



# SCOTLAND'S FREE CHURCH

A HISTORICAL RETROSPECT AND MEMORIAL  
OF THE DISRUPTION BY GEORGE BUCHANAN  
RYLEY WITH A SUMMARY OF FREE CHURCH  
PROGRESS AND FINANCE 1843-1893 BY JOHN  
M. M<sup>C</sup>CANDLISH F.R.S.E LATE PRESIDENT  
OF THE FACULTY OF ACTUARIES



*I say that I am not using the language of Romance, which sometimes perhaps may be heard even in this House, but I am using words which the most rigid observer and describer would admit to be applicable to cases like that which has been so frequently mentioned and so much discussed in the course of these debates—the case of the Free Church of Scotland, to whose moral attitude scarcely any word weaker or lower than that of majesty would, according to the spirit of historical criticism be justly applicable.—MR. GLADSTONE, Third Reading of The Irish Church Bill, 31st May, 1869.*

WESTMINSTER  
ARCHIBALD CONSTABLE AND COMPANY  
14 PARLIAMENT STREET S.W  
1893

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS . . . . .	xi
PREFACE . . . . .	xiii

## THE RULE OF THE MONASTERY

### CHAPTER I

Ninian and Whithern, 360-432?—Palladius sent, 431—Kentigern or Mungo and Strathclyde, 515-603? . . . . .	3
--	---

### CHAPTER II

Migration of the Scots from Dalriada—Columba, 563; and Irish Monasticism—Iona—Peculiarities of the Celtic Church . . . . .	10
--	----

### CHAPTER III

First recorded Scots' Synod—Scots' Church in England—Aidan and Lindisfarne, 635—Paschal and Tonsure Controversy, 664—Wilfrid, Chad, and others—Claims of the See of York—Successors of Columba—Adamnan—Revival of Candida Casa, 730—Inroads of the Danes—Unification of Scotland under Kenneth Macalpine, 843—Transfer of the Primacy from Iona to Dunkeld, 849—Transfer of the Primacy to St. Andrews, 900 . . . . .	19
---	----

## THE RULE OF THE PALACE

### CHAPTER IV

St. Andrews and Constantine—Consolidation of the Kingdom under Malcolm II.—Increase of Lay Holders of Church Property—Macbeth—Malcolm Canmore, 1057, and Margaret of England—Influence of Margaret—Alexander I. and Claims of the See of York—Growth of Feudalism under David I.—Third formation of Candida Casa—Passing away of the Celtic Church . . . . .	31
--	----

## CONTENTS

## CHAPTER V

	PAGE
William the Lion and the Liberties of the Scotch Church—Further Weakening of the Community of Iona—Establishment of Annual Church Councils under Alexander II.—Coming of the Mendicant Orders—Alexander III., the last Celtic King—Building of Sweetheart Abbey, the last of Scotch Abbeys . . . . .	40

## CHAPTER VI

War of Scotch Independence—Patriotism of the Clergy—Bruce—Rise of the Stewarts, 1371—Beginning of the Reformation in Scotland—University of St. Andrews founded, 1414—Burning of Resby and Craw—University of Glasgow founded, 1450—St. Andrews made an Archbishopric, 1472—Glasgow made an Archbishopric, 1492 . . . . .	48
---	----

## CHAPTER VII

Patronage in the Church—Persecution of the Lollards—Aberdeen University Founded, 1497—Flodden—Margaret, Sister of Henry VIII., Regent—Bad Influence of Henry—Burning of Patrick Hamilton and others—Marriage of James V. with Mary of Guise, 1538—Cardinal Beaton—Death of James and Birth of Mary Stewart, 1542 . . . . .	56
--	----

## CHAPTER VIII

Minority of Mary Stewart—French and English Parties—Persecution of Reformers—George Wishart—Murder of Cardinal Beaton—Siege of St. Andrews' Castle—John Knox—English Invasion and Battle of Pinkie—Burning of Adam Wallace . . . . .	64
--	----

## CHAPTER IX

Mary of Guise Regent, 1554—Return of Knox—His Influence—League of the Lords of the Congregation, 1557—Burning of Walter Milne—Bad Lives of Ecclesiastics—Conflict of the Reformers with the Queen Regent—Monastery Burning—Mary Stewart, Queen of France—Death of the Queen Regent—Treaty of Edinburgh—Appeal of Reformers to Parliament—Acceptance of "The Confession of Faith" . . . . .	71
--	----

## CHAPTER X

Difficulties of the Reformers—"The First Book of Discipline"—First "General Assembly of the Reformed Church of Scotland," 1560—	
---	--

# CONTENTS

vii

	PAGE
Return of Mary to Scotland, 1561—Interview with John Knox— Division of Church Property—Work of the Assembly—Strife between Mary and Knox—The First Moderator of Assembly— “The Book of Common Order,” 1564—Mary’s Marriage with Darnley : and with Bothwell—Her Abdication, 1567—Legislation of 1567—More Plundering of Church Property—Tulchan Bishops— Death of Knox . . . . .	82

## CHAPTER XI

Andrew Melville—Abolition of Episcopacy—“Second Book of Disci- pline”—Scotch Presbyterianism <i>v.</i> Stewart Episcopalianism— Assembly’s Petition to the King—Romanist Hopes—James’ Wish to Restore Episcopalianism—His Success—Rising against James— Recovery of Presbyterianism—“Magna Charta of the Church of Scotland,” 1592 . . . . .	100
---	-----

## THE RULE OF PRESBYTERS

### CHAPTER XII

Presbyterian Difficulties—Persecution of Romanists—Melville and James—Desire of James to Restore Episcopalianism—The “Gowrie Conspiracy”—James in the “Promised Land” . . . . .	113
---	-----

### CHAPTER XIII

James’ Interference with the Assembly—A “Bishop’s Parliament”— Andrew Melville in James’ Power—Further Interference with the Assembly—“Court of High Commission”—The Assembly Episco- palian, and the Episcopate Anglicised—The Romanists in Scotland —James in Edinburgh—“The Perth Articles” . . . . .	123 .
--	-------

### CHAPTER XIV

A Rehoboam for a “Solomon”—Charles I. and Church Property—His Visit to Scotland—“The Book of Canons”—The Stool Throwing in St. Giles—Rioting . . . . .	135
--	-----

### CHAPTER XV

“The Tables”—“The Covenant”—Charles’ Duplicity—Assembly of 1638—The Shadow of the Sword—The Covenanters and their Triumph—“A Contented King” . . . . .	144
--	-----

## CHAPTER XVI

	PAGE
The Assembly and the English Puritans—New Presbyter and Old Priest—Theological Work of the Assembly—The Assembly and the “Engagers”—The Covenanters and the Younger Charles—Act against Patronage . . . . .	153

## CHAPTER XVII

Charles II. a Covenanter—Cromwell in Scotland—“Protesters” and “Resolutioners”—Dismission of the Assembly by Colonel Cotterel—Episcopalians and Romanists—Charles II. King—“The Recissory Act”—Appointment of Prelates—Leighton . . . . .	160
---	-----

## CHAPTER XVIII

Restoration of Episcopacy, and of the Court of High Commission—Persecution of the Covenanters—King and Pope in One—Murder of Archbishop Sharp—Rising of the Covenanters—The Cameronians—Test Act—Cruel Persecution . . . . .	169
--	-----

## CHAPTER XIX

James II.—Rising of Argyll—A Romish Head of the Church—William of Orange—His Favour to the Presbyterians—Abolition of State Church Episcopalianism—Patronage—Assembly meets again in 1690—Friction with William—“Oath of Assurance”—Episcopal Ministers in the Establishment—Martyrdom of Aikenhead—Education—Barrier Act . . . . .	179
---	-----

