these difficulties cease to be so formidable." The N.E.B. goes a step further giving as its translation of this particular verse, "Every inspired scripture has its use for teaching etc." Here all reference to the Scripture being inspired by God is completely missed out, as well as teaching that it is only these parts of scripture which are inspired which are useful for the purpose of teaching, etc. One or two further instances may be given with respect to the Godhead of the Saviour:

A.V.

Acts xx, 26: "... the church of God which he purchased with his own blood."

N.E.B.

"... the church of the Lord which he won for himself by his own blood."

The translation in the A.V. has always been appealed to as a text which makes clear the Godhead of the Saviour Who is referred to as God. By the use of the word "Lord," however, a doubt is cast on this, as one's view of the matter would depend on how one viewed the Lord. If one viewed Christ as Lord and yet as mere man then the whole force of the efficacy of the blood of atonement is lost, and the text no longer proves the Godhead of the Saviour.

A.V.

Romans, ix, 5: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever."

N.E.B.

"Theirs are the patriarchs and from them, in natural descent, sprang the Messiah. May God, supreme above all, be blessed for ever."

Here again the A.V. states clearly that Christ is God. By breaking the sentence, however, the N.E.B. avoids this and empties the text of its proof of the Godhead of the Messiah!

A.V.

1 Timothy, iii, 16: "And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit ..."

N.E.B.

"And great beyond all question is the mystery of our religion. He who was manifested in the body, vindicated in the spirit ..."

Once more the A.V. sets forth clearly that He who was manifested in the flesh was God. But when we come to the N.E.B. we are met with the simple statement, "He was manifested in the body." Here again the verse has been emptied of its witness to the deity of the Saviour. These three scriptures indicate the seriousness of the changes made and the tremendous implications when coming to construct doctrines based on the new version.

Much more evidence could be, and has already been produced to confirm the contention that the modern versions do aim at a lower form of theology. The point put by Professor Allis is undeniable: "That the question would be raised whether the R.S.V. is 'liberal' or 'higher critical' was inevitable. There are two reasons for this, neither of which is far to seek. The first is the theological viewpoint of at least a large majority of the committee of revisers, the other is the translation itself. Unless the distinction between 'conservative' and 'higher critic' or 'liberal' is to pass utterly into the discard, few, if any will endeavour to maintain that this revision was prepared by a group of conservative scholars. Evidence to the contrary is too clear and too abundant."

The views expressed by Mr MacLeod in these two articles raise, of course, another question. How widely are those views representative of the ministers in the Free Church? We have no hesitation whatever in saying that if any Free Presbyterian minister propounded these views in the way that Mr MacLeod has done his Presbytery would take to do with him by way of discipline. Will this be the case in the Free Church? However, if these views are held by a considerable percentage of ministers in the Free Church, there exists a far greater gulf between the Free Church and the Free Presbyterian Church than perhaps has been before realised. There are some, not noted for their intelligent

grasp of the situation, who try to minimise differences between the two churches. If Mr MacLeod's views are an expression of views generally held in the Free Church ministry, then the difference is very great indeed.

We are sorry for the correspondents who enquired for advice from the Banner of Truth Magazine with respect to the Bible and Textual Criticism. They got advice which was deplorable, and which will certainly not lead to any strengthening of such commitment as they may have to the Reformed Faith, but rather, in our judgment, to a weakening of the same.

"How sweet are Thy words unto my taste! Yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth! Through Thy precepts I get understanding: therefore, I hate every false way." (Ps. 119: 103; 104).

Posadh an Anama ri Criosd

Leis an Urr. Eideard Pearse (A.D. 1672)

(Air a leantuin bhò t.d. 53)

