



# THE MISSIONARY RECORD

OF THE

## Free Church of Nova Scotia.

VOL. I. HALIFAX, N. S., NOVEMBER, 1851. No. 11.

### REMARKS ON MATTHEW xxvi. 47-75.

Let us regard the conduct of Judas in its proper light. It was treachery of the deepest dye. It was premeditated. He revolved the matter for a long time in his mind. He contemplated it beforehand, and kept it steadily before him till his purpose was accomplished. It was in the face of warning. His purpose was not hid from Christ, and Christ gave him to understand that he was cognizant of his intention, "Verily I say unto you that one of you shall betray me." And when Judas asked: "Is it I?" Christ answered: "thou hast said;" which was equivalent to admitting the fact. This should have put Judas on his guard, should have awakened his repentance, and made him shrink from so black a deed. He should have felt how unbecoming, how ungrateful, how wicked, to cherish such a purpose. All his relentings should have kindled at such a moment. His friendship for Christ, if he ever cherished any, should have revived. Christ's uniform kindness, his amiableness, if nothing more, all his admirable qualities, should have spoken in his favor, and made Judas revolt from the contemplated act. The circumstances, too, in which Christ announced the fact of his betrayal, should have operated upon Judas. Sitting at the same table, commemorating the same feast, and dipping in the same dish, it should have been impossible for him to cherish in his heart so black a treachery. The act was deliberately gone about. He went and consulted with the chief Priests what he should deliver up Jesus for. "Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests, And said *unto*

*them*, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver" And it is added in the 16th verse, "And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him". And then at last the act was done under the mask of friendship. It was with a "hail master!" and a kiss.

Every sin that the professed follower of Christ commits, is a betrayal of Christ. It is an act of treachery. It is all the worse if it is premeditated—if it is deliberately done—still worse if it is done in opposition to warning, and in spite of kindness, notwithstanding all Christ's admonitions and threatenings, and all his grace and goodness. Have we never delivered over Christ to his enemies, to be mocked, and to be scourged, and to be spit upon? Have we never joined his revilers, and his crucifiers? Have we given no countenance to the deed by which he was nailed to the tree? This is done in every sin after we have come to the knowledge of the truth. And let us remember that the smallest sins of Christ's followers are to be thus regarded. Or, they are like Peter's sin when he denied his Lord. Let us beware of thus betraying Christ. Let us look upon every sin as treachery, as betraying, or denying, the Lord that bought us. Shall we *sell him who bought us—bought us with his own precious blood!* shall we *sell him for so trifling a recompense?*

Verse 52. Christ here enunciates a most important principle connected with his kingdom. It matters not how trifling the incident is which calls forth the expression of it. In the most trifling act there may often be involved a great prin-

iple. Peter stood forth to defend Christ. He drew his sword, and struck a servant of the High Priest, and smote off his ear. Christ discerned in this a false principle. Christ whose mind was omniscient, saw all that such a principle would lead to.— He saw down through the long ages of struggle and contest, and consequent weakness and disaster, through which his church was to pass. He beheld his servants, or those who professed to be so, fighting for his kingdom. He saw the armies enlisted under the banner of the cross, and wielding the sword in his cause. Doubtless all was before his view as it may be before the view of those who now ponder the melancholy history of these contests; and he gives forth at once the principle and the prediction: "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword." Christ was not to be defended with the sword, nor was his kingdom to be propagated by the sword. If Christ was to defend himself he might have had angelic warriors, legions of angels, now surrounding him, encamping about him:—the sword of the Archangel might have been drawn in his behalf. But it was not thus that Christ's cause was to triumph. He was to triumph by *living*. "How then shall the scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" Scripture must be fulfilled. The counsel of God must be accomplished. The scheme of redemption must be completed. Christ must die. It was inconsistent with the counsels of God, and with the grand objects to be accomplished, that the sword should be drawn from its scabbard. Angels were Christ's armies had it been his pleasure to command them. "Put up thy sword into his place". What majesty, what authority, in these simple words! "Put up again thy sword into his place". Let it sleep in thy scabbard. I have no need of its aid. "My kingdom is not of this world". No, it is not like the kingdom of the earth. It consists only of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Let it not be propagated by the sword: "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword". We have a remarkable verification of these words in the history of the crusades, or the wars of the cross, as they were called. The crusades, which were undertaken to recover the Holy Land, and especially the Holy sepulchre, the place where it was supposed Christ was laid, terminated most disastrously to the crusaders themselves. Two millions, it is computed, per-

rished in these enterprises, which were undertaken from time to time, during the 11th, the 12th, and the 13th centuries.— The object was to drive out the infidel from Palestine, and set up the kingdom of Christ in the room of that of the false prophet. But disaster and blood-shed alone were the result. Thousands fell beneath the sword—their blood dyed the plains of Palestine—and the wrecks of armies returned only to announce the defeat of their enterprise. It was not thus Christ's cause was to be promoted. Mahomet might gain by his armies and by the scymitar. The sword of the false prophet was the great means of his success. He achieved his triumphs by his military skill, by the power of the sword. Christ tells us it shall not be so with his kingdom. It cometh not with observation: it is not of this world. It appeals not to the sword, but to the truth. Its progress is the progress of the truth—the progress of conversion. Its conquests are won from the kingdom of Satan, from the empire of darkness. Jesus reigns, and he will reign, till all his enemies are made his footstool. He has his throne in heaven, and his kingdom is in the hearts of men. That kingdom shall advance by the victories of the truth, by the conquests of the Spirit. The sword may oppose Christ's kingdom, but it will not promote it; and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, will prevail over every opposition. Christ, without the aid of the sword, shall yet be King of kings, and Lord of lords."

Verse 54-57. Christ's enemies had no power over him till Christ himself gave them that power, till his hour was come till all that was written in the scriptures was fulfilled. They could not lay hold on him till then. Once it will be remembered they had him on the brow of a hill, near the town of Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and they were going to cast him headlong. But he, passing through the midst of them, went his way. He could as easily have delivered himself now. But how should the scriptures be fulfilled? How should redemption be accomplished? How should God be glorified? How should the world be saved? This was their hour, and the power of darkness. There was a great struggle between Christ and evil principles. Christ had to contend with them in delivering the prey from the mighty, and rescuing the lawful captive. He had to enter into conflict with Satan himself. Nay,

he had to suffer the wrath of God. It was their hour, because it was the hour appointed in the counsels of God himself for the accomplishment of man's redemption. It was the power of darkness, when Satan, and the powers of darkness, sought to overcome his steadfastness, to tempt his soul, to make him renounce his work, and so baffle his enterprise. It was their hour, and therefore he permitted them to lay hold on him, and they led him away to Caiaphas the High Priest, with whom the scribes and the elders were assembled.

At this moment all the disciples forsook him and fled. How touching this circumstance! By one he had been betrayed—by another he was to be denied—now he was forsaken by all. This was the hour spoken of by Christ, when they were to be scattered every man to his own, and were to leave him alone:—alone in the hands of his enemies. It is sad in many circumstances to be left *alone*. Christ was now *alone*: of the people there were none with him; while he was about to endure the wrath of God, and the cruel death of the cross. To be deserted by *friends* especially is a calamity of all others the greatest. This was now the situation of Christ. He was alone, in the power of his enemies. And yet he was not alone: the Father was with him. Still God was with him. The time was coming when even he should forsake him, when he was to exclaim in the bitterness of his soul, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And then should Christ be indeed *alone*, alone in the universe, the great sacrifice, the great propitiation:—at once the High Priest, the altar, and the victim!