## CHAPTER XX

Queen Anne—Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge—Case of Greenshields—Act of Toleration—Act restoring Patronage 1712 . . . . .	190
---	-----

## CHAPTER XXI

Rising Under the Pretender—Heresy Cases : Professor Simson : “Marrow Controversy”—John Glass—Lowered Tone of the Church—Growth of the Patronage Trouble—“The Moderate Party”—Ebenezer Erskine—First Secession, 1733—Deposition of the Associate Synod—George Whitfield in Scotland . . . . .	198
--	-----

# CONTENTS

ix

## CHAPTER XXII

	PAGE
Rebellion of 1745—Division among the Seceders—Augmentation Scheme—Popular and Moderate Parties—Patronage Troubles—Deposition of Thomas Gillespie—Dr. Robertson . . . . .	211

## CHAPTER XXIII

“Presbytery of Relief”—More Patronage Difficulties—Growth of Dissent—Supremacy of the Moderate Party—Romanist Relief—Principal Hill, Leader of the Moderates—“Chapel of Ease” Question—Foreign Mission Debate—Relief of Episcopalians and Romanists . . . . .	220
---	-----

## CHAPTER XXIV

Nineteenth Century—Leslie Dispute—Pluralist Controversy—Strengthening of the Evangelical Party—Rapid Development of the Patronage Controversy—Preparation for “The Ten Years’ Conflict” . . . . .	231
---	-----

## CHAPTER XXV

Scotch and English Establishments and Patronage—The Veto Act—The Chapels of Ease Act—Beginning of the Auchterarder Case—Decision of the Court of Session in 1838 . . . . .	237
--	-----

## CHAPTER XXVI

Assembly of 1838—The Lethendy and Marnoch Cases—Auchterarder Case before the Court of Final Appeal—Action of the Assembly—Assembly’s Committee in negotiation with the Government—Refusal of Government Help—Development of the Marnoch Case . . . . .	247
--	-----

## CHAPTER XXVII

Earl of Aberdeen’s Proposals—Uselessness of his Bill—Assembly against it—Strathbogie Presbytery Troubles—Antagonistic Associations formed by the Moderates and Evangelicals—Interference of the Court of Session with the Spiritual Province of the Church—Intrusion of Mr. Edwards at Marnoch . . . . .	258
--	-----

## CHAPTER XXVIII

Duke of Argyll’s Bill of 1841—Deposition of Seven Ministers at Strathbogie—Resolve of the Evangelicals to Appeal to the Country—Culsalmond Case—Decision of the Court of Session against the Assembly . . . . .	270
---	-----

## CONTENTS

## CHAPTER XXIX

	PAGE
Change of Government in 1841—Negotiations by Sir G. Sinclair—Refusal of Legislation by the Government—Assembly of 1842—Cases of Discipline—"The Claim of Rights"—Resolution against Patronage—Second Auchterarder Case—Convention of 1842 . . . . .	279

## CHAPTER XXX

Events in January, 1843—The Stewarton Case—Mr. Fox Maule's Motion—Lord Campbell's Resolutions—Anticipations of Secession—Final Decision of the Court of Session in the Strathbogie and Auchterarder Cases—The Sustentation Fund . . . . .	288
---	-----

## CHAPTER XXXI

Prospect of Disruption—Real Nature of the Controversy—May 18, 1843—The Disruption . . . . .	295
---	-----

## PROGRESS AND FINANCE

Introductory . . . . .	315
The Support of the Ministry—The Sustentation Fund . . . . .	319
Church and Manse Building Fund . . . . .	345
Congregational Funds . . . . .	348
Education—Public Schools . . . . .	351
Colleges—The Training of the Ministry . . . . .	353
Home Missions and Missionary Work in the Highlands . . . . .	356
Foreign and other Missions . . . . .	358
Summary . . . . .	367
INDEX . . . . .	377
Abstract of Sums contributed yearly to the various Funds and Schemes of the Church 1843-1892. Appendix I. . . . .	<i>At end</i>
Diagram in Colours to illustrate the above Abstract Statement. Appendix II. . . . .	<i>At end</i>



# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

## FULL-PAGE PLATES

- DR. CHALMERS . . . . . Frontispiece  
Etching by D. Murray Smith, after a calotype taken in 1843-44, by the late D. O. Hill, R.S.A., of Edinburgh.
- I. IONA CATHEDRAL, FROM THE SOUTH-WEST *To face page 42*  
After a photograph by Wilson.
- II. AN ORDINATION OF ELDERS IN A SCOTTISH KIRK . . . . . 240  
Photogravure by the Swan Electric Engraving Company, of the picture by John H. Lorimer, A.R.S.A. *Copyright with Messrs. Aitken, Dott & Son, Edinburgh.*
- III. THE REEL OF BOGIE!! A CLERICAL DANCE . . . . . 255  
After a copy of the original issue of the lithograph, from a drawing by Benjamin William Crombie of Edinburgh.
- IV. THE DISRUPTION!!! MAY, 1843. . . . . 302  
After a copy of the original issue of the lithograph, from a drawing by Crombie.
- V. ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENT NEAR AUCHNACROISH, ISLAND OF MULL . . . . . 311  
After the lithograph from a drawing by James Drummond, R.S.A.

	PAGE
VI. FREE CHURCH, DALIBRO, SOUTH UIST, 1851. . . . .	336
After the lithograph from a drawing by D. H. Robertson, F.S.A.	
VII. FREE ST. ANDREW'S, EDINBURGH, 1893 . . . . .	346
After a photograph.	

## ILLUSTRATIONS IN THE TEXT

FIG. 1. THE CATSTONE, KIRKLISTON . . . . .	4
„ 2. INSCRIBED STONE AT WHITHORN. . . . .	11
„ 3. EXTERIOR VIEW OF THE CELL AT INCHCOLM . . . . .	14
„ 4. INTERIOR VIEW „ „ „ . . . . .	20
„ 5. GROUND PLAN „ „ „ . . . . .	25

Figs. 1-5 reproduced from illustrations in Dr. Anderson's *Scotland in early Christian Times*, by permission of the Society of Antiquaries in Scotland.

The Frontispiece printed by Mr. F. Goulding, London.

Plates III., IV., V. and VI. from blocks supplied by Messrs. J. C. Drummond & Co., London.

Plates I. and VII. and Figs. 1-5, from blocks supplied by Messrs. Walker & Boutall, London.

## PREFACE

IN this book I have attempted to tell the story of the Church of Scotland briefly and quietly, down to and including that great act of conscientiousness and sacrifice in 1843 that made eminent Scotchmen "proud of their country," and added fresh nobility to the Christian world, by the new impulse it gave to allegiance to Jesus Christ. By the older generation of Scotchmen a good deal contained in this book may be thought an oft-told tale, but it is hoped that a rehearsal of the facts may be welcome to them as reviving in their memory events in which many of them had some part.

Few in any nation are well acquainted with the best parts of their country's story ; and young Scotchmen especially might at this time be reminded of the great act of their fathers, in which was shown to the world and the Church an almost peerless devotion to Christ and conscience. To religious Englishmen even the history of the Church of Scotland is comparatively unknown. A few

names, such as Columba, Knox, Buchanan, Beaton, Sharp, Chalmers, stand forward as having been notable for something good or something bad. But it may be safely said that to the vast majority the long and honourable story of Scotland's Church is strange. Should this book receive a welcome, it may do something to remove what is almost a reproach.

In writing the book the difficulty has been to bring the necessary parts of the history within the compass of the volume. All through the work suffers from compression ; but the main line is clear. Almost at every point there is the possibility of controversy—strong feeling has run high at every turn of the history. Nothing, however, has here been written to the demerit of any party or man that friends could have denied. Nothing has been credited that enemies could, with warrant, have rejected.

