

which remains, although he has not inscribed his name. It is, we hasten to tell, the version of the Old Testament, published at Lausanne, at which he laboured for twenty-five years. It is the compiled work of a number of Swiss pastors and professors, and has been completely reviewed page after page, line by line, by Monsieur de la Harpe. He put it together and gave it the finishing touch. Thus, when in 1876, the University of Edinburgh awarded to our brother the highest academical degree, that of Doctor of Theology, Dean Charteris mentioned this great work as one of the chief claims of the recipient to the honour conferred, and recalled the memory of the architects of the great cathedrals, who, entirely occupied with the works they were executing, did not care to carve their names upon them, satisfied with having reared to God an imperishable monument. We must also mention numerous sermons and reports written by Mr. de la Harpe for the Church and the Evangelical Society, works seriously conceived, elegantly written, from which future historians will derive useful hints and precious instruction. Some of these discourses have been printed separately. We shall mention two: the first upon the relation of science and religion, entitled 'Attack and Defence,' delivered on the 4th October, 1869, at the opening of the session of the Theological School; the second upon a subject very dear to the heart of the venerable Professor, 'The Church, its Importance and its Nature,' delivered on a similar occasion on the 11th October, 1877. In both of these discourses Mr. de la Harpe gives to the Bible the chief place in the development of the Church and in the forming of the Christian. Thus, always active, always devoted, never resting, Mr. de la Harpe lived happily to a green old age.

"Last June, after presiding at the General Assembly, and having submitted to the students a great many examination papers, he left for the holidays, expressing to his colleagues the hope of labouring with them still for many years. Alas! it was not to be so. One evening in September as he was stepping forward in the dark on the stairs of Cessac Castle, near Bordeaux, to contemplate the starry heavens, he made a false step and fell from a height of seven feet. He rose with his face bruised, arm and leg slightly sprained. He quickly recovered from this fall, and appeared to feel no bad effects, when he returned to Geneva. But the journey fatigued him. Still, however, he wished to preside at the opening of the session, assist at the examinations, and resume his classes. On Sabbath, the 10th, he preached in English at the American chapel, and proceeded in the afternoon, with great earnestness, to an ordination service; but on Thursday, the 14th, when on the street, he had a slight attack, and next day he rapidly lost strength, although he still preserved his mental clearness. Some weeks later he expressed to his beloved companion his amazement that God should receive him into the glory of heaven. The last words which he articulated were the words of the twenty-third Psalm, which had just been read to him: 'I fear no evil, for Thou art with me.' Then the shadow of death passed slowly over that serene countenance, and after two days, in which he had almost entirely lost consciousness, he expired, without apparent suffering, on the 30th of October, at two o'clock in the afternoon. Thus passed away from this earthly scene the last representative of that generation of professors who had founded the Theological School; thus entered into the glory of the Father this faithful witness, who never knew anything else but Jesus Christ and Him crucified. Three days later Pastor Desplands conducted the funeral service at the residence of the deceased. On that occasion he remarked 'that what particularly struck him in the life of Monsieur de la Harpe was the self-consecration to God.' In various situations we always found him the same, a serious, helpful, meek, amiable, humble Christian, firm in his principles, and consequently in his conduct, till the end, large-hearted and indulgent to every one. Our brother had placed all that he *had* and *was* at the service of his Master—talents, science, moral energy, health, fortune, and with a disinterestedness which we cannot pass over in silence. Thus Jesus Christ and His cause was the great and supreme object to which our brother subordinated everything. This is what formed the strong and beautiful consistency of this character, so rich, so varied, and so humble. We saw him for the last time about three weeks ago, and what an expression, like transfiguration! What a look radiant with peace and joyful serenity! and his voice

had accents of celestial unction. Such was the close of this beautiful life. It was the evening of a lovely day. He had no family, but innumerable spiritual children and students, who in succession for nearly half a century received at his feet the results of his learning, his talents, his faith. Let us have this faith, that we may live and die like him. With these words we close this rapid sketch."

#### THE VISION OF MOUNT ZION.

The mountains round Jerusalem  
Are higher than the hill  
Of Zion, where the glorious Lord  
To dwell declares His will.

And Carmel rears a grander pile  
Shading the western sea;  
While Tabor from its brow commands  
More beauteous scenery.

And there is stately Lebanon,  
Crowned with eternal snow:  
Nowhere such ancient cedars wave  
When stormy tempests blow!

And Sinai lifts a stern, gray peak,  
By angels girt of old,  
When God came down in smoke and flame,  
And the law's thunders rolled.

Why leap ye, all ye giant hills?  
Why look ye thus askance  
On Zion low, because the Lord  
It favours with His glance?

Behold the prophet's visioned eye  
Views Zion swell and rise,  
Crowned with the temple of the Lord—  
A wonder to all eyes.

Far above every hill or peak  
In history renowned,  
Where foot of patriot trod of yore,  
Or tyrant's castle frowned—

Far above Alp and Himalah,  
He views it still ascend—  
Zion the mountain of the Lord,  
In glory ne'er to end.