Verse 58. Peter followed him afar off. "Where was his courage now? Where was his daring now? "Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I *never* be offended". Never! Now he is offended surely when he follows Christ only afar off, when he will not boldly stand by him and defend him. And it is curiosity merely it appears, that leads him to follow him even a far off. It was merely to see the end—to see what these things would lead to. He "went in, and sat with the servants to see the end." A most unworthy motive truly. How many unworthy motives may actuate the professed followers of Jesus! Let us look to our motives even when we may be embarked in a worthy cause. Let it not merely be to see the end. Let it be to accomplish the end, though it may even

be connected with disaster and defeat. — In this defeat there may be often the greatest victory.

Verse 59-68. They were resolved by all means to accomplish Christ's death, and they would suborn false witnesses rather than suffer him to escape. But they found none. It was with difficulty they could obtain any: At last came two false witnesses. A false cause is often supported by the *appearance* of evidence rather than by evidence itself. Heaven and earth are moved in this instance to obtain evidence that will be satisfactory, and it is last but the most paltry evidence that is obtained, and that is held enough. We are told, "At last came two false witnesses, And said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days".—That was a remarkable scene which passed between the High Priest and Christ. Think of the High Priest sitting in judgment upon Him of whom he was the type. He was the High Priest according to the law of a carnal commandment—Christ according to the power of an endless life. He was the High Priest which had infirmity: Christ, the son who is consecrated for evermore. The son of God arraigned before a mortal like ourselves, made to answer for his life!—But hear that solemn announcement, which ought to have struck the High Priest with fear, and thrilled his inmost soul: "Hereafter shall ye see the son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of Heaven". That is a sight which we shall all witness. We shall see Christ at the right hand of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Now he is the accused—then he will be the Judge. Now he is at the bar of another: then we shall stand at his bar. This is his hour of humiliation: that will be his hour of exaltation. He will be then higher than the highest—the fellow of God! How solemn the thought of Christ's coming, and that we must all stand at his judgment seat! "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, and give account to him of the deeds done in the body whether good or bad". Aye, and that High Priest will be there, who now rent his clothes and said: "He hath spoken blasphemy". Will it be to receive the sentence of damnation as he now pronounced it upon Christ?—Perhaps he will be among the redeemed on that day—among those who will be acquitted at the bar of God, having embraced the merits of Christ. Although he condemned Christ, Christ may acquit

him; for Christ died for sinners; and many even of those who crucified Christ afterwards believed on him. He may be among the trophies of saving grace—one of the monuments of redeeming mercy, and all the more conspicuous that he was now the very instrument of condemning Christ to death.

Doubtless some of those, too, who now "spat in his face and buffeted him; and smote him with the palms of their hands, saying, Prophecy unto us thou Christ, who is he that smote thee?" will be found at the right hand of the Judge on the great day. They have obtained mercy like the Persecutor Saul, who says respecting himself "and I obtained mercy." But meanwhile how insulting their language and conduct! What abuse was thus heaped upon Christ! What ignominy did he not endure! And how meekly did he bear all! He answered his accusers not a word "When he was reviled, he reviled not again—when he suffered he threatened not, but committed himself to him who judgeth righteously".

Verses 69-75 We have here the melancholy fall of Peter—him who said: "Though I should die with thee yet will I not deny thee". Strange, after having been so well warned, and but so recently: after having himself so solemnly repudiated the charge that he would deny him: he should that very night, according to our Lord's prediction, before the cock crew twice, deny him thrice. And yet there is nothing so wonderful in this: it was but an exemplification of the deceitfulness of the human heart. It was but Satan prevailing over grace. Fear probably was what Satan wrought upon, to the overthrow of Peter's steadfastness, and Peter's truthfulness. He was afraid, probably, lest he might be involved in difficulty, and share the treatment which Christ received. He was not yet prepared to be a martyr. His faith, and his constancy gave way in the face of danger. He was bold enough when the danger was not imminent—now when it was pressing he yields. The standard-bearer faints. His courage fails him and he becomes weak before his enemies—"I know not the man". To his denial he adds oaths and curses. Who would have expected this of Peter! And not once, but a second and a third time he repeated his denial. Sad, melancholy, failure of human resolution! "Though all men be offended because of thee, yet will not I be offended. Though I should

die with thee yet will I not deny thee". And now he denies him even with oaths and with curses. But mere human resolution is weak before the power of temptation. Let us never resolve in our own strength, but in the strength of God—Satan, our own hearts, are too powerful adversaries, if we have not the grace of Christ. He alone can keep us from falling. "Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling"—says the Apostle.—Saints are kept. They are in Christ's hands. He orders their footsteps. He keeps them in all their ways. He hedges their path. He protects them from evil. Satan may desire to have them, but he prays for them. They are the objects of his special care, and intercession, and love. They would fall away—their faith would decay, their love would grow cold—their obedience would relax, did not Christ keep them—did he not bestow his Spirit: were they not in a word included in the gracious covenant by which salvation is secured to them. And even with respect to Peter, we find, accordingly, that he was speedily renewed unto repentance. Christ suffered him to fall for a moment, perhaps, that he might learn his own weakness, and that he might afterwards lean solely upon the arm of Christ. Christ cared for him even in his fall. "Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to have thee that he might sift thee as wheat, but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not" Christ turned to him and looked to him at the proper moment. There was the Saviour steadfast amid all his persecutors—upright amid his accusers—here was Peter prostrate under the power of the enemy—ready it may be, to deny his Lord again should he be challenged as before. *But Christ's look triumphed.* Peter bethought himself, he remembered whence he had fallen, and he rushed out of the room, and poured out a flood of burning tears. He wept at his fall: he wept at the dishonour he had done to Christ: he wept at his pusillanimity: he wept at his treachery: he wept for his sins. There were the tears of genuine sorrow—the tears of true contrition—the tears of sincere repentance.—They fell in showers while he thought of his weakness and apostacy: and now he was the Disciple again, ready to confess his Lord, and to suffer for his sake. Peter's repentance is as instructive as his fall. The true penitent will be received. He will not be cast off. God will regard his prayer. God will listen to his con-

cession, his supplication. Christ will not cast him off. The Saviour will receive every sinner that truly comes to him for salvation. His blood will wash away his sin. His death will atone for his guilt. His righteousness will justify him. He invites sinners to come unto him: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light". Let this encourage any who are sensible of their sins, and who are willing to be saved. Christ will in no wise cast you off. He pardoned Peter, he will pardon you. Only see that you are truly humbled, truly penitent, and that you are willing to be saved through Christ, through his merits alone.

---

REMARKS

ON THE

"*Reply of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, to the Letter of the Free Church Synod declining the Union.*"

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR KING.

FIFTH ARTICLE.

The Fourth Article explained the ground upon which the Free Synod regarded the refusal of the Presbyterian Synod to adopt, or to declare their adherence to, the principles of the Free Church of Scotland as an evidence that they and that Synod did not entertain the same view either of the Confession of Faith or of the Basis of Union; and that, consequently, for the present at least, any prospect of a union was precluded.