By the great event of the Disruption of 1843 feeling was begotten in those who left and in those who stayed in the Establishment that still has power. In 1874, by the abolition of secular patronage in the State Church of Scotland, the legislature did, too late, that which, if it had been done at the right time, would have been one of the greatest benefits the Scotch Church had ever received. But the Disruption of 1843 made the legislation of 1874 possible. The increased freedom of the State Church was bought by the self-enfranchisement of the men of the Free Church, who carried on the direct line of the Church of

Scotland. Church continuity is not determined by buildings and endowments, but by spiritual life.

I desire particularly to call attention to Mr. McCandlish's valuable contribution in the latter part of the volume, in which he continues the story of the Free Church from the Disruption up to the present day, especially in its financial aspects.

As one who since 1843 has had some connection with the Free Church's most devoted life, and is at the present time the Chairman of its Finance Committee, Mr. McCandlish is able to write in a way that gives exceptional importance to the portion of the volume for which he is responsible.

Thanks are due to Mr. Lorimer, A.R.S.A., Messrs. Aitken, Dott & Son, and Mr. Emerson Bainbridge, for their courtesy in permitting the reproduction of Mr. Lorimer's copyright picture, "Ordination of Elders in a Scottish Kirk."

Mr. Campbell Douglas, one of the Vice-Presidents of the Royal Institute of British Architects, very kindly supplied the photograph, reproduced at page 346, of Free St. Andrew's Church, Edinburgh, of which he was the Architect.

To Mr. Andrew Elliot the book is indebted for the hitherto unpublished calotype by the late D. O. Hill, R.S.A., from which the etched portrait of Dr. Chalmers was prepared; and to Mr. R. Cameron for identification

of the figures in the Disruption caricatures reproduced at pages 266 and 302.

I have also to acknowledge the assistance I received from the large collection of books, documents, and pamphlets put at my service by Mr. Constable; without which the book could not have been written in time for the Jubilee of 1843.

G. BUCHANAN RYLEY.

THE RULE OF THE MONASTERY

## CHAPTER I

Ninian and Whithern, 360-432?—Palladius sent, 431—Kentigern or Mungo and Strathclyde, 515-603?

WHAT Gibbon calls "the dark and troubled paths of Caledonian antiquity" are alluring because of their very obscurity. This, which is true enough of the secular story of Scotland, is at least as accurate of the ecclesiastical history. There are few, but quite enough hints in the literature, and suggestions in the monumental relics of the land, to stimulate interest, and even to tempt the imagination beyond the bounds that are lined out by the reliable evidence. Thus, it is easy to give too much meaning and value to Tertullian's boast at the end of the second century, when he wrote that places in Britain that were untrudged by the Romans bore the domination of Christ.\* So, too, it is possible to think, the wish being father to the thought, that Caledonia had received the truth of Christ far beyond Hadrian's Wall; though the legionaries were glad to keep within its shelter. But even the most sceptical mind could find no improbability in the supposition that, during the Roman lordship in South Britain, prisoners who had

\* Ad. Jud., c. vii.



been taken by the northern barbarians, or unknown Chris-



FIG. 1.—THE CATSTONE, KIRKLISTON.

tian missionaries, may have planted the cross where the

Roman standard never stood. In like manner, the few stone remains in Scotland that have Latin inscriptions on them, such as the very remarkable "Catstone" near Edinburgh (*see* fig 1); the slab in Yarrow Kirk, Selkirkshire; the cross-inscribed monument at Whithorn; and the pair of slabs, also cross-inscribed, at Kirkmadrine, might easily, and without much reproach, be credited with too great a value as evidence of the progress of Christianity in Scotland during the Roman occupation of South Britain. As it is, these fragments are the lonely witnesses to the presence of a Latin Christianity, that seems to have been utterly removed when the legions left Britain.\* But, whatever degree of organized Christianity there may have been in North Britain in that early age, its status seems not to have been great, nor its area very extensive. For of the three British bishops who sat in the Council of Arles in 319, none was Scotch. The churches of York, London, and Caerleon were represented: and only they from Britain.

The first name that can be warrantably used in connection with the history of the Church in Scotland is that of Ninian, to whom, as to a saint, no fewer than sixty-three churches are said to have been dedicated. But even here a wary tread is needed. The sources of information are limited to two—the Venerable Bede and Ailred of Rievaulx. Bede lived 300 and Ailred 700 years after Ninian. The propensity to exaggeration, if not to fiction, in ecclesiastical, and especially in monastic story, has ever been too great to make the legends that cover such inter-

\* *Vide* Anderson, "Scotland in Early Christian Times." Second Series.

vals reliable. Whatever credit is given to Bede's account of Ninian, Ailred's life of the saint may be safely enough regarded as a book that was written, at the request of the monks of Rievaulx, for edification in things desirable, rather than for instruction in well-founded history. And this will not diminish the real honour that is due to the apostolic life and labours of Ninian. As a well-born youth, Ninian left his home on the Solway to go to Rome, where he was, in all likelihood, in 370. There he stayed some years. When he left Rome it was as a Bishop commissioned to carry the Gospel to the West of Britain. On his way home he visited Martin, the monastic Bishop of Tours, and carried from him the determination to build a stone church after the Latin, and unlike the British, custom; together with the more important impulse to found a monastic bishopric, like that of Tours. He settled near his early home. Where now in Wigtonshire the town of Whithorn stands, or if not there, then on the coast in what is called the Isle of Whithorn, is, in all probability, the place at which Ninian made his settlement and built what was called Candida Casa—the Whithern, or White House, that has ever since been linked with his name. Ninian's part in the Church history of Scotland was notable enough to make him worthy of being ranked with the great ecclesiastics who were his contemporaries—with Basil, Gregory, Chrysostom; with Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine; and with Martin of Tours. At Whithern Ninian founded a great monastic school, the brothers of which could carry on, and were willing to perpetuate and extend their master's missionary spirit and work. His own

enthusiastic work was chiefly honoured in the conversion of the southern Picts, who then lived in the district between the Grampians and the Firth of Forth. But a perhaps larger work was his introduction to Scotland of that monastic system of worship, work, and brotherhood, which, from the first and for a long time, was the most potent influence in the evangelization of Scotland, and of other lands that owe their religious light to the spirit of the Celtic church. Among sacred Scotch names and places none can be put in a more worthy, tender, and reverend regard than that of Ninian, the first-known apostle of Scotland, and that of the Church and monastery of Whithern, whence the light he brought streamed so far and so long. For the institutions of Candida Casa lasted through many years, with varying fortune that ebbed and flowed with the tide of the nation's life. But the ebb was always a loss, and the flow was equally a blessing to the land. Ninian died about 432.

Near to the time of Ninian's death, Pope Celestine I. had sent Palladius to the "Scots, who believed in Christ, as their first bishop." It is now one of the quite accredited things of history, that for many centuries "Scots" always means the tribes of Erin. Palladius failed in his mission, and he left Ireland to make way for the man whose name is inseparably linked with Irish Christianity—viz., Patrick. But Palladius' work in Caledonia was more fruitful than in Ireland; and to him, with other devoted men such as Serf and Ternan, whose names are most honourable though obscured by many legends, is to be ascribed the honour both of continuing and strengthening Ninian's work, and also of carrying the Gospel farther afield. The story that

Nectan, King of the Southern Picts, late in the fifth century, founded the church of Abernethy in honour of God and Bridget the Irish saint, shows at least that it was believed in later times, that the work of spreading the truth was steadily going on, and that the links between the Irish and Caledonian churches were close and strong. This connection, which proved so great a blessing to Scotland in the following generations, must have been largely due to the position of Ninian's monastery and school, and the good work that was ever going on at Whithern. The quiet seclusion of the place and its nearness to Ireland, were invaluable in the troubled days that followed the departure of the Romans.