3. Gabh beachd, nach fhada gus an tig an Tighearn Iosa, d' Fhear-posga gràdhach agus an daingnich E'm pòsadh eadar E Féin agus t-anam, agus oh cia milis a bhios so! Cha'n eil am pòsadh an so ach mar gu'm biodh e tòiseachadh eadar Criosd agus thusa; ach thig Criosd an ùine ghoraid agus daingnichidh se e. "Feuch tha'm fear nuadh-pòsda a' teachd; reachaibh a mach ga choinneachadh." Mata xxv. 6. Agus a ris, "Agus chaidh iadsan a steach leis a chùim a phòsaidh, agus dhruideadh an doras." rann 10. "Thàinig pòsadh an Uain, agus dh'ullaich a bhean i féin." Tais. xix, 7. Tha àm anns an tig Criosd gu bhith daingneachadh a phòsaidh eadar E Féin agus anamaibh. 'n uair a thig E a thaobh an t-saoghail, thig E mar Bhreitheamh a chùim an dìteadh, gu bhith toirt àichmheil a thaobh an t-soisgeil, a thaobh a chùimhnant, a thaobh fhola, nithean uile gu leir a dhiùlt iad; thig E gu bhith toirt a mach binn orra a thaobh cur an aghaidh a' Spioraid, air son dìmeas a dheanamh air fhuil, a thaobh briseadh a laghanan, a thaobh dìmeas a dheanamh air a shlàinte. Agus Oh cia cho dorch 's a bhios latha a theachd dhoibh! Ach a nis a thaobh a chéile Féin, 'n uair a thig E, thig E mar am Fear-nuadh pòsda: agus oh cia milis a bhios an teachd so Aige dhoibh-san.

(1) An sin tionndaidh E ar n'uile uisge gu fion, Eoin, ii7, 7-8. Tha sinn a leughadh, air bhith do Chriosd aig pòsadh, gu'n do thionndaidh E an sin uisge gu fion. Agus gu cinnteach, anam, 'n uair a thig E gu bhith daingneachadh a phòsaidh eadar Esan agus thusa tionndaidh E t-uile uisgeachan àmhghaireach gu fion comhfhurtachd mhilis dhuit. Tionndaidh E t-aoidheche gu latha, do dhorchadas gu solus, do bhrònaibh gu aoibhneas, do chumha gu dannsa, do thrioblaidean gu fois, do

chòmhragan gu buaidhean, do shaoithir gu duais, do thuiridhean duilich gu halleluidhean aoibhneachd. An sin coimhlionaidh E'n Sgriobtur sin dhuit, "Agus tiormaichidh Dia gach deur o'n sùilean; agus cha bhi bàs ann n's motha, no bròn, no eigheach, agus cha bhi pian ann n's motha; oir chaidh na ceud nithean thairis." Tais. xxi. 4. Anam bhochd, tha nis do shùilean làn dheoir; le Daibhidh naomh, tha thù dol mu'n cuairt a gul agus a caoidh, faodaidh e bhi fad an latha gu h-iomlan; ach an sin bithidh do dheoir uile air an siabadh bho do shùilean. Tha thù nis ann am bàsan gu minic, mar a bha'n t-Abstol; ach an sin, cha bhidh bàs n's motha. Nis tha thù lan bròn, tha do laithean air an cur seachad ann am bròn, agus do bhliadhnan le osnaich; ach an sin cha bhi bròn n's motha; teichidh bròn agus mulad air falbh gu bràth. A nis tha thù làn do phiantaibh; seadh mar a bha'n fàidh naomh bho shean a gearain, tha thù air do chràdh aig a chridhe; an a mothuchadh air t-àmhghairean féin, ann a' mothachadh air àmhghairean na h-eaglais, ann a' mothachadh air do pheacaidhean féin, ann a' mothuchadh air peacaidhean an t-saoghail, tha thù air do phianadh aig a chridhe; ach an sin cha bhi pian n's motha. Nis tha thù cur gu deurach, ach an sin buainidh tù le gàirdeachas, nis tha thù dol a mach a gul, gidheadh a giulain siol ro phrìseil; an sin pillidh tù air ais le gàirdeachas, a giulain do sguaban. Nis tha thù ann an stoirm, stoirm de gheur-leanmhuin, stoirm de bhuairean, stoirm de dh'àmhghairean, stoirm de thrioblaidean, stoirm de dhoinneanan, agus gu'n chomhfhurtachd agad, faodaidh e bhì, mar a bha'n eaglais aig amaibh, Isaiah liv. 11. Ach an sin tionndaidh E'n stoirm gu fiadh, agus mar sin bheir E thù do'n chala, gus bhi labhairt a reir Salm cvii, 30. Nis tha'n diabhol agus a sheirbhisich ga'd chuartaichadh, agus nach tòir iad dhuit fois; an sin bithidh iad air an saltairt fodh na casan, agus nì an t-anam buaidh-chaitheam siorruidh os an ceann, ag ràdh mar a thuirt ise bho shean na dàn, "O m'anam, shaltairt thù sios neart."