A second matter referred to as leading to the same conclusion, was the refusal of that Synod to join in the Protest of the Free Church against the Scottish Establishment as it is now maintained. The brethren in their reply profess to be unable to see the difference between these two things, and say, that "the first and second if not one and the same are so intimately connected, that separate answers to them, if they could be given, would serve no useful purpose." The fathers of the Secession, whose descendants and representatives they claim to be, would have had no difficulty in apprehending the distinction. They mark it very clearly in their Judicial Testimony, in which there is, on the one hand, what they called an Approbatory part, bearing testimony "to the many great appearances of

the Lord for this church and land, and to the doctrine, worship, government, and discipline of the Lord's house therein, agreeable to the Holy Scriptures, our Confession of Faith and Catechisms, the National Covenant of Scotland, and the Solemn League and Covenant of the three Nations;" and setting forth, therefore, what they regarded as right in conduct, and true in doctrine which had been attained: and, on the other hand, a condemnatory and assertory part, enumerating various evils, and defections, and errors, which had defaced the beauty of the church, and asserting and maintaining still the attainments which had been reached, "against the injuries and insolent indignities done unto, and the encroachments, violations, and breaches made upon the same." A reply to the first argument, which was founded upon the Presbyterian Synod's declining to join in the testimony of the Free Church so as to express an approbation of their principles, and acting in accordance with these principles, if a reply were to be given, should be a statement shewing that the Assemblies of the Free Church are not free, faithful, reforming Assemblies, acting upon the principles of the Confession of Faith, as received by the Church in 1647, and that the Presbyterian Synod could not in connexion with such a body follow out the proper design of the Secession. A reply to the second argument, which was founded on the refusal of the Presbyterian Synod to join in the Testimony or Protest of the Free Church against the Establishment, if a reply were to be given, should be a statement shewing that there is nothing in the present condition of that Establishment calling for the Protest of the Free Church, which the Presbyterian Synod declines to countersign.

Instead, however, of dealing with the subject in this straightforward manner, the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod, unable or unwilling to distinguish where things really differ, profess to answer the two in the following statement: "They" that is the Free Synod, "have completely separated from the Church of Scotland, and solemnly bound themselves to hold no communion with any of her members, however deserving, while we have only seceded from her judicatories, reserving the right of holding Christian and ministerial communion with the Godly within her pale. We frankly own that during the course of the negotiation, we urged the adoption of this latter prin-

ciple; but finding our brethren inflexible in their opposition to it, we yielded and consented that their principle should be adopted by the united body. Is it then consistent with fairness and truth to charge us with the contrary as a reason for breaking off the negotiation?

"The object of our brethren in their statements upon this subject, seems evidently to be to produce the impression, that we approve of certain proceedings in the Established Church of Scotland, which they have described at some length. They cannot, however, be ignorant of the fact, that our fathers of the Secession raised their standard against the Erastianism of the Church of Scotland long before the members of the Free Church thought of unfurling their banner—that the present generation regard their reasons for secession as still valid, and that they have no disposition to return within her pale. So far from approving of the terms on which she holds her endowments, they disapprove altogether of her connexion with the state, as imposing trammels, which are inconsistent with that perfect freedom which is the birth-right of Zion; and have gone to lengths in asserting the freedom of Christ's Church, and in maintaining the rights of his people, to which the Free Church has scarcely yet attained."

However convenient this mode of disposing of the case may have appeared to the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod, it misrepresents the facts which they had to deal with, and evades the points to which they had to reply. The Committee on Union, in their Report which was submitted to the Free Synod on the 29th of June, 1847, after mentioning that they and the Committee of the Presbyterian Synod, met at New Glasgow, and recognised as a Doctrinal Basis the Basis of Union previously agreed to by both Synods, add, "The Committee then proceeded to discuss the subject of external relations, and found that the Committee of the Presbyterian Church made no distinction between the present Establishment and the Free Church, which, in the mind of this Committee, precluded a Union with them while holding such views." This is something very different from what is stated by the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod, although not at all inconsistent with any thing that appears in their Reply. There may seem, indeed, to be a difference recognised by them between the two bodies, in the fact that they were negotiating a union with the

Free Synod, while no corresponding step had been taken with those who still maintained a connexion with the Establishment in Scotland; but that admits of a very easy explanation, on grounds quite different from any approval of the Free Church, as maintaining the principles of the Westminster Standards in opposition to the defections of the Establishment—The members of the Union Committee of the Free Synod were not allowed to cherish the mistaken notion that this negotiation was an indication of superior regard for the Free Church, and were given very plainly to understand that "the toss up of a halfpenny" might determine with which of the bodies the Presbyterian Synod might be connected. Nor will it do for that Synod to say, as they do in reference to certain opinions expressed with regard to Lord Aberdeen's Act, "in our collective capacity we have expressed no opinion upon the subject, and we do not hold ourselves responsible for the private sentiments of our individual members, on matters in which we have no interest." In respect both to Lord Aberdeen's Act, and the relative position of the Free Church and the Establishment, they ought to feel an interest—if they were genuine Seceders they would feel an interest—and, as they cannot but know that the Free Church at all events feels an interest, it was their duty to see to it that their Committee, and especially its Convener, whom they appointed, were men who would be true exponents of the views of the body for whom they were appointed to act, and who would not just lay themselves out to insult those whom they were to meet on a treaty of union.

But what is there in the refusal of the Presbyterian Synod to join in the Protest of the Free Church against the Scottish Establishment, that should be regarded as an indication that they and the Free Synod do not entertain the same views with regard to the Confession of Faith and the Basis of Union? In answering that question, it may be necessary to remind the reader of two features which characterized genuine Seceders. The first is, that, as the Secession was a secession not from the Church of Scotland, but from the prevailing Moderate party, the original Seceders, and those who had a right to be recognised as their descendants, continued to feel an interest in that Church; and longed for the time, which they hoped might yet arrive, when through her falling into the hands of more

careful managers, they might, in perfect consistency with the principles for the maintenance of which they had seceded, return to the bosom of the Establishment. A remarkable exemplification of this, in the case of Adam Gib and the late Dr. McCrie, is given in the Life of Dr. McCrie by his son, P. 312, where the following quotation from a letter of the Doctor's, written in something of a playful style, shews that, notwithstanding the clouds that so much obscured the prospect, even he was not without some occasional glimmerings of hope that he might be a minister of the Established Church:—"Is it yet time for me to commence a canvass for John Knox's Church? I have heard that Adam Gib, to a considerably late period of his life, expressed the hope that he would preach in St. Giles's. You know the practical inference. Yet we do injury to more than our own happiness by dealing harshly with kind hope, repressing her ardour, and chiding her for those lamb-like friskings in which she indulges to please us." The second feature is, that, notwithstanding their Secession from the Moderate majorities of the day, they considered themselves as still having a connexion with the Church of Scotland, and an interest in her movements, and in all that affected her. They felt, in their secession state, that there was a duty which they had to discharge in testifying against what they regarded as her corruptions, her abuses, her acts of backsliding; and that not merely down to the period when the secession took place, but subsequently, as, to their mind, the occasion seemed to call for a renewed expression of their judgment. Besides what was stated in the first or extra-judicial Testimony in 1734, the Judicial Testimony, which was agreed to by the Associate Presbytery in December 1736, brought down to that period the narrative of abuses against which a Testimony was lifted up. When the Burgher Synod published their Re-exhibition of the Testimony, in 1779, they added an Appendix, "in which the Judicial Act and Testimony, is extended to some public transactions which have happened in this Church and Nation, since that Testimony was first published; and the Assertory Articles pointed directly in opposition to other Defections in both." The General Associate or Anti-Burgher Synod, in 1804, published their Narrative and Testimony, in which, no doubt, there were important departures from the subordinate standard to which