For situation beautiful,  
The joy of all the earth;  
The citizens of Zion all  
Are kings and priests by birth.

And thither in the light of God  
The happy nations flow—  
Up to the city of the Lord,  
And to His court they go.

Not to the war-drum's beat they march;  
No more will spear or sword  
With blood of man be stained in all  
The mountain of the Lord.

The Sabbath bell will Afric's sons  
Gather in bands of peace;  
The Gospel will make India glad;  
And China's woes shall cease.

All hail! thou vision of the Lord!  
How long, oh, Lord, how long?  
The night clouds gather still between,  
The foemen still are strong.

Be still, impatient soul, be still;  
The clouds are but the dust  
Of God's feet on His way to keep  
The triumph of the just.

Cobourg.

JAMES BALLANTINE.

#### A GENERAL SUSTENTATION FUND.

MR. EDITOR,—Any candid person who examines the facts which I have adduced will, I am persuaded, see how largely the same principles animate a sustentation fund and a supplemental scheme as presented in the Free and United Presbyterian Churches—how they aim at the same object, and appeal to the same motives, and when thoroughly and efficiently worked, how nearly they approach in their modes of operation. Mr. McLeod would, however, find a fundamental difference between them, and has indulged in the following strain:

"A supplementing scheme is the strong assisting the weak, simply as a matter of bounty, bestowing a gift, which may be given or withheld as the giver thinks best. A sustentation fund is the strong helping the weak as a matter of debt, not considering their duty fulfilled towards the Church until their abundance has supplied the wants of the weak, and the weak not considering themselves degraded by receiving now, as they know that soon the position may be reversed, and their duty becomes the pleasanter one—giving rather than receiving. The supplementing

scheme means giving to the poor as an act of benevolence, the sustentation scheme means upholding the equality of all the members of the household of faith, and the rights of the poor to the same spiritual food and the same pastoral care as the rich. The supplementing plan tends to the pauperizing of the weak, who are receiving assistance, whereas the sustentation fund tends to the strengthening of the weak and to the prevention of tyranny on the part of the strong. The supplementing permits selfishness. There are always congregations who will do little or nothing for any such object as helping their neighbours. The sustentation plan prevents selfishness by placing all the congregations under obligations to reach a certain standard of self-support, and to take upon themselves responsibility for their neighbours in proportion to their means."

Mr. McLeod does not deem it worth while to adduce any facts to support these assertions. As to the motives of those who give to a supplementing scheme I have to say that the givers in the United Presbyterian Church are men of as high Christian principle as are to be found in any Church, and in this matter act from as high a sense of duty to Christ and His servants, as any men in the Church on earth. As to their being able to "give or withhold as they see best," I wonder if a contributor to the Sustentation Fund cannot do this. If he sees fit to withhold, as some are doing at this moment, and others threatening to do, what power is there in a sustentation plan that can compel him to continue. Then as to congregations, take two aid-giving congregations in the two bodies, of equal liberality, each giving say £1,000 to the different funds. The United Presbyterian congregation gives its minister £600, and acting on the law of Christ, that the strong should help the weak, pays £400 to the augmentation fund. The Free Church one gives £600 to the Sustentation Fund, draws back £200, and gives its minister in addition £400. And yet Mr. McLeod would have us believe that the former are not acting from a sense of duty, but from inferior motives, while the giving of the latter is on principles high and holy, and if the former would only pay their contribution into a fund from which they draw their share back, they would be acting like high-minded Christians.

As to the degradation of those receiving aid from a supplementing fund the ministers I have known in that position were possessed of as high a sense of honour as Mr. McLeod, and saw no more reason to feel themselves degraded than Mr. McLeod in receiving the money of Central Church. In the United Presbyterian Church the average contribution per member in a supplemented congregation is 15s. per member, so that it would pay its minister £150 and receive a grant of £50 more. In the Free Church the average contribution per member in the aid-receiving congregations is so much lower that such a congregation would not pay more than £100 into the Sustentation Fund and draw either £171 or £182 out. Yet Mr. McLeod would have us believe that the former is degraded and the latter highly honoured. We do not think that there is any degradation in either case, but we take the liberty of saying that we regard the position of the former as the more honourable of the two. Then what of those ministers of the Free Church who are not on the platform of equal dividend, who receive merely what the congregation have paid to the Sustentation Fund (less a deduction for expense of management) or that sum with a grant from the Sustentation Fund as in a supplementing scheme. Does the mere fact of the money not being paid to him by the congregation directly, but sent round through the committee render his position honourable. As to the assertions that a supplementing scheme pauperizes, while a sustentation fund strengthens the weak, that the former permits selfishness, while the latter prevents it by teaching self-support, we have only to say that with the facts which we have already adduced, where under the Sustentation Fund three-fourths of the congregations depend on the other fourth, that congregations of five and six hundred members draw aid to pay their ministers £160, and the rate of giving per member is so much lower than in similar congregations of the United Presbyterian Church, I leave it to your readers to say whether the case is not exactly the reverse.

I regret that it has been necessary to give these letters so much of a controversial character; but the nature of Mr. McLeod's articles, so one-sided, and the style in which the operations of other bodies were