(2) An sin tionndaidh Crìosd t-uile dhuthachas gu maise: t-uile mhì-mhaise peacadh gu fìor-ghlaine iomlan agus naomhachd gu bràth; Mo thruaigh, deir an t-anam, tionndaidh E m'uisge gu fion! is fìor, tha sin milis; ach tha nì ann a tha luidh nì's truime orm na uile thrioblaidean agus àmhghairean anns an t-saoghal; agus 's e sin mo dhuthachas peacach agus mo mhì-mhaise. Oh mo nàdur salach, truailte, agus gràineil! an tobar peacaidh agus naimhdeas an aghaidh Dhé a tha'n taobh a' stigh! 's e so nì a tha na ealach a tha tuilleadh is tròm dhomh dhà ghiulain. Ro mhaith, air son do chomhfhurtachd biodh fhios agad, gu'm bheil t-fhear-pòsda, Iosa, a tighinn; agus 'n uair a thig E, tionndaidh E do dhuthachas gu maise, do pheacadh gu naomhachd; an sin "chùm gu naomhaicheadh, agus gu'n glanadh E ì le ionnlaid an uisge tre an fhocal; chùim gu'n cuireadh E na làthair féin ì 'n a h-eaglais ghlòrmhor, gu'n smal, gu'n phreasadh, no nì air bith d'an leithidean

sin; ach chùim gu'm biodh ì naomh, agus neo-lochdach. Ephes. v, 26, 27. Anam bhoichd, thà ort a nis iomadh smal, iomadh ball-dubh, agus iadsan a tha mar a tha thusa ullamh aig amaibh gu smuainteachadh nach iad smalan sluagh Dhé; ach an sin bithidh na smalan sin air an siabadh air falbh agus tù gu'n smal; seadh cha'n e mhàin gu'm bi thù gu'n smal, ach as eugmhais preas mar an ceudna. Faodaidh preasan a bhi far nach eil smalan ach 's e th'ann sin ach gaoid. O ach ann sin chà bhi aon chuid smal na preas; bithidh tù gu h-iomlan saor bho na peacaidhean is lugha cho math ris an fheadhan is motha; seadh chà bhi agad aon chuid smal na preas, na nì air bith da'n leithidean sin; nì air bith a dh'amhairceas coltach ri peacadh, nì a smuainticheas tù anns an tomhas is lugha na smal na 'n a phreas; cha bhi'n comharadh is lugha n'an ceum is lugha de sheann Adhamh (mar a tha neach a labhairt air an àite) air fhàgail annad, na ort, ach bidh tù gu leir naomh agus gu'n smal, Lionaidh Criosd thù gu h-iomlan le a Spiorad Féin, nì E maiseach thù le iomhaigh Féin, sgeadaichidh E thù le usgraichean Féin, eudaichidh agus dealraichidh E thù le a ghlòire Féin, oir an sin nì E thù coltach Ris Féin, an dà chuid ann an naomhachd agus an aonachd, I Eoin iii, 2. Anam bhoichd, nis thà thù'g osnaich fodh chorp peacaidh agus bàis, fodh ghluasadan neo-ghlan a pheacaidh, miannan salach na feola, riaghladh mallaichte cridhe iosal, salach, neo-chreidmheach, a thà riaghladh thairis ort anns a h-uile dleasdanas, anns gach suidheachadh, anns gach daimh. Nis thà thù air do chràdh le eirigh suas, fàs, agus blàth, agus taomadh a mach ana-miann, agus truaillidheachd an taobh a stigh dhiot; ach 'n uair a thig Iosa, bi crìoch air na nithean so uile. Tha Criosd ag amharc thairis a nis air na nithean so uile, ach an sin, Bheir E air falbh iad uile, agus dealraichidh tù le iomlanachd na maise. (R'a leantuinn)

Church Notes

Committee Meetings (D.V.)

The following Committees are due to meet at the Free Presbyterian Church, Inverness on the last Tuesday and Wednesday of March.