they had hitherto professed to adhere (and for refusing to concur in which changes, Dr McCrie, Mr Aitken, Professor Bruce, and Mr. Chalmers were deposed), but in which they too bring down the narrative of the defections in the Establishment against which they testify to the time of the publication. They state their warrant and call in duty for doing so in the following terms: "In bearing witness for the truth, it is incumbent on the Church to signify her approbation of the contentings that have been made in the behalf of truth in former times; and in testifying against what is opposite to the truth, it is her duty to state her testimony against every step of defection and opposition made to the truth in former, as well as in present times. This appears from the approved example of the church; as in the 78th psalm, and in the 9th chapter of Nehemiah, with various other places of Scripture." In like manner, when the New Light Burghers and Anti-Burghers, formed into one body as the United Associate Synod of the Secession Church, published their Testimony in 1827, they say, "We deplore the corruptions in administration, for testifying against which our fathers were cast out of that church, and which, as they still exist, and are in some respects increased, render continuance in a state of secession an imperative duty. To those corruptions we must distinctly advert; nor, however painful the task is, ought we to shrink from affixing to them the condemnation which they merit. This is a duty which we owe to Jesus Christ, for it is by maintaining his gospel and ordinances in purity, that his name and salvation are declared and perpetuated;—to the best interests of men, for thus we shall warn them against errors and evils, which are injurious to their precious souls;—to the National Church herself, as a means of exciting her to remember whence she has fallen, and to repent and do the first works;—and to our own character and influence as a church, for we shall thus vindicate our secession, and promote one of its leading objects." In following the line of duty which they have thus marked out, they are not satisfied with declaring their adherence to the testimony which their seceding fathers had lifted up against the Establishment in the Act, Declaration and Testimony of 1736, they are not satisfied with indicating generally that the evils therein testified against were still unredressed; they specify a

variety of particulars in which the abuses had been increased. They refer to the deliverance of Assembly 1784, after having rejected some overtures relating to the repeal of the law of Patronage, in which they declare "that it does not appear to this Assembly, that there is any reason for an innovation being made in the mode of settling vacant parishes;" and, in notes, they illustrate what is generally stated in the Narrative itself, by specific instances of intrusive settlements, down to those of Kiltarlity and Croy, in 1823.

The principles of the Presbyterian Synod, they professing to be Seceders, are such as should have led them to recognise, and act upon the duty not only of testifying against the evils, if they exist, on account of which the first Seceders separated from the Moderate majorities of their day; but of enlarging their Testimony, if the evils have been increased in later times. The question, then, is this, Has nothing occurred, in connexion with the Disruption, that should draw a very marked line of distinction betwixt the Free Church and the Establishment? Or, if there are admitted differences, are they of so trifling a nature as that, with any intelligent and honest Seceder, it should be as the "toss up of a half-penny" with which of them he should unite? Or, on the contrary, are they not such as that a refusal to join in a Protest against the evils which constitute the ground of difference, especially when so evident a call in duty was presented in the proposal to unite with a body that was already pledged to that Protest, is in itself a very distinct indication that the parties so refusing have no right to be recognised as Seceders, and cannot be regarded as holding by the Confession of Faith, as it was received by the Church of Scotland in 1647? The materials for answering the question are ample, and present a wide field of illustration; but they are also of such a nature that they may be presented with much condensation, and yet with a well defined outline. This condensation must now be attempted.—The task of holding up corruptions for condemnation is painful, but the Testimony of the United Secession Synod teaches, that the painfulness of the task is no reason why it should be evaded; and it may be well to remind some, who have of late shewn a wonderful sensitiveness about affixing to the corruptions of the Establishment the condemnation which they merit, that the following lan-

guage with respect to the duty of doing so is the language, as already quoted, of the United Secession Synod. "This is a duty which we owe to Jesus Christ, for it is by maintaining his gospel and ordinances in purity, that his name and salvation are declared and perpetuated;—to the best interests of men, for thus we shall warn them against errors and evils, which are injurious to their precious souls;—to the National Church herself, as a means of exciting her 'to remember whence she has fallen, and to repent and do the first works;'—and to our own character and influence as a Church, for we shall thus vindicate our secession, and promote one of its leading objects."

It is admitted that there were serious defects in the Revolution Settlement.—It is admitted that there were evils in the terms on which the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland was finally adjusted. It is admitted that a great additional grievance was inflicted on the Church of Scotland by the Act of Parliament 1712, restoring Patronage; an Act which was passed in violation of the Articles of Union. Notwithstanding these admissions, it is asserted, as a matter of plain historical fact, that at the time of the Secession, the Church of Scotland, possessed of a scriptural constitution, had such freedom to work out the principles of her own constitution, that the men who seceded, not only could have had no difficulty in remaining within her pale, but would have felt it to be their duty and their privilege to do so, *if they had not been prevented from the exercise of their constitutional liberty by the tyrannical sway of the Moderates*, who at the time were "the prevailing party" in the Church courts. This was a view of the case to which the Seceders themselves attached great importance; and, accordingly, they were careful to make it distinctly known that they had not seceded from *the Church of Scotland*, but merely from that party who were subverting the constitution of the Church. The brethren of the Presbyterian Synod seem to think that they represent themselves as occupying the same position, in relation to the Establishment, with these early Seceders, when they say, "we have only seceded from her judicatories, reserving the right of holding Christian and ministerial communion with the Godly within her pale." If such, however, is the view with which they have expressed themselves in the language just quoted, they are labouring under two very grave mis-

takes. First, they are greatly mistaken when they think that their term "Godly" is equivalent to the description which the Seceders gave of those with whom they would still hold communion with the Establishment. The Seceders did not consider themselves very well qualified to search the heart and to try the reins of the children of men, so as to be able to say who of them were "godly" and who were not: but they knew that they could judge of a man's profession—that they could form some opinion of his conduct; for these are visible things.—Accordingly, they do not say, with the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod, We reserve "the right of holding Christian and ministerial communion with the *Godly* within her pale" (with all deference, that might have kept them in communion with Moderates still, miserably misguided though these men were in their management of the affairs of church government); but they say, in their Protest, as given in the fourth Article of these Remarks, "We still hold communion with all and every one who desire, with us, to adhere to the principles of the true Presbyterian, Covenanted Church of Scotland, in her doctrine, worship, government and discipline: and particularly with every one who are groaning under the evils, and who are affected with the grievances we have been complaining of; who are, in their several spheres, wrestling against the same." Secondly, when this mistake is corrected, and, instead of the term "Godly," the description which the Seceders themselves gave of the persons in the Establishment with whom they would be willing to hold communion is inserted the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod are grievously mistaken in imagining that there would be found a single person in the communion of the Establishment, from the Moderator of the General Assembly downwards, with whom they would be at liberty to hold communion, *on the ground that they correspond with the description given.*

These brethren say, "our fathers of the Secession raised their standard against the Erastianism of the Church of Scotland long before the members of the Free Church thought of unfurling their banner." This may be allowed to pass as true; for it is not likely that any of the members of the Free Church are old enough to have been capable of unfurling any banner in 1733. It is, however, more to the purpose to observe, that the banner of the Free Church was not un-

furled for the first time when the procession moved from St. Andrew's Church to take up their position at Canonmills, on the 18th of May, 1843. That banner floated over the General Assembly in 1647. When, in the time of Charles II, the state interfered with sacred things, and required the Scottish nation to adopt new modes of worship, "in obedience to the law of the land;" that banner, the banner of the Church of Scotland, waved in the breezes which fanned the temples of those who, forsaking houses and lands, betook themselves to the moors, and the mountain sides, that they might obey the law of Christ. It was under that banner that the "outed ministers" returned, when, upon the Revolution, they regained their position as ministers of the Establishment. It was for the purpose of upholding that banner that the first Seceders, as has been shewn, separated from the Moderates. It was to uphold that banner that others, at the same time, kept their places in the Establishment, where they could still consistently strive to prevent the guaranteed privileges of her constitution from being trampled upon by their oppressors, the Moderates. It was as upholding that banner that, when at length in the providence of God they became the majority, they prosecuted those measures of reform which gladdened the heart of every true Seceder, and which drew within the pale of the Establishment numbers who worthily borne that name. It was when consistently acting under that banner that the Church of Scotland was resisted and obstructed by the unconstitutional interference of the civil courts. It was in defence of that banner that, in her Claim of Right, agreed to in 1842, she sought redress of the grievances of which she had so much cause to complain. When that claim was rejected, when the encroachments of the civil courts were ratified by the acquiescence of the State, when it was made distinctly known that the benefits of the Establishment were no longer to be enjoyed but upon the condition that the Church should submit to the control of the civil power; determined still to obey God rather than man, it was under the same banner that the *Church of Scotland*, for the second time, forsook houses and lands, manses, glebes, and stipends; and left an Establishment that was now to have a banner flaring over her head inscribed "Obey the law of the land."