The disorganization that was consequent on the withdrawal of the strong hand of Rome, seems to have brought back barbarism to places that had received Christian truth. And while this was worst along the eastern coast, the district of Strathclyde on the west felt the ill-effects of the invasion of the barbarous Angles, who every year made their footing firmer and heavier in the land. To read the history of Kentigern, whose name comes next to Ninian and Palladius in the evangelizing of Scotland, is like reading of work done in a pagan country. He, like his predecessors, founded a monastery as his home in the place that he made the headquarters of his mission: and Glasgow still stands as the memorial of the great work that Kentigern or Mungo, as he was also called, did in the kingdom of Cumbria and the large territory of Strathclyde. Though he was banished at one time by the king of Cumbria, he returned from his exile in Wales, where he

left his chief disciple Asaph to rule the monastery he had founded there, (of which the diocese of St. Asaph is still the memorial), only to take up again his great work in Glasgow. He died early in the seventh century: leaving in his monastery town on the Clyde a centre of work that was much needed among the Britons of Strathclyde. The cathedral of Glasgow was built over his tomb; and its monastic bishops counted it among their chief honours to have Kentigern as their first bishop; and as their great privilege to multiply the monastic families, that then were the best agents for the work of the Church in Cumbria, and in what was gradually becoming Scotland.

## CHAPTER II

Migration of the Scots from Dalriada—Columba, 563 ; and Irish Monasticism—Iona—Peculiarities of the Celtic Church.

TOWARD the beginning of the sixth century a migration from Ireland began that was to change the history of Caledonia and to give it the name of Scotland. The Scots of Dalriada in the north of Ireland took possession of what is now the district of Argyll and the Isles, and gave it the name of their fatherland. There were in consequence two Dalriadas, one Irish, the other Caledonian, each held by the same race of Scots. Ireland was the true Scotia : and it was not until the Dalriads migrated that the transference of the name became possible. Fergus, son of Erc, with two of his brothers, led an expedition of Dalriads to Britain, and founded a Scottish monarchy in the Western Isles. They were Christians, of the type of their time and country : and are said to have left Ireland with the blessing of Patrick. Their new kingdom had on the north the barbarous and heathen Picts ; on the east the relapsed southern Picts ; and on the south the almost pagan Britons of Strathclyde. Their alliances, especially at the first, were naturally with the

Picts ; though their closest relations were still with their kinsfolk across the narrow sea. It was this that led to the coming of Columba to Britain ; with whom the real and credible history of Scotland and its Church becomes more possible. From Columba also the rule of the monastery family over Scottish Christianity took its most definite form, and left its most legible mark on the religion of North Britain for many generations.

Just as Ninian brought from Gaul the monastic customs that Martin of Tours had made honourable and sacred, and by them had made Whithorn a hallowed place (*see fig. 2*), so Columba brought from Ireland the peculiar monasticism of Erin, and gave it the position and influence it had for so long. For Irish monastery life *was* peculiar. It seems to have always had a tribal and territorial character. Thus, a chief who adopted or favoured Christianity might grant land to the preachers who came among his tribe ; and, after the fashion of his country, would surround their huts and lowly church with a defensive rath or cashel. This wall enclosure was still made



FIG. 2.—INSCRIBED STONE AT WHITHORN.



when it was no longer needed for defence ; and it served to secure the privacy for worship that the brotherhood desired. There they lived in their hive-shaped huts, forming a community within the tribal union. But at the same time, by the grant of land and protection, it often came about that the headship, the abbacy of the brotherhood, was held as the right of the chief's family. " It is remarkable that, for more than two centuries from the foundation of Iona, almost all its abbots were descended from Conall Gulbanus, thus connected more or less by relationship with Columba and belonging to the line of the northern Nialls."\* The custom, thus illustrated, led in later times to the anomaly of secular abbacies in many parts of Scotland, and to difficulties concerning the property and revenues of various monasteries. Structural remains of the cashels that marked the grants of land by the chiefs and kings are known in Ireland ; and the monastic remains on many sites in Scotland are found to be of precisely the same type. This is not remarkable when the Irish origin of the Columban mission is remembered. Columba brought with him both the religious and secular marks of Irish monasticism. He came to the Western Isles in A.D. 563, when he was about forty years old. He had founded monasteries in Ireland before he journeyed to North Britain : and there are curious legends and stories as to the immediate cause of his leaving Ireland. They may be left for the entertainment of the curious, though they cast light on the con-

\* Lanigan : quoted by Grub, Vol. I., p. 115.

dition of Ireland and the churches of that time. Columba, who was kin to the royal family of Ireland, sailed for the kingdom of Dalriada in Caledonia, the prince of which was his kinsman. This king of the Scots,—Conal,—made over to Columba and his twelve companions the island of Iona, or, as it is also called, Hy, *i.e.*, the island; or Icolmkill, *i.e.*, the isle of Columba of the churches. There Columba founded a monastery of the Irish form; with lowly, unpretentious buildings of wood and earth. “The glory of those buildings was within.” “It is by no means improbable that the severe simplicity, as well as the uniformity of plan and size, which usually characterize our early churches was less the result of the poverty or ignorance of their founders than of choice, originating in the spirit of their faith, or a veneration for some model given them by their first teachers, for that the earliest Christian churches on the continent before the time of Constantine were like these, small and unadorned, there is no reason to doubt.”

“These buildings (in Ireland) themselves of the most venerable antiquity, the earliest existing temples in Northern Europe, are representatives of others more venerable still. They derived not their origin from the gorgeous basilicas of Constantine and Theodosius, but in them we behold the direct offspring of the lowly temples of the days of persecution, the humble shrines where Cyprian bent in worship, and which Valerian and Diocletian swept from off the earth.”\* There was no mere self-centred asceticism, or selfish concentration on deliverance from the terrors of the

\* Note in Anderson, First Series, p. 128, quoting Petrie and Freeman.

unseen, practised in those lowly buildings (*see* figs. 3, 4, and 5); but a great school was formed, in which devoted men were trained for a work of missionary enterprise, that has made Iona one of the most hallowed places on the earth. For a while Columba worked among his Scottish countrymen who were already Christians,—of a sort. It may also



FIG. 3.—EXTERIOR VIEW OF CELL AT INCHCOLM.

be safely believed that the literary work of transcribing sacred manuscripts, for which the Iona brotherhood became noted, was begun as early as possible. For Columba was himself a famous scribe and very fond of beautiful writings, as the strange story of the *Cathach* or *Battler* (a manuscript Psalter of Columba that was borne in battle so late as 1497) very clearly shows.

The true work of Columba's life was the conversion of the Northern Picts. To this service Columba and his monks gave themselves with peculiar earnestness : and notwithstanding the weary difficulties that such a wild land and barbarous people must have shown, they brought the Picts of the north to the knowledge of the truth. Monasteries rose after the model of Iona wherever the preachers went : and when Columba died in 597, he was revered as the head of the Scottish and Pictish churches, and also of many Christian communities in Ireland. Though he was only a priest, yet his sacred rule was over bishops and presbyters alike. This beginning of the peculiar relation of the Iona communities to the episcopal order as then known is very notable : and ought to be remembered in judging the relation of the early Scots church to other bishoprics and ecclesiastical dominations.