Tuesday, 27th March

- 10.00 - 11.30 Publications Committee
- 11.30 - 13.00 Religion and Morals Committee
- 14.30 - 16.30 Finance Committee
- 16.30 - 17.30 Dominions and Overseas Committee
- 19.00 - 21.00 Jewish and Foreign Missions Committee
- 21.00 - 22.00 Home of Rest Committee

Wednesday, 28th March

- 10.00 - 11.30 Church Extension Committee
- 11.30 - 12.30 Church Magazine Committee

Concerted Prayer

In the proposals for concerted prayer agreed to at the Synod last May the first Sabbath of January, April, July and October were specially mentioned as days for prayer for the revival of the Lord's Cause. It was also agreed that in the issues of the Magazine for the months previous to those mentioned above that space be given to provide our people with information on matters to be remembered in Prayer.

As this issue contains articles on Italy and Rhodesia we think that the minds of exercised Christians will be directed to the spiritual needs of those lands. Italy, long under papal dominion, deserves our prayerful consideration. Our own Mission in Rhodesia should be constantly upon our spirits at a throne of grace. This, however, should not hinder us making it a special matter of prayer in connection with the revival of the Lord's Cause.

If we need any further direction, then let the teeming Christless millions of China, Russia, India and Africa be the burden of our concern. They need the Gospel or they will perish in their sins. We must not sit snugly secure in our Gospel privileges without any concern for the regions beyond. Doors of opportunity in some of those lands are closing as we delay to send them succour. If we are not prepared to answer the call: "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" with the answer: "Here am I; send me"; then at least let us pray the Lord of the harvest that He may send forth labourers into His harvest.

Rev. John Tallach's Accident

On 23rd January Rev. John Tallach's car was in collision with a van near Kirkhill, Inverness-shire. Mr Tallach sustained a broken arm and leg, while his wife injured her hand. The driver of the van was badly injured as well. We do hope and trust that they will all soon be restored to health and strength in the Lord's good providence. It is a matter of thankfulness to the Lord that the lives of all those involved in the accident were spared.

Church Deeds of Covenant

The Finance Act 1972 sets out the new Unified Tax System which comes into effect on 6th April, 1973. The new system is intended to simplify the structure of personal taxation and, among other things, the previous "earned income relief" available to taxpayers, is abolished.

Accordingly Deeds of Covenant in favour of the Church now have a much wider appeal in that any person who subscribes to the Church Funds out of the income on which he pays tax, may, by signing a Deed of Covenant, and without any additional expense to himself, enable the Church to recover from the Inland Revenue, a sum equal to the tax paid on his contribution.

At this point it should be emphasised that a person's contribution to the Church Funds means the total sum he puts in the regular Church door collections as well as his normal contributions to the Special Funds, i.e. Sustentation Fund, Home Mission Fund, etc.

The basic rate of tax for 1973/74 has been provisionally fixed at 30% and let us assume a Subscriber to the Church Funds who pays tax on at least £10 of his income and subscribes £7 to the Church Funds per annum.

If he does **not** sign a Deed of Covenant the Church receives only his £7 contribution.

If he signs a Deed of Covenant the Church receives not only his £7 but also the tax paid on the income out of which the contribution was made, i.e. £3, giving a total of £10 to the Church Funds.

It is to be emphasised that this is a provision made by the law of the land for the benefit of Churches, among others, and it is perfectly lawful for those who are in a position to do so, to make use of this provision to increase the value of their subscription to the Church. In making this provision, Parliament is carrying into effect, so far as the Church is concerned, the duty, which we believe the State has in accordance with the Establishment principle, to help support the Church.

Parties who have already signed Deeds of Covenant require to do nothing further in the meantime but any such who have increased their contributions since signing the Covenant would be advised to sign an additional Covenant for the amount of any such increase.

Induction at Stirling

At its meeting in Glasgow on 14th February, 1973, the Southern Presbytery agreed to meet again, D.V., within the Tolbooth, Broad Street, Stirling, on Tuesday, the 6th day of March, 1973, at 6 p.m.; and at 7 p.m. for the Ordination and Induction of the Rev. Ian R. Tallach to the Church Extension charge of Stirling, Perth and Dundee. The Moderator of Presbytery, Rev. H. R. Moshe Radcliff, Th.L., is to preach and preside.

M. MacSween, Clerk of Presbytery.

Aberdeen Minister Laid Aside

On 20th February Rev. E. A. Rayner underwent a serious operation. We understand that he is now progressing favourably but expects to be several weeks off work convalescing. We trust that in the Lord's good providence he will continue to make progress and before long be able to resume his duties again.

FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SCOTLAND: SPECIAL COLLECTIONS — YEAR ENDED 31st DECEMBER 1972

Places	Minister and Missionaries	Sustentation Fund	Home Mission Fund	Jewish and Foreign Mission Fund	Aged and Infirm Ministers' etc. Fund	College and Library Fund	Organisation Fund	General Building Fund	Dominions and Overseas Fund	Total
NORTHERN PRESBYTERY		£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Aberdeen	Rev. E. A. Rayner	800.00	80.00	100.00	60.00	40.00	30.00	50.00	50.00	1210.00
Bonar Bridge	Rev. D. B. MacLeod	255.20	23.00	25.30	12.95	16.00	10.00	9.80	10.00	362.25
Lairg		377.00	53.05	31.82	19.29	20.76	14.60	16.27	14.33	547.12
Beauly	Rev. D. A. MacFarlane	600.00	73.80	226.79	32.90	22.75	35.29	—	44.75	1036.28
Dingwall		700.00	235.00	200.00	25.00	45.00	75.00	30.00	45.00	1355.00
Dornoch	Mr D. MacLennan	110.00	89.50	41.00	8.25	10.20	8.15	8.30	8.85	284.25
Rogart		80.00	28.00	24.00	5.55	4.00	4.55	4.55	4.55	155.20
Fearn	Rev. J. Nicolson	300.00	31.00	26.00	11.00	20.00	14.00	26.00	15.00	443.00
Tain		380.00	64.00	35.00	22.00	25.00	22.00	20.00	10.00	578.00
Halkirk	Rev. D. A. MacLean	509.49	107.69	64.60	19.54	24.55	29.24	24.46	21.00	800.57
Helmsdale		275.00	19.10	17.00	7.40	7.90	9.65	5.60	7.00	348.65
Inverness	Rev. A. F. MacKay	4000.00	600.00	500.00	300.00	350.00	300.00	300.00	300.00	6650.00
Kinlochbervie	Rev. J. M. Tallach	335.00	212.00	212.80	29.50	41.30	35.50	31.50	47.25	944.85
Scourie		55.00	61.50	36.50	12.35	13.70	17.10	19.67	25.10	240.92
Daviot	Rev. A. MacPherson	480.76	87.23	93.05	38.70	30.17	24.20	30.21	32.25	816.57
Tomatin		366.50	91.50	40.00	28.50	26.50	28.00	28.50	28.50	638.00
Stratherrick		400.00	64.84	40.95	32.09	30.30	31.59	29.04	31.49	660.30
Strathy	Mr Jas. MacLeod	71.00	95.00	49.00	17.00	20.00	18.20	15.00	24.00	309.20
Thurso		155.49	14.00	10.00	—	—	—	—	—	179.49
Wick	Rev. R. R. Sinclair	800.00	130.00	200.00	70.00	70.00	60.00	70.00	54.23	1454.23
		11050.44	2160.21	1973.81	752.02	818.13	767.07	718.90	773.30	19013.28
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERY										
Aberfeldy		469.13	20.25	19.50	17.50	17.50	17.54	18.00	16.50	595.92
Dumbarton	Rev. D. Campbell	1450.00	167.76	225.16	55.94	49.62	47.07	58.07	71.55	2125.17
Edinburgh	Rev. J. A. MacDonald	951.83	156.95	95.69	43.13	34.90	47.75	47.00	51.73	1428.98
Fort William	Rev. D. MacLean	2812.22	565.44	600.49	201.71	255.30	162.50	169.37	204.98	4972.01
St. Jude's, Glasgow		—	5.00	5.00	10.00	—	—	5.00	5.00	30.00
Dunoon	Rev. L. MacLeod	600.00	55.00	68.60	31.00	40.00	24.50	28.00	28.00	875.10
Greenock	Rev. D. A. MacDonald	500.00	34.17	45.55	16.50	21.00	10.00	18.20	19.15	664.57
Kames		3.00	1.00	1.00	—	—	—	—	—	5.00
Lochgilphead		926.52	143.42	152.02	74.02	47.55	46.90	49.65	42.70	1484.78
London		800.00	35.00	66.67	15.91	22.76	23.68	16.39	22.98	1003.39
Oban	Rev. M. MacSween	—	—	—	21.29	—	—	—	82.65	103.94
Vancouver, Canada	Rev. R. MacDonald	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.49	20.49
Calgary, Canada		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gisborne, New Zealand	Rev. Wm. MacLean	—	—	100.00	—	—	—	—	—	100.00
Auckland, New Zealand	Rev. D. M. MacLeod	—	—	120.00	40.00	—	—	—	45.00	194.81
Grafton, Australia		—	—	273.83	—	—	—	—	—	273.83
		8514.70	1183.99	1753.89	536.33	488.63	379.94	409.68	610.73	13877.69