This was not a Secession. It was the

movement, not of a party adopting new principles, but of the Church of Scotland maintaining the principles of 1617,—maintaining the principles which she held in 1690—maintaining the principles which she held in 1733, although a party called the Moderates were trampling upon them—maintaining the principles which she held forth in her Claim of Right, in 1812; and renouncing the benefits of an Establishment when, *through a new mode of interpreting and administering the civil law*, the benefits of the Establishment could no longer be enjoyed but through the sacrifice of these principles. The change effected by this new mode of administering the civil law in reference to ecclesiastical affairs is such, that no man who, in the language of the Seceders, “desires to adhere to the principles of the true presbyterian, covenanted Church of Scotland,” has an inch of ground to stand upon in the Scottish Establishment now. This was very soon brought out in the conduct of some who have a right to be regarded as at once competent and impartial judges. One instance must suffice. At the time of the Disruption, there was a deputation in Edinburgh from the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, with a commission to hold friendly correspondence, on behalf of that Church, with the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. These deputies witnessed the proceedings of the Disruption. They had now to consider how they were to execute their commission; and, after due deliberation, found that they could not acknowledge the Ecclesiastical Establishment, as it now stood, as their parent Church, the Church of Scotland. It was not there that they could find the representatives of the Bairs, and the Livingstons, whose labours had been so much blessed to Ireland, in the seventeenth century. They found their way to Canonmills, and they laid their commission before the Assembly there, as the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. When they returned to their constituents, their conduct was approved of, as in precise accordance with the terms of their commission. The correspondence continues to be maintained, not with the Establishment, but with the Free Church of Scotland.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

The preceding Remarks have extended so far, that there is not sufficient space

left for entering upon a statement of evidence in proof of the averment, “That Mr. Trotter calumniate the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and gives a most erroneous view of their labours with respect to the Confession of Faith.” It must therefore stand over till another opportunity, as must also some remarks on the principal portion of a Letter which he has since published in the “Presbyterian Witness”, in which he attempts still further to bolster up the same charges.

In this subsequent Letter, he comes out with additional mistatements, in his attempt to defend the untenable position which he took up, when, in his Letter which appeared in the “Guardian” of this city, Sept. 28th, 1849, he said, “but it is a fact of which you cannot be ignorant, that there are many in the Free Church, and that the number is rapidly increasing, who are willing to dispense with the Confession of Faith altogether, which would leave them at liberty to maintain or depart from its doctrines as they please. I have different authorities for making such a statement, but shall confine myself to one at present.” The one authority on which he founds so grave a charge, is an extract from a speech of Dr McKay’s, before the Free Church Commission in 1848. He now says, “we have given it as reported by their own friends, and allowed it to speak for itself; and the Professor has not ventured to correct any of the Dr’s statement.” The Doctor’s statement did not require to be corrected; but Mr. Trotter’s mistatement did; and it was corrected. It is a fact, that, from a desire to act with other bodies in the matter of education in common schools, there are numbers who would have the Church put her own standards in abeyance so far as not to insist upon the subscription of the Confession of Faith by the *school-masters*. It is not a fact, however, that what is thus admitted to be true is a warrant for Mr. Trotter to say that in this he has a proof “that there are many in the Free Church, and that the number is rapidly increasing who are willing to dispense with the Confession of Faith altogether, which would leave them at liberty to maintain or depart from its doctrines as they please.” As if, however, the admission of facts as stated by Dr. McKay were an admission of the extravagant mistatements of Mr. Trotter, he goes on with an air of triumph to say, “The commission thus adjured did not venture to deny it, and neither has the Professor.—

He only insinuates that it extends only to a single point which he regards as a trifle."—and "he thinks it a matter of small importance to permit the young to receive their first impressions of religion from men who refuse the Confession of Faith altogether! How very inconsistent." Rather, How very anxious Mr. Trotter is to represent him as inconsistent; and how very unscrupulous about the means. 1st. The Professor did not *insinuate*, but assert, that the fears of the Presbyterian Synod lest the Free Church should get rid of the Confession of Faith altogether, were entirely groundless, and originated in the usual blundering of Mr. Trotter. Every intelligent reader must see that the assertion is quite true; and that a minister's being of opinion that a schoolmaster might be entrusted with the education of children, *not although he repudiates entirely the doctrines of the Confession*, but although he may not be prepared to subscribe to every doctrine in the Confession, is something very different from that minister's wishing to get rid of the Confession as the standard of the church, that he and other ministers may maintain or depart from its doctrines as they please. Mr. Trotter cannot see the difference. 2ndly. Even with respect to schoolmasters, the Professor did not say whether it was or was not a trifling matter. Mr. Trotter, as he deems very much in the practice of doing, was simply drawing upon his own fancy for that picture of inconsistency which he was inviting his readers to contemplate so admiringly.

#### FREE PRESBYTERY OF HALIFAX.

This court met here on the 29th October. They had again under their consideration the application for supply to Bermuda, in the expected absence of Mr. Adam, when, after a full consideration of the case, the inconvenience of giving the supply during the winter was felt to be such that the Clerk was instructed to write to Mr. Adam, requesting him to remain for some time longer, in the expectation that the Presbytery would be able to give supply at the close of the College session.

The following supplies were appointed for the stations in the neighbourhood of Halifax:

Nov. 2nd.	Dartmouth—Mr. Lyall.
" "	Goodwood—Mr. Romans.
" 9th.	Dartmouth—Mr. King.
" "	St. John's—Mr. Lyall.
" "	Lawrencetown—Mr. Romans.
" 16th.	Dartmouth—Mr. Romans.
" "	St. John's—Mr. King.
" 23rd.	Dartmouth—Mr. Romans.

" "	St. John's—Mr. Romans.
" "	Musquodoboit Harbour—Mr. Forrester.
" "	Chalmers' Church—Messrs. King and Lyall.
" 30th.	Dartmouth—Mr. King.
" "	St. John's—Mr. Lyall.
" "	Lawrencetown—Mr. Romans.
Dec. 7th.	Dartmouth—Mr. King.
" "	St. John's—Mr. Forrester.
" "	Goodwood—Mr. Lyall.
" "	Sackville—Mr. Romans.
" 14th.	Dartmouth—Mr. Romans.
" "	St. John's—Mr. Lyall.
" 21st.	Dartmouth—Mr. Lyall.
" "	St. John's—Mr. King.
" "	Lawrencetown—Mr. Romans.
" 28th.	Dartmouth—Mr. King.
" "	St. John's—Mr. Lyall.
Jan. 4th.	Dartmouth—Mr. Lyall.
" "	St. John's—Mr. Forrester.
" "	Goodwood—Mr. King.
" "	Musquodoboit Harbour—Mr. Romans.

Mr. John Alexander Ross, who has been already for two sessions in attendance upon the Theological classes of the College, presented himself for examination by the Presbytery previously to his enrolment for the third session. Mr. Alexander Ross, who has been attending the preliminary classes for three sessions, presented himself, at the request of the Professors, in order that the Presbytery might have an opportunity of judging whether it might not be proper for him now to enter upon the study of Theology. The Presbytery agreed to hold a special meeting on the following Saturday for the purpose of examining these two students, and any others within the bounds who might be in similar circumstances with Mr. Alexander Ross. They agreed to hold their next ordinary meeting on the first Wednesday of January next.