In many ways the Celtic church was very distinctively marked. Its individuality is even singular ; and makes it vain for any extreme modern partisan to claim for his church identity with ancient Celtic Christianity. There is certainly no sign of obedience to the distant Roman bishopric, as there was in Italy, Spain and Gaul : but rather the contrary. And there is an even greater difference between the Celtic church and the churches of the time in many continental countries : for when those nations were almost unchristianized, and the southern part of Britain was nearly paganized by the Saxon irruptions, the Celtic church in Ireland and West Caledonia seemed to become a fresh fount of missionary zeal and Christian influence for Europe. To this day the Swiss canton of St. Gall, and the tradi-

tions and relics of other places, show how far the freer and fuller life of the Celtic churches had advanced in the almost lost battle with heathenry. Italy, Germany, France, England, Ireland, all give witness to vigorous energy of the Christian Celts. The convent of Erfurt, from which Luther came, is said to have been a foundation of the Irish Celtic missionaries : and the last of their monasteries that survived.

Even the outer forms of its art, &c., show an equally singular individuality in the Celtic church. Its church buildings, bells, croziers, and the wonderful decoration of the sacred manuscripts, are distinct in shape and spirit from all others of the time. The form of the Celtic cross is different from all others, in the curved intersection of the arms with the shaft and summit, and the surface decoration. The Celtic tonsure was different from the custom of all the rest of Christendom. The observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath, and the time of keeping Easter were equally apart from the ways of other churches. The touch of other churches quickly brought changes that were not always for the better. The exquisite tooling of the carved work of the crosses, and the purity of the handwork in the manuscripts, are true to their own spirit, till the alien influence of later times and other communities began to act on the religious life of the brotherhoods. No carving of the crucifixion appears till these later times came and the touch of the Roman church domination was felt. The Celtic cross and slab carvers left the cutting of the crucifixion to less reverent hands. Among 250 Celtic carvings of the Irish church there is no crucifixion found ; but only

the cross in native form. And Celtic art in Scotland is almost entirely Christian. The pagan Celts of Scotland had nothing worth calling memorial art, or, if they had, its remains have yet to be found.

In agreement with the distinctive life thus expressed, there were other marks that are of great interest as showing the spirit of the Celtic or Columban church. On the evidence of "The Book of Deer," it seems certain that, late in the history of the church, centuries after Columba, "the ecclesiastical institutions were still so far conformed to their original model that territorial jurisdiction, monastic orders (*i.e.*, in the European sense), and the hierarchy of ecclesiastical degrees, were still unknown among them; and dedications to the Apostle Peter were a recent innovation."\* Not till King David's time was the church of Deer dedicated to St. Peter. Their saints were not so much martyrs as founders of churches and great teachers, whose spirit and work the communities tried to carry on, even though sometimes it led to the "red death" of martyrdom. The position of the Columban brotherhoods and churches in relation to the episcopal office was very peculiar. Of bishops, as distinct in order from presbyters, it is certain they had many. Of nine pilgrim Scots mentioned in a charter of 810 at a monastery near Strasbourg, eight are bishops.† But no ruling power was conceded to the episcopal office. The diocesan arrangement with authority resident in the bishop, as now understood, never seems to have been known. For the communion office, and for ordinations and con-

\* Anderson, First Series, p. 138.

† Ibid., pp. 163-4.

secrations, bishops were always recognized. But even for such purposes the office seems to have been so carelessly administered as that, in 816, the English bishops south of the Humber met in council, under the Archbishop of Canterbury, and interdicted any Scot from ministering in the Church, because of the uncertainty of their ordination, and the absence of metropolitan control among the Scots' churches.\*

There can be little, if any, doubt that the abbot of Iona was regarded as primate and head of all the Scots and Picts' churches, without any reference to the Roman jurisdiction. Of parishes and dioceses there were none. The monasteries, affiliated to Iona, were the sources and distributors of the life and light that went out so marvellously. And if any one should be troubled by what may seem to them to be such grievous irregularity, the evidence of Christ's work done in western, and even southern Europe, may be confidently set over against any criticism of the Columbian and other Celtic churches, and any approval of others with whom, and with whose church customs, they and their forms may be contrasted. In the main, however, the Columbian doctrines and church practices were such as obtained position in all western Europe; with a character of freedom in worship and work and custom, of which there is scarcely a trace in any other church of the time. The letter of Lawrence of Canterbury, the successor of Augustine, to the bishops and abbots, is very significant concerning this†.

\* Grub, Vol. I., p. 127, &c.

† Bellesheim, "History of the Catholic Church in Scotland," Vol. I., p. 111.

### CHAPTER III

First recorded Scots' Synod—Scots' church in England—Aidan and Lindisfarne, 635—Paschal and tonsure controversy, 664—Wilfrid, Chad and others—Claims of the See of York—Successors of Columba—Adamnan—Revival of Candida Casa, 730—Inroads of the Danes—Unification of Scotland under Kenneth Macalpine, 843—Transfer of the Primacy from Iona to Dunkeld, 849—Transfer of the Primacy to St. Andrews, 900.

THE year of Columba's death saw the landing of Augustine, the Roman missionary, in Kent. Thence flowed northerly the vigorous stream of revived Papal mission work, to meet the more cultivated and earnest flow of the Scots missionaries' work. During the two or three centuries of the supremacy of Iona over the Scots' church after Columba's death, no matter who was abbot, the one great evangelistic work went on: if not with the same intensity, yet with great earnestness. When the kingdom of Northumbria, that had been brought to Christianity by the Roman missionaries, was settled under Oswald in 634 by his victory over Cadwalla, the heathen king, it was without a bishop. Paulinus, Archbishop of York, had fled to Kent during the successful inroads of Cadwalla and Scuda. Oswald, who had been an exile among the Iona families,



turned to the Scots' church for a bishop, rather than to the English : and Iona sent a bishop, who, however, soon returned without having done any good. At the synod that heard his report of failure, Aidan, the Iona monk,



FIG. 4.— INTERIOR VIEW OF CELL AT INCHCOLM.

suggested that if he had been more gentle with his rough hearers, the bishop might have had a better result. Thereupon the Iona synod commissioned Aidan as a bishop, and he immediately went to Northumbria. This is the first recorded meeting of the synod of the

Scots' church ; and the work done was worthy such a distinction.

On his arrival in Northumbria, in 635, Aidan chose the island of Lindisfarne for his see. Perhaps this was in remembrance of Iona. There he made a second Iona,

cultivating the same virtues and doing the same work as Columba. To him, as Bishop of Lindisfarne, the foundation of the noble Abbey of Melrose, then in the territory of Northumbria, is due; and from him also came the first female monastery in Northumbria at Hartlepool. He died in 651, after a life and work that were worthy the name of Iona. To succeed him at Lindisfarne, Iona sent out Bishop Finan, whose name will ever be linked with the Abbey of Whitby, that he instituted under the Abbess Hilda. Ceadda, or Chad, the first Bishop of Lichfield, was Finan's disciple and of Scottish church sympathies. After Finan's death, in 660 or 661, Iona sent Colman, another of its brothers, to be Bishop of Lindisfarne. In his short episcopate it was that the paschal and tonsure controversy with the agents of the Roman church, which had not lacked heat on the Roman side, was ended, so far as Northumbria was concerned. The king, Oswy, favoured the Celtic church observance, and the queen the Roman. So that sometimes the queen would be still observing Lent, while the king was rejoicing in the Easter festival. A council was agreed upon to settle the difficulty, and it met in Whitby monastery, in 664. The result was the conversion of the king to the Roman view, and the decision of the synod went with the king's judgment. Thereupon Colman resigned the see, and returned to the loved Iona, accompanied by all the Scottish monks and about thirty of the English. This was the end of the Scots' church supremacy in England. From that time the Roman see was as good as established in South Britain. The change is significantly marked by the sending of Ceadda to

Kent, to be consecrated bishop, and by the consecration, in Gaul, of Wilfrid, the great champion of Rome at Whitby. The northern conquests of King Oswy gave Wilfrid the opportunity, of which he was not loth to take advantage, of working against the Columban church. Oswy's wars had given him power as far north as Dalriada and the district of the Southern Picts. This gave the see of York ecclesiastical power wherever Oswy's authority ran in those regions; and made possible claims of supremacy for the Archbishop of York over parts of Scotland, that lasted down to the Middle Ages. But Northumbrian political supremacy passed away in the great battle of Dunnichen, in 685, by the loss of which and the death of Egfrid, the English power over Strathclyde, Cumbria, and the Southern Picts was ended. But though the military and political lordship of the English in that territory was destroyed, the ecclesiastical pretensions of the bishopric of York were only in abeyance.