OUTER ISLES PRESBYTERY

		£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Achmore	Rev. J. MacLeod	118.50	25.00	26.00	12.00	2.00	—	12.00	210.50
Stornoway		1543.32	262.74	137.95	24.32	123.97	102.86	100.98	2407.77
Bayhead, North Uist	Rev. A. Morrison	650.00	101.00	93.10	24.70	23.80	22.00	30.00	953.72
Breasclete		113.35	34.65	25.00	15.00	9.50	10.00	10.00	224.50
North Tolsta	Rev. D. MacLean	950.00	173.50	180.00	44.80	59.00	50.00	50.00	1563.50
North Harris	Rev. A. MacKay	931.21	307.20	124.30	50.96	49.12	40.26	40.19	1631.64
South Harris									
Northton		298.82	126.33	58.80	34.49	25.16	21.00	21.00	610.60
Strond	Rev. A. M. Cattanach	148.55	61.05	51.00	16.00	20.00	16.00	—	312.60
Finsbay		287.20	71.20	43.50	19.10	15.50	13.55	10.34	476.49
Seilabost		88.50	37.00	18.75	6.00	11.00	7.00	—	168.25
Ness		347.25	50.12	56.12	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	519.49
Uig	Rev. D. J. Macaskill	800.00	62.00	50.00	30.00	30.00	25.00	—	1020.00
		6276.70	1261.21	830.56	365.67	396.15	320.37	286.51	10099.06

WESTERN PRESBYTERY

Applecross	Rev. A. Murray	570.35	128.00	80.00	20.00	20.50	15.00	22.00	875.85
Bracadale	Rev. D. J. MacDonald	850.00	51.00	45.00	22.54	36.00	27.25	16.60	1086.39
Strath	Rev. S. F. Tallach	724.20	97.50	126.55	16.55	23.20	21.67	15.10	1043.05
Flashadder	Mr D. MacKay	100.00	32.10	14.15	—	7.76	7.70	—	172.43
Gairloch	Rev. A. MacDonald	1208.38	249.39	181.17	59.42	50.46	55.15	60.95	1923.56
Glendale		452.60	82.74	48.22	20.14	30.88	29.18	28.72	717.06
Vatten	Rev. J. Colquhoun	244.30	89.00	44.65	9.72	17.42	19.08	18.60	461.62
Watnish		81.00	40.00	15.00	10.00	11.00	6.00	6.00	181.00
Laide	Mr A. MacLean	482.70	101.00	66.00	24.27	23.25	27.50	24.50	772.22
Kyle of Lochalsh	Rev. D. Beattie	378.90	57.33	39.50	17.40	22.80	15.23	25.91	574.94
Plockton		65.55	18.17	11.00	4.52	6.43	8.54	10.20	130.11
Lochbroom	Rev. M. MacInnes	1212.16	248.79	165.69	45.00	60.00	50.00	52.00	1913.64
Lochcarron	Rev. J. W. Ross	514.60	104.70	72.00	16.09	18.75	10.55	13.38	774.01
Lochinver	Rev. A. Macaskill	500.00	115.00	94.00	28.00	37.00	30.00	28.00	862.00
Stoer and Drumbeg		588.00	120.00	100.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	30.00	1000.00
Portree	Rev. F. MacDonald	1994.23	409.97	377.97	81.45	142.00	90.10	80.11	3280.83
Raasay	Rev. D. Nicolson	826.45	183.13	79.45	30.78	38.23	33.38	34.44	1257.59
Shieldaig		260.50	67.00	35.00	20.00	20.00	19.00	20.00	466.50
Staffin	Rev. J. MacDonald	800.00	108.06	62.38	25.37	34.75	25.85	26.20	1111.91
		11853.92	2302.88	1657.73	491.25	640.43	531.18	512.71	18604.71