The Presbytery met on Saturday, Nov. 1st. when they examined Mr. John A. Ross, about to enter the Theological Hall for the third session, and were highly satisfied with the proficiency he had made. They also examined Mr. Alexander Ross, Mr. William Murray, Mr. Hector McKay, Mr. Alexander Campbell, and Mr. George Munro; when they found that the progress which these students had made in the preliminary classes was such that they might now with advantage enter upon the study of Theology.

#### FREE PRESBYTERY OF PICTOU.

The Free Presbytery of Pictou met in the Church of Lochaber on the 29th Oct.—There was a full attendance of the congregation. After sermon by the Rev. Mr. Stewart, the call from Prince Edward's Island to the Rev. Mr. Campbell, was taken up.

Mr. Campbell stated that he had now been labouring in that congregation for a

about six years, amid many difficulties, and with an anxiety of mind alike impossible and unnecessary to detail, nor did he look for any sphere without its difficulties. He had an attachment to many in that congregation too strong to be broken, he trusted, should the course of events lead to his translation. He had no desire of removal, and when in Prince Edward's Island in harvest, urged upon the people not to renew their former call. There were however difficulties with which he had to contend, and which, unless considerably removed, rendered the hope of his being able to continue there with prospects of success very doubtful. From all he knew of the congregation in Prince Edward's Island he did think that it holds out greater prospects of usefulness in the Lord's vineyard than his present sphere. In these circumstances he left the matter in the hands of the Presbytery as the medium of ascertaining the mind of the Lord.

The great extent of the congregation in Prince Edward's Island—their long destitution—their many past unsuccessful efforts to obtain a pastor—their cordiality in this call—their exertions to do all in their power for the encouragement and comfort of the Minister—and the evils likely to result from the failure of the present effort were all pleaded in behalf of the call.

The congregation present deplored the existing evils—deprecatd the thoughts of translation which could not but be followed with most disastrous consequences, and resolved to use the utmost endeavours to retain their pastor.

In order to give the congregation further opportunity, the Presbytery delayed coming to a conclusion; and adjourned to meet at New Glasgow on the 5th of Novr.

The Free Presbytery of Picton met at New Glasgow on the 5th Novr.

The case of the translation was again taken up. Documents were produced which shewed that considerable exertions had been made by the congregations. These exertions however were confined chiefly to one part of the evils complained of. The main difficulty still remained.

Mr. Campbell being interrogated as to his own mind, stated that he felt interest in the prosperity of that congregation. He saw the dangers to which they would be exposed—the little hope of their being soon supplied or perhaps ever gathered into one congregation—and yet considering that the principal evil of which he had to complain continues as it was—the prospect of greater usefulness in the Lord's cause in the congregation in the Island—together with some leadings in providence, he felt it to his duty so far as he could discover to close with the call, which he now did.

Mr. Sutherland briefly stated the comparative merits of both congregations, with the

peculiar necessities of and prospects of usefulness in the Island, and also the greater facility of rendering services in Lochaber, and accordingly moved for the translation.

Mr. Neil Gunn stated the danger to which the people of Lochaber and St. Mary's must be exposed in case of translation. The strong affection of a large majority to Mr. Campbell—the shortness of the time they had to consider—and that he knew every exertion would be made to prevent it. He therefore opposed the translation and craved delay.

The Presbytery then agree without coming to a vote to delay the final determination of this case until the ordinary meeting in order to give the congregation of Lochaber and St. Mary's a full opportunity to have the grievances completely removed.

The congregation of Picton applied for a third part of Mr. Stewart's services until otherwise provided for. It was agreed to bring it before Mr. Stewart's congregation and with their consent granted.

The Presbytery adjourned to meet at New Glasgow on the second Wednesday of Jan'y. 1852.

—o—

The following notice of Mrs. Mackay of Rockfield was appended to the Brief Sketch of the Cape Breton Mission which appeared in our last number.

This short review of the Cape Breton Mission having been called for in consequence of the lamented death of Mrs. Mackay, who had the principal management of it—the sketch might be considered incomplete without some notice of her personal history and character, especially as such a notice has been generally looked for and desired by those who so long loved and esteemed her.

Mrs. Isabella Mackay was the third daughter of John Gordon, Esq., of Carrol, in the county of Sutherland, and Isabella McLeod of Genies, in the county of Ross. In 1803, she was married to John Mackay, Esq., of the parish of Lairg, in the county of Sutherland, where his father and grandfather had been ministers—a gentleman of cultivated mind, extensive information, and agreeable manners, who, but for the misfortune of blindness which befell him in the prime of life, would undoubtedly, by his abilities, have risen in the service of the East India Company, where his career commenced—He was a man of warm and generous feelings, and in every way of congenial principles and taste. Both Mr. and Mrs. Mackay took a deep interest in the young persons with whom they were connected, especially those who had been early deprived of their natural guardians, and acted towards them with a parental affection and concern, educating them, and unwearied in their eudea-

vours to promote their advancement in the world. Nor were their assiduities confined to relatives—they were ever ready to befriend the friendless. By nature philanthropic and ardent, and living during a period when social improvement was sought by means of political reform, they were enthusiastic admirers and strenuous advocates of the principles of civil and religious liberty.\*

Thus connected with the north of Scotland, Mrs. Mackay had, at an early period of her life, taken a deep interest in the Celtic population of the Highlands and Islands. It was a warm and enthusiastic attachment which led her to make so great efforts in behalf of her fellow-countrymen who had been compelled by poverty and distress to leave their native land—to which was added, in after life, the impulse of a higher motive—a concern for their spiritual welfare.

Her mind was naturally powerful and active, as well as benevolent. It was a large and enlightened benevolence, which sought the best and permanent interests of her fellow-creatures. Endued with no common buoyancy and vivacity of spirit, and an ardent temperament, she was not to be discouraged by difficulties in any work she undertook. The kindness of her nature, and that power which an ardent spirit exercises over the feelings of others with whom it comes in contact, generally enabled to remove them all:—above all, her own soul had been touched by the Spirit of all grace, and she felt constrained to go on in her course. But this grace, at the same time, led her to see much defect and sin in the motives of her conduct, and to complain that, in what she did for the good of others, she was more actuated by a mere *instinctive* compassion, than by a single regard to the glory of God. Her reception of the doctrines of the gospel had been gradual—these doctrines having in her to contend with the scepticism of an understanding, not immediately brought to a conviction of its own weakness. But as, by the grace of God, she came to a more full reception of them, her whole character underwent a corresponding change. Her natural ardour was brought under a softening, subduing, and restraining influence; and in her latter days, love to men, and the salvation of their souls, became more and more the predominating prin-

ciple of her conduct. The discipline of a death-bed sickness (as will be seen afterwards), opened her eyes to see more than she had ever seen before, that human actions cannot stand the scrutiny of a holy God—that there is no righteousness but Christ's righteousness—and that there could be no salvation, had not God declared his willingness to save the guiltiest for Christ's sake.