The successors of Columba in the primacy of the church in Scotland up to this time had been seven in number. The work of the brotherhood under them in Iona and on the mainland had been continued on the lines laid down by their great founder, and chiefly among the Northern Picts. But their influence, as will have been seen, ran farther afield in many directions. The most eminent of these first successors of Columba was Adamnan, whose tenure of the abbacy was from 679 to 704. He was of Columba's family, like so many of the abbots of Iona. The most complete life of Columba is from his hand. It shows the personal and official influence of this abbot, that when

Alfrid, king of Northumbria, who had been at Iona, held a number of Irish captives, Adamnan went to Northumbria and secured the liberation of sixty, whom he brought to Iona. Similarly in Ireland, at the synod of Birr in 697, he was the means of passing a much-needed law; by which women were exempted from going to battle. Another visit to Northumbria wrought his conversion to the Roman usages concerning Easter and the tonsure. On his return to Iona he earnestly tried to bring his monks to the same, but found it impossible. Rome was not in authority. The Irish Columbites were persuaded by him to the Roman customs. But it was not till some years after his death that Iona, under the influence of the monk Egbert, conformed. And even then, the other communities on the mainland kept up the usage of Columba, till in 717, Naiton, or Nectan, King of the Picts, cleared the country of all those who would not adopt the Latin customs. With this peculiarly Latin form of conversion the primacy of Iona began to decline in the kingdom of the Picts; and its decline was accelerated by the general progress of North British history.

The Strathclyde church, with its centre in Glasgow where Kentigern had worked, has left no history of this period. Yet some Christian tradition there must have been during all the troubled time of the centuries between Kentigern's life and the unifying of Scotland under Kenneth Macalpine. Some such tradition, and a positive endowment of the Cumbrian bishopric, were presumed when the see was revived about 1125. But nothing reliable can be told. Similarly there is no history

of the continuance in a regular form of the work, that Ninian had so well begun at Whithern. But in the early part of the eighth century, about 730, a new or revived bishopric was constituted at Candida Casa, with Pecthelm as the first bishop of the restored see. His successor was consecrated by the Archbishop of York. But the renewed bishopric seems to have ended its recorded history at the beginning of the ninth century. The history of the bishopric of Lindisfarne, the daughter of Iona, after Wilfrid the successor of Cuthbert, is similarly scanty, being little more than a list of names. Its story falls within the province of the Anglo-Saxon church. But all the churches and communities must have felt the terrible visitation of the Danes. Within a few years of each other Iona and Lindisfarne were ravaged by the heathen. Again in 825 the horror of a Danish inroad was felt in Iona—the abbot being martyred after his monks. To the last Abbot Blaithmac professed ignorance of the place where the shrine of Columba had been hidden, which the Danes wanted for its riches. The Abbot died declaring that he would not tell them, if he could. Abbot Indrecht, or Innrechtach, seems to have been the last of the Iona primates who ruled over the Scottish churches. He was killed by Saxons while on a journey to Rome. It was during his primacy that the Picts and Scots came together under one king—Kenneth Macalpine. Kenneth was acknowledged king of the Picts in 843 or 844: just as a few years before, in 829, Egbert had been accepted as king of what, at last, was England. What motive led to his action can be only supposed; but in 849 Kenneth trans-

ferred some of the relics of Columba to Dunkeld, shricing them in the church of St. Columba that he had built to receive them. With that transfer the second primacy of the church of the Scots began. Dunkeld came to be what Iona had been to the churches of Kenneth's kingdom. And this was without loss of union between the two communities. In evidence of which, it has been well noted, that when diocesan episcopacy was established in Scotland, the abbot of Iona acknowledged obedience, not to the neighbouring prelates of the Isles or Argyll, but to the bishop of Dunkeld.\*

The primacy at Dunkeld was still that of the monastery, with this difference—that while, at Iona, the head of the Columban fraternities could not be a bishop, but only a presbyter, at Dunkeld that limitation did not hold. From this point the primacy is associated with the episcopal office: though, as yet, diocesan episcopacy was unknown in Scotland. It is significant of the time and of the feeling of the King of the Scots to religion, that Kenneth, who transferred the primacy, burned the noble monastery of Melrose in one of his many forays into English




FIG. 5.—GROUND PLAN OF CELL AT INCHCOLM.

\* Grub, Vol. I., p. 131.

territory. South of the Forth was then English. He is also said to have brought from Iona the fateful stone on which ever after the kings of the Scots were crowned, and to have put it in his house at Scone. Thence it was taken to rest till now in Westminster Abbey. Though Iona had thus been degraded and despoiled, Kenneth and most of his successors were buried in its sacred soil. The sanctity of the place was too great to be really lessened by the transference of ecclesiastical power. (*See* Plate I., facing p. 42).

Over the next part of the history there is much obscurity. The successors of Kenneth were his brother Donald and his sons Constantine and Aodh. The second and last abbot-primate of Dunkeld died in 873. A "usurper,"—Grig,—seems to have been on the throne about the year 890: and his reign is chiefly notable for the first use of the expression, "Scottish Church." Grig is said to have "given liberty to the Scottish church, which had been under servitude up to that time, according to the custom of the Picts."\* What that may mean can be only conjectured. The Pictish kings held the church almost in vassalage: and it would be easy for another king to appear a liberator after them. Another Donald and Constantine now follow as kings of the Scots. In the time of Constantine there appears to have been another transfer of the primacy in 900 or 910: this time to St. Andrews. For, in the sixth year of his reign, Constantine with Kellach, the first recorded bishop of St. Andrews, held an assembly at "The Hill of Belief," as it was

\* Chronicle of the Picts and Scots.

thenceforward called, vowing "to protect the laws and discipline of the faith, and the rights of the churches and of the Gospel." From this time St. Andrews, a see, but not a diocese (unless the whole land can be so called), takes the place that Dunkeld and Iona had held previously. The primacy had moved from the west to the east. The over-rule also had passed from the monastery to the palace.



THE HISTORY OF THE  
CITY OF BOSTON  
FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT  
TO THE PRESENT TIME  
BY  
NATHANIEL BENTLEY  
VOLUME I  
1822

THE RULE OF THE PALACE



## CHAPTER IV

St. Andrews and Constantine—Consolidation of the Kingdom under Malcolm II.—Increase of Lay Holders of Church Property—Macbeth—Malcolm Canmore, 1057, and Margaret of England—Influence of Margaret—Alexander I. and Claims of the See of York—Growth of Feudalism under David I.—Third formation of Candida Casa—Passing away of the Celtic Church.