SUMMARY

Northern Presbytery	11050.44	2160.21	1973.81	752.02	818.13	767.07	718.90	773.30	19013.88
Southern Presbytery	8514.70	1183.99	1753.69	536.33	488.63	379.94	409.68	610.73	13877.69
Outer Isles Presbytery	6276.70	1261.21	830.56	365.67	396.15	320.37	286.51	361.89	10099.06
Western Presbytery	11853.92	2302.88	1657.73	491.25	640.43	531.18	512.71	614.61	18604.71
	37695.76	6908.29	6215.79	2145.27	2343.34	1998.56	1927.80	2360.53	61595.34

Acknowledgment of Donations

The General Treasurer, Mr Wm. D. Fraser, F.C.M.A., 20 Daleview Avenue, Glasgow G12 0HE acknowledges the following donations with sincere thanks —

Sustentation Fund — Anon., £250; Anon., Edinburgh, £30; E. M. Robertson, Leven, £2; D. MacKenzie, Glenelg, £5; Miss J. A. M. MacDougall, Girvan, £3.35; Anon., Greenock, £5.80 (last 2 per R.W.M.M.).

Home Mission Fund — Anon., £25; Friend, £50 per Rev. I. T., for Church Extension Work (in Perth, Dundee and Stirling).

Jewish & Foreign Mission Fund — Anon., £25; M. & S. M. Aleman, £5 for Mbumba Mission; Anon., Edinburgh, £8.50; E. M. Robertson, Leven, £2; Anon., £100; Victoria Park Presbyterian Church, Toronto, \$403.50; Mrs J. Murray, Livingston, £2.80 (per R.W.M.M.).

Organisation Fund — Anon., £25.

Home of Rest Fund — Interested, Dingwall Congregation, £5; Anon., £25; B.P., London, £20; A. MacLeod, Meavaig, £2; In memory of Miss Catriona MacDearmaid, Edinburgh, £5, John chapter 20 (last 3 per R.W.M.M.).

On behalf of the Trinitarian Bible Society — South Harris Congregation, £21; Lochinver, Stoer and Drumbeg Congregations, £40; Oban Congregation, £19.89; Waternish Congregation, £5; Staffin Congregation, £46; Scourie Congregation, £5; Kinlochbervie Congregation, £6.50; Portree Congregation, £109.04.

The Publications Treasurer, Mr R. W. M. MacKenzie, C.A., Hilton of Cadboll, Fearn, acknowledges with sincere thanks the following donations —

Publications Fund — Mrs R. MacLennan, Lochmaddy, £2.50; Mrs M. Anderson, Killin, £1; B.P. London, £10; K. MacLennan, Michigan, £21; M. MacLeod, Aberfeldy, £1; A. P. MacDonald, Kiltarlity, £1.20.

Welfare of Youth Fund — Mrs M. Anderson, Killin, £1; B.P., London, £10; Friend of the Cause, £2; Anon., Inverness, 50p; K. MacLennan, Michigan, £21; Inverness Congregation, £20; Ness Congregation, £5; M. MacLeod, Aberfeldy, £1; C.M., Lochinver (per W.D.F.), 50p.

On behalf of the Trinitarian Bible Society — Friend of the Cause, £3.

Home of Rest — Mrs A. Hughson, £30; Mr R. MacLeod, Lairg, £10; A Resident, £5; Mrs MacLeod, Kishorn, £1; Miss Mary MacIntosh, Glasgow, £5; "Aliquis", £10; Waternish Congregation, £5.

Free Distribution Magazine Fund — Donations held over till next month owing to lack of space.

The treasurers of the following congregations acknowledges with sincere thanks the following donations —

Staffin — Two Friends, Portree, £5 for Congregational Purposes, per Rev. J. MacDonald.

Portree — From the Estate of the late Mrs Janet Dunbar, Portree, £100, for Congregational Purposes.

Tain and Fearn — A Friend, Dunvegan, £10 per A.M.; Anon., £10 per K.R.; Anon., £20 per K.R.; Anon., £5 per K.R.; Inverness Congregation, £100 per W.M.; In memory of Mr A. Robertson, £10 per K.R.; Anon., Easter Ross, £50; J. Scott, Fearn, £40; Anon., Deuteronomy chapter 10 verses 12-15 and V 22, £25, all for Manse Fund.

Greenock — Friends, Harris, £2.50 for Sustentation Fund per Rev. I. MacLeod; Robt. H. Conway, Bangor N1, £5 for Congregational Purposes.