In illustration of her character, and the Christian principle which guided her, two events of some importance in her life may be stated. The first of these was in 1837, when she received a considerable and very unexpected accession of private fortune, by the bequest of one of those whom she and her husband had befriended in early life, and who had ever felt himself bound to his parental benefactors, by a warm and affectionate gratitude; but the accession gave rise in her mind to no idea of self-indulgence, or large expenditure on her own account. On the contrary, she avoided such expenditure, while she entered upon a more enlarged sphere of benevolence, and seemed to be resolved upon a more entire consecration of her substance to the Lord. No doubt, a naturally humane and generous disposition rendered such a sacrifice, in her case, more easy; but we have, at the same time, her own recorded conviction, that "a grateful recognition of God the giver was a bonnden duty in disposing of the bounties with which he favored us;"—"that there was too often a sinful omission in the distribution of property;" and that she felt bound to allot a portion of her means "to the furtherance of the eternal interests of a very destitute portion of our countrymen,—that God, having singularly prospered an effort made to this end, had thereby strengthened the claim on the instrument he had so honoured, to spare no means likely to advance it."

The second occurrence deserving of notice, was the deep impression made on her mind by the Disruption of the Church of Scotland, and the line of conduct which it led her, thereafter, to pursue. The principles on which so many ministers seceded from the Establishment she thoroughly appreciated; they approved themselves to her mind and conscience, and never ceased to influence and direct her in the future distribution of her means. "While (she said) as a christian and a patriot, I hold myself indebted to the protesters and founders of the Free Church of Scotland, of which I am a member, in an amount of obligation to which money can bear no proportion, I feel that, in the circumstances in which I am placed, it is my privilege as well as my duty, to bestow my property on the men, who by a sacrifice as noble as the reasons for it were imperative, cast themselves and their families on the bounty, or rather on the justice and gratitude of those who participate in the valuable results of the sacrifice, from the sufferings of which they are at the same

\* Late in life, Mr. Mackay became author of a "Life of Lieut.-General Hugh Mackay of Scoury (his distinguished and pious ancestral kinsman), who was Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in Scotland, 1689 and 1690, Colonel Commandant of the Scottish Brigade in the service of the States-General, and a Privy Councillor in Scotland."—To a revised edition of this work after the death of Mr. Mackay, Mrs. Mackay prefixed a memoir of her husband, very interesting in itself, and very creditable to her talents and literary taste.

time exempt, and on their successors in the ministry of the Free Church of Scotland, trusting that they will ever be animated with the same spirit." Under the influence of these sentiments, Mrs. Mackay gave herself in every way she could devise to the relief of those ministers and schoolmasters who suffered by the Disruption, the manner of relief being adapted to the particular circumstances of each case. To many a family, the help was most seasonable, and was received by them as the bounty of a gracious God who has all hearts in his hands, and who will not forsake those who are faithful to him.

A suffering clergyman, who knew not from whence the assistance came, and who to this hour is unknown, except to the individual thro' whom a large gift was transmitted, thus expresses himself,—“A minister of the Free Church, deeply indebted to the unknown friend into whose hands this note will be delivered, begs briefly to express his feelings, under the very peculiar circumstances in which, by her kindness, he has been placed. He desires, with gratitude to the Father of lights, from whom ultimately cometh down every good gift, and with gratitude also to the individual, who has so spontaneously, humbly, and delicately acted as the immediate giver, to accept the large sum sent for the supply of his necessities. He would seek to recognise in this most singular, opportune, and unlooked-for providence—singular in itself, but still more so, when taken in connection with a series of dispensations, and a track of spiritual exercises, alike strongly marked, and known only to himself—the faithfulness and power of Jehovah, who, in these latter days, can still provide for his people in ways as marvellous, and as well fitted to arrest the soul, and bring it to feel that it has to do with him, and that he is dealing immediately with it, as were his people of old with manna from heaven, or supporting his prophet by the ministry of a raven.” And it was not her own benefactions only; she was indefatigable and successful in awakening the sympathies of others, in behalf of distressed ministers and schoolmasters.

While individual cases excited her feelings, and called forth all her energies, her benevolence was not restricted to them.—Her benefactions, for the benefit of the church in general, were large; and in the ultimate disposal of what remained of her property, in the view of her death, she did not forget the rule of conduct which she had prescribed for herself, as the result of deliberate judgment and conscientious conviction.

It may be said, with respect to her pecuniary givings generally, that they were not only with consideration and delicacy, but with an enthusiastic warmth of feeling characteristic of herself; for she had previously entered with deepest sympathy into all

the circumstances of the case which had prompted her benevolence—so that when she bestowed the gift, it was a relief to her own feelings. This intense interest in the cause of distress also accounts for the largeness of her bounties.

It would be unsuitable to enter here into the details of what she did for the Highlanders and Islanders, whose interests, temporal and spiritual (always comprehending those of them in Cape Breton), deeply engrossed her mind during the closing years of her life. She herself had all the warm feelings of her countrymen, and these were sorely tried by the calamity which overtook them in the failure of the potato crop. She always felt that, to the condition of the people, justice had not been done—that adequate provision had not been made for even a common education—that the land had never been so managed and cultivated as to give them employment, and form them to industrial habits, and, above all, that their spiritual state had been neglected (into some parts the light of the Reformation having scarcely ever penetrated,) or the means of grace had been supplied to them most scantily and insufficiently—that they were a loyal, peaceable, and enduring race, and, as a part of the great common-wealth, deserved better treatment.

While unceasing in her efforts to procure food and clothing during the temporal destitution (which unhappily still continues), she always kept steadily in view their elevation in the scale of society, by means of religious and intellectual cultivation, and was ever most anxious to bring forward, and ready to aid young men possessed of the Gaelic language intending for the ministry, or to become schoolmasters to the Gaelic population.

Such occupations left little time for those studies and pursuits in which, otherwise, an acute mind and literary taste would have found gratification; and so employed, the Lord found her when he called her to himself. It was only within a few days of her death that she wrote to four of the ministers in Cape Breton.

Some months previous to her death, the probability of her removal from the world at no distant date was impressed on her mind; and to a friend she said,—“I trust you and my other friends will pray much for me, that as the old casket is breaking up, the precious jewel within may be polished and prepared, and made meet for glory.”

At an early period of her illness, she believed that the hand of death was upon her; and the messenger did not seem to be unwelcome. She spoke of the sin of her nature, and of the sin that entered into every spring and motive of conduct. She loathed herself on account of it, and desired to depart that she might be delivered from its power, and be with Christ. For a time anxious, on account of indwelling corruption,

and the want of evidence of sanctification (her views of the only ground of a sinner's acceptance being for a season obscured), she at length took refuge, and found peace, in the atoning blood and perfect righteousness of Christ her Redeemer.

These views of the grounds of a sinner's acceptance were not new to her, but had been long ago adopted by her in the view of eternity. "I desire to commend my soul to God," she wrote, "hoping for his mercy through the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I know that my redeemer liveth; was the sufficient consolation of righteous Job, under multiplied temporal sufferings. Blessed be God, a brighter light and surer word of promise now irradiates the darkness and suffering of the death-bed and the grave. The fountain is open to all who feel and loathe their load of pollution. The glorious robe of a Redeemer's righteousness is prepared for all who mourn under a sense of their unfitness to appear before the God who hateth iniquity, in the filthy rags of their own righteousness. I desire to rest on these promises, trusting that my innumerable transgressions are laid on One mighty to save."