THE eminence of St. Andrews was due, in large measure, to its reputed possession of the relics of St. Peter's brother. But "the badly-assorted collection of legends," as it has been well called, that link the place with a St. Regulus of the fourth century, who, the legends say, was told to flee from Patrae in Achaia with the relics of St. Andrew, and who was blown, with the relics in his possession, to the east coast of Scotland, have even less than the usually small quantity of trustworthiness to be found in ecclesiastical traditions. When King Constantine transferred the primacy of the Scotch church to St. Andrews, there was in the city a community of "Culdees," or "worshippers of God," with their abbot. These were a kind of secular monk, a degenerate remnant of a purer devotion to God than prevailed at that time. When Constantine and his Danish allies were beaten in a great

battle by Athelstane, King of England, the heir to the Scotch throne being left among the slain, the King of Scotland entered the semi-monastic community of the Culdees in St. Andrews, of which he became the superior. There he died in 953. The tenth century has little in it of moment to the history of the church. Politically it was of greater importance. Cumberland came under the crown of Scotland in 945 by grant of Edmund, King of England. A little later Edinburgh was abandoned by the English, and still later the whole of the Lothian district came into the possession of the Scotch. The eleventh century opened with the people of North Britain more consolidated than ever they were before, under Malcolm II., in whose long reign of nearly thirty years the kingdom is first spoken of as Scotia. But one disastrous thing had been growing steadily during the tenth century, and that was the assumption of much of the property of religious communities by lay abbots and others, who left the religious duties attached to the possession of the revenues to be seen to by the priors and monks. Thus, the abbacy of Dunkeld had become a hereditary property in one family, one holder of which was slain in the battle that settled the rival claims of Duff, son of Malcolm, and Culen, son of Indulf, to the throne. Later on, in 1045, another—evidently lay—abbot of Dunkeld fell in battle, fighting against Macbeth. The lands of the abbey, however, remained with his descendants. While the church life of the century was going on quietly and without any story worth recording, it is almost curious to note that prominent, if not eminent, among the benefactors of the church was Macbeth,

whose name has had so misleading a glamour thrown round it by Shakespeare. Macbeth's munificence to the church, and especially his donations to the Culdees of Lochleven, are chronicled ; while, as the only Scottish king who ever visited Rome, his benefactions to the poor of Rome are told by a contemporary, with much admiration. The story of both St. Andrews and Iona at this time is little more than lists of bishops and abbots.

The middle of the eleventh century saw, both in England and Scotland, events that came to have much meaning for the Scotch church. Malcolm Canmore was crowned King of Scotland in 1057 ; and the Norman Conquest of England in 1066, by driving Edgar Atheling, with his mother Agatha and his sisters Margaret and Christina, to Scotland, brought about the marriage of Margaret with Malcolm. The foundation of a church in the place where their marriage was solemnized, betokened the new influence that had come to Scotland. From this time, the power of the palace—regal and episcopal—over the Scotch church rapidly developed : sometimes for good ; often with harm. Margaret's influence, as the friend and pupil of Lanfranc of Canterbury, and as a thorough adherent of the English system of diocesan bishoprics, was quickly set in the direction of reforming the Scotch church on the lines of the English. As a holy and intelligent woman, her life was an almost unqualified blessing to Scotland. There seems to have been no real opposition to the changes she made. The custom of the Lenten fast she brought into harmony with the rest of Western Christendom. Easter communion, which had been neglected because of superstitious reverence

for the service, (the Scots in this being like their descendants of the Presbyterian period, who communed only infrequently), was arranged in a similar way. The observance of Sunday as a rest-day, instead of Saturday, which was the custom of the ancient Celtic church, was also brought about. Margaret patronized and endowed the Culdees of Lochleven. She restored the Monastery of Iona that the Danes had destroyed; and made kindly arrangements for the entertainment of the pilgrims who were flocking to the resting-place of the legendary relics of St. Andrew. Her death and her husband's both left the Church of Scotland greatly Anglicized or Latinized, and the general life of Scotland largely affected by the Saxons and Normans, who had been driven over the border by the merciless rule of William the Conqueror. These emigrants and fugitives so modified the life of the Lowlands, as to bring the beginning of the differences that soon marked off the border Sassenach from the highland Celt. Malcolm and Margaret died in 1093, the same year seeing also the death of Fothad, Bishop of St. Andrews. During Malcolm's reign the northern and western isles were extensively Christianized. And though there was a conflict of episcopal authority between the Scandinavian and British bishops, a work that can be called religious was done along the rough seaboard of the north and west.

The great influence of Margaret on Scottish history is easily seen in the continuance of her policy by her husband's successors. A short, troubled time followed the death of Malcolm, in which his brother Donald, after the Celtic fashion, assumed the kingship: reigning, with a brief

interval, for three and a half years. Then Margaret's eldest son Edgar was king for nine years. In his reign the first sign of the forming of parishes is to be found in Scotland. He was followed by his brother Alexander I. in 1107. Alexander at once showed he was Margaret's son by his prompt interference in church matters. The see of St. Andrews had been vacant for some years. Alexander immediately nominated his mother's confessor—Turgot, prior of Durham. In this there was no hint of the appointment needing confirmation by the see of Rome. On this nomination the troublous claim of York to rule over the Scottish church was revived. The dispute was left a drawn battle: Turgot being consecrated by Thomas of York, with the reservation of the rights of both bishoprics. With Turgot began the line of English bishops of St. Andrews as primates of Scotland. His death in 1115 gave opportunity for the rule of the palace again. Without any loss of time Alexander worked against York, by appealing to the Archbishop of Canterbury for help: playing the one see against the other. In his letter he appears quite as much the political schemer as the church ruler. His statement that the Bishops of St. Andrews had always been consecrated by Canterbury or Rome was against history. Nothing came of his appeal and false statement for awhile. For five years there was no bishop of St. Andrews; and at last Alexander nominated Eadmer, a monk of Canterbury. But when the Archbishop of Canterbury wanted to consecrate Eadmer, the king roundly refused to allow a Scottish bishop to be subject to an English primacy. Eadmer at last left



Scotland, and was glad to be back in Canterbury, where he died in 1124. The king died in the same year; before his next nominee, the prior of Scone, was consecrated.

Under Alexander the system of diocesan episcopacy was largely developed. To him is ascribed the formation of the bishoprics of Dunkeld and Moray. By him also the monastic orders of Western Europe were brought into Scotland; where they quickly supplanted the older foundations. This likening of the Scotch church to the English and the continental was carried farther on by his brother David, who at that time was Earl of Cumbria. Thoroughly Anglo-Norman in his tastes and sympathies, David brought French monks to Selkirk in 1113; for whom he built a monastery, with a significant dedication to St. Mary and St. John. Two years later he revived the bishopric of Glasgow, over which he had a repetition of his brother's controversy with the Archbishop of York. This wrangle ended in an appeal to Rome: the result of which is not known. When David first came to the throne, he indulged his ecclesiastical preferences and desires in a way that has made him much admired by ecclesiastics; and is also said to have won for him the comment of James VI., that "he was a sore saint for the crown." But it may be questioned whether, in the troubled time that Scotland was passing through, and with feudalism spreading rapidly over the land, it was not on the whole good for the people that so much of the property of the crown should pass for helpful uses to those who, at the least, were more likely to hold it for the good of all, than were the semi-barbarous nobles,

who quickly and ruthlessly took to themselves the gains that feudalism made possible to such as they.