An experimental conviction of these truths was manifested on her deathbed, and ultimately became the stay of her soul, as appears from what is related by a friend who visited her repeatedly:—"When I first saw her in her sickroom, I found her much cast down on account of the darkness that had overspread her soul. She said one day, she had not a shadow of an assured hope.—When the fulness and freeness of the offered salvation was pointed to—the open fountain opened for sin and uncleanness, supplying *all* our need, whether that was pardon and acceptance with God, or whether it was the cleansing influences of the Holy Spirit, as shown forth in the *blood and water*, her general reply was, 'I know all that; have we not been hearing these doctrines faithfully preached from Sabbath to Sabbath these many years. I believe Him to be all that he is said to be—a *complete* Saviour; but what interest have I in Him; what assurance that he is my Saviour?' On something further being mentioned, she said, 'Do not argue, I cannot bear it; God alone can do this work of faith in my soul—none else. I now see what I have been engaged in, which others thought so much of, were *all sin*—self-pleasing, self-seeking—not seeking the glory of God, and what is not done for his glory, God *cannot* accept—impossible, he *cannot*—no, I am a miserable sinner.' It was here suggested, that when the Spirit shines into the soul, all believers see themselves to be utterly vile, but we must come to Jesus just as we are, that is what he invites us to do. Two verses of Miss Elliot's hymn were repeated to her—

Just as I am—without a plea,  
But that thy blood was shed for me,

And that thou bid'st me come to thee,  
O Lamb of God, I come,' &c.

When I next saw her, I found that the hymn (the whole of which had then been read to her), together with parts of the Word of God, had been blessed to her heart with the Spirit's comforting power. She said to me, 'I see I was trying to bring something of my own to God, and I could find nothing, and so, I have come now to the Saviour on this simple ground: God holds forth Jesus Christ, his Son, God in our nature, as an all-sufficient Saviour—he is able to save me, and God commands me to believe in him and receive him; and I think I cannot be wrong in doing so, that is, obeying and trusting in him, and resting simply on his mercy. I have no other ground of hope, but I find *rest* here.' In all the subsequent visits she was full of love and praise—her heart and eyes overflowing at the thought of her Saviour's love to her. The last time I saw her (the day before her death), I thought her much changed in appearance, but calm and composed, and quite clear in mind. On leaving her, she said, 'Tell every one to pray for me, a poor sinner, and there is One who will not forget to intercede for me—the Advocate within the veil—he will not forget—I think he will not forget me.' I said, Oh! no—he cannot forget, for his people's names are written on his heart as they were of old on the breastplate of the high priest. 'Aye, that is it,' she added, I, in common with many others, loved her much; her clear and powerful intellect, her wit, her kindness, and the lively interest she took in my dear boys, and all other young persons in her circle, were very attaching qualities, and drew many hearts to her."

To others she said, "If I am saved at all, it must be by the atonement of Christ, and his righteousness, and that a free gift."—"The robe of Christ's righteousness is enough for me." On the passage from 1 Peter (ch. i. verse 12), "Which things the angels desire to look into," she remarked emphatically, "And no wonder." Under a painful attack of illness, her words were, "It is all right—it is just a part of the rod—it is just as it should be."

From the commencement of her illness, she expressed a desire to depart, and, while resigned to the will of God, requested that no prayer be made for the prolongation of life. Her conflict with the last enemy was neither long nor severe—and grace was given according to her need. There was no gloom on the deathbed—it was rather a spectacle of hope and humble confidence.

She died at Edinburgh, on the 15th November 1850, in the 73rd year of her age.

**CONTENTS.**

	Page.
Remarks on Matthew xxvi. 47-75.	161
Remarks on the Reply of the Presbyterian Synod. By Professor King.	165
Fifth Article.	170
Postscript.	170
Free Presbytery of Halifax.	171
Free Presbytery of Pictou.	171
The late Mrs. Mackay of Rockfield.	172
Advertisements, &c.	176

**FREE CHURCH COLLEGE LIBRARY.**

The Convener of the College Library gracefully acknowledges receipt of the following donations of books:—

- From Rev. John Stewart, New Glasgow, 8 vols.; including Pye Smith's Testimony to the Messiah.
- Rev. Patrick Miller, New Castle, 16 vols.
- Misses Bruce, do., a parcel of books.
- Mr. James Bruce, do., 2 vols.
- Mrs. Kelly, do., 7 vols.
- Mr. James Purves, Berwick, 7 vols.
- Mr. McComb, Belfast, 34 vols.
- Dr. Wilson, do., 1 vol.
- Dr. Killen, do., 9 vols.
- Rev. Wm. McLure, Londonderry, 3 vols.
- Rev. A. S. Paterson Hutcherontown, Glasgow, 12 vols.
- Rev. John Bonar, do., 1 vol. Bates' Works.
- Rev. Dr. Forbes, Glasgow, 3 vols.; including "Theory of the Differential and Integral Calculus. By John Forbes, D.D."
- Mrs. Spark, Craigie Park, Aberdeen, Sir John Sinclair's Statistical Account of Scotland. Old Edition.
- Rev. John Longmuir, do., 3 vols.
- Rev. Dr. Foote, do., Lectures on Luke by Dr. Foote, 3 vols.
- Rev. David Mitchell, Glasgow, 12 copies of "Christian Fidelity in the House of Mourning."
- Rev. W. G. Forbes, Cape Breton, 3 vols. Tract Society, 80 vols.
- The late Mrs. McKay, Rockfield. Owen's Works. Johnstone's Edition, First Issue. Calvin's Translation. Issue 1850.

**SCHEMES OF THE CHURCH.**

The following collections have been received:—

**SYNOD FUND.**

Musquodohoit Harbour	£0 17 6
Sydney Mines	2 13 0
St. George's Channel	1 16 9

W. S. STERLING, *Treasurer.*

**JOHN ESSON & CO.**

Corner of Duke and Barrington Streets.

**GENERAL IMPORTERS & DEALERS IN  
Flour, Meal, Groceries, Fish,  
Fishing Supplies, West  
India Produce, &c.**

HALIFAX, N. S.

Printed for the Committee, by JAMES  
BARNEB, Halifax, N. S.

**Free Church of Nova Scotia.****CURRENT EXPENSES OF COLLEGE AND ACADEMY.**

**I**N terms of the Act of the Free Synod of Nova Scotia, ancient public Collections, the Collection for the Current Expenses of the College and Academy (that is, the rent, and other expenses incident to the occupation of the premises), is to be made in all the Churches and Preaching Stations of the Free Church, on the First Sabbath of **DECEMBER**: and it is expected therefore that Ministers, Probationers, and Catechists, will give due intimation thereof on the Sabbath immediately preceding.

Halifax, October 23rd, 1851.

**No 16 Granville St. Halifax, N.S.****A. & W. MACKINLAY,**

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL

**Booksellers & Stationers,**

**H**AVE constantly on hand a choice and extensive assortment of **BOOKS AND STATIONARY** of every description, amongst which are. Day Books, Journals, Ledgers, and Memoranda Books; Pot, Post, Foolscap, and every description of writing papers, Note paper, Drawing paper, Drawing and Common Pencils, Bristol Board, Nories Navigation, Thompson's Lunar Tables, Mathematical Instruments, Charts in great variety, Dilworth's, Universal, Mavour's, Murray's, and Carpenter's Spellings. Murray's Reader and Introduction, Lennies Grammar, Chamber's Educational Course, Chamber's Journal, Chamber's Papers for the People, Bibles, Testaments, Prayer Books, Slates & Pencils, Ink, and Inkwashers, Framed Engravings.—Also—an assortment of Salmon & Trout Flies, Rods, Reels & Lines.

**Morison's Universal Medicine,**

Sold in Halifax, only by

**A. & W. MACKINLAY,**

General Agents for Nova Scotia.

**TERMS OF SSUBSCRIPTION**

TO THE

**MISSIONARY RECORD,**

OF THE

**Free Church of Nova Scotia**

If paid within the first quarter. 2s. 6d. P an  
If not paid until the expiry of  
the first quarter 3s. 9d. do.  
Single Copies 3d.

☞ All communications whether on Business, or for the Editors, must be addressed to Messrs. **A. & W. MACKINLAY,** Booksellers, Halifax, N. S.