Feudalism, both in church and state, grew rapidly under the favour of David I. His wars do not seem to have interfered with his ecclesiastical likings. Even when he retired to Carlisle, after the disastrous battle of the Standard in 1138, he had piety or ecclesiasticism enough in him to hold a council of the bishops and clergy of Scotland, with a Papal legate. Most kings would have judged it better to have thought of the condition of his army, and the peril of the country before the victorious English. Perhaps he did both. Under the influence of David's Anglo-Norman preferences, the old Celtic life and customs everywhere faded. That there was need of change, if not of reform, in the Scotch church is certain. Much of the unction had gone from the Celtic monasteries and churches. And to the piety of David it seemed that the best way of restoring vitality and activity to the church, was the introduction of the new blood of the monastic orders, and the division of the country into bishoprics, with rural deaneries, and in two cases archdeaconries; by means of which, as through new channels, the energy of the fresh foreign life might flow. The sees of Ross, Aberdeen, Caithness, Dunblane, and Brechin were created by David, and were all administered on the English model. The Celtic ritual passed away, and almost everywhere the modified Roman form, known as "the use of Sarum," was followed. In place of the decayed Columban and Culdee communities the king formed monasteries, in which, with adequate support, the learning and religious earnestness of

the time found ample opportunity for cultivation and expression. His charter constituted the monastery of Deer. His foundation and endowment began the abbey of Holyrood. Convents for nuns at Berwick and elsewhere owed their origin to him. For his favourite Cistercians David had always a ready help. The military orders had several establishments in Scotland through David's patronage. When he died, in 1153, he left feudal diocesan episcopacy strongly rooted in the land, with all the supports and means of nourishment that elsewhere had been found useful to its maintenance and authority. The military and legal feudalism, that he is also responsible for introducing into Scotland, went along with the ecclesiastical; and, together, they wrought much of the lawlessness that, in after years, marked the Scotch nobles. One most interesting event of David's reign was the third formation of the see of Candida Casa, or Whithorn. It was revived, with submission to the Archbishop of York, and was the only Scotch diocese that acknowledged his jurisdiction. For, notwithstanding papal commands to submit to York, that were repeatedly given, the Scottish prelates, with the exception of him of Candida Casa, refused such obedience, asserting their independence as of old. The difficulty was got over in a characteristic way, so far as the authority of Rome was concerned, in 1185, when a bull of Clement III. declared the Scotch church to be immediately subject to the Roman see, "whose special daughter she was." In David's reign also the first council called by Roman Papal authority is said to have been held in Scotland, when Honorius II. convened the council of Roxburgh,

with John of Crema as Cardinal legate. They who owed so much to David I. have naturally praised him greatly : and he was worthy their praise. Yet no one can read the passing away of the old Celtic church and life without regret. But it had lived its day. It was not meeting the needs of the new day that had broken. No one can doubt that it was well for Scotland that the changes which so rapidly and thoroughly came, were wrought by a king who, for his time, was exceptionally pious ; and who, while giving a new form to the church life of Scotland, gave also opportunity for the coming of a spirit of devotion worthy of the ample embodiment he provided for it.

## CHAPTER V

William the Lion and the Liberties of the Scotch Church—Further weakening of the Community of Iona—Establishment of Annual Church Councils under Alexander II.—Coming of the Mendicant Orders—Alexander III., the last Celtic King—Building of Sweetheart Abbey, the last of the Scotch Abbeys.

THE story of the church in Scotland for the next century or two is of little more than the development and consolidation of the system that David I. had so vigorously begun. The different dioceses and districts were more and more feudalized: episcopal and monarchical feudalism then, as ever, helping each other. Contentions with the English for national and ecclesiastical independence continually recur, the open sore of the strife not being even temporarily closed, till Robert Bruce wrested from England and Rome, the acknowledgment of Scottish liberty in Church and State. Additions were made to the bishoprics and monastic foundations, till it seemed as if there were no need and no room for more. Then the great change that ended the real rule of the palace was not far away.

Malcolm, grandson and successor of David, reigned but a few years, during which many monastic foundations were made, either by him or the nobles. Paisley monastery is

of this reign. Malcolm's brother, William the Lion, succeeded him in 1165. The capture of William by the English in 1173 gave England an opportunity that Henry II. was not slow to seize. The Scots nobles and bishops compounded for the king's release by the pernicious treaty of Falaise, in consequence of which the king of Scotland did homage to Henry for his whole kingdom. The only reservation was of the liberties of the Scots' church, which were somewhat astutely and ambiguously protected by phrases that secured delay, if nothing else. The delay, useful as it was, lasted only two years—to the council of Northampton in 1176. There the English required the obedience stated in the treaty, to which the Scotch bishops answered that they never had been, and never ought to be, subject to the English church. The Archbishop of York revived his old claim to Glasgow and Galloway, to which Glasgow answered by claiming special affiliation to the see of Rome. In this answer they were also helped by the counterclaim of Canterbury to the oversight and overlordship of the Scotch church. The council ended with no decision. Nor did the legatine council of the bishops in Edinburgh, in 1177, bring about any result worth recording. In the year 1179 the Scotch church is found for the first time represented in a council in Rome—several of the bishops being present at the third Lateran Council.

The greatest religious foundation of William the Lion was the Benedictine Abbey at Arbroath, which he formed in 1178, in honour of "St. Thomas of Canterbury," who, had been murdered eight years before. Thomas à Becket

and William were old friends : and the quick recognition of the saintship of the churchman by the king is explained by that. While he was building the monastery, William entered into a controversy, for which the ghost of his murdered friend ought to have visited him. Not having been consulted by the chapter of St. Andrews in the election of John the Scot as bishop, William swore a big oath, and had another man consecrated bishop in John's place. Appeal was made to the Pope ; the issue of which and of William's stubbornness was, that in 1181 he was excommunicated and the kingdom put under interdict. The interdict was lifted by the next Pope : but the trouble ran on, with various complications, to the end of the century, when the second son of the Earl of Leicester was elected to the bishopric of St. Andrews. William was astute, as well as daring. An evidence of this is found in his getting from the Pope a declaration that the Scotch church was under the special protection of the See of Rome. This Clement III. granted in 1188 : and subsequently Innocent III. confirmed it in 1208, and Honorius III. in 1218. With equal intelligence and care William secured from Richard of England the revocation of the treaty of Falaise, by the payment of 10,000 marks and an alliance, when Richard was about to go on crusade. When William died in 1214, he left behind him the remembrance of one of the strongest, if one of the most intractable, kings that Scotland ever had. Nor did any of his successors give cause for modifying the judgment. Through him the Scotch church was strengthened and unified : and if, by the steady inflow of Anglo-



IONA CATHEDRAL FROM THE SOUTH-WEST





Normans, both Church and State were affected in every direction, it was in the main for good, and, possibly, for great good. The Church was also much enriched at this time by many bequests and endowments : and there can be little doubt that, if the slaves who were transferred with the land to the various monasteries and churches had been asked, they would have gladly witnessed to the bettering of their condition, by deliverance from the feudal baronage that soon began to make trouble for the Crown and country. One more bishopric was formed at the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century. That was the See of Argyll. The exact date of its foundation is unknown.

Once more Iona is noted in William the Lion's reign. It seems probable that the monks of Iona countenanced a rising of the Lord of Argyll : with the consequence, that when the opportunity came, they felt the heavy hand of William ; though the rising was in the time of King Malcolm. The Iona churches in Galloway were taken from the mother churches and given to the Abbey of Holyrood. The accounts of Iona in the Irish annals of this time are difficult to make clear : but the annals of 1203 show Iona to be still in the hands of the Celtic church of Ireland. By some, William is credited with the founding of a Cluniac Abbey in Iona : with which the Culdees may have amalgamated. After this Iona more and more becomes a memory : but such a memory as few places on earth beside itself can quicken and keep alive. There is a touch of special interest in the association of the name of its great founder Columba, with the charter

of William's newly-founded monastery of Aberbrothock. In that charter he endows the monks with lands, and with the "Brecbennoch, they making for it the service in the army, with the said Brecbennoch, which is due to me from the same lands." This Brecbennoch was, in all probability, a relic of Columba, which was carried into battle as a palladium: the custodian of it having special privileges. The hereditary keepers of this almost fetish are specified down to the year 1500.\* But this is a poor memorial with which to end the story of the great work of Columba. Carrying his relics into battle, as a North American Indian carries his medicine bag, is a poor memorial for Columba; even though it is possible that they were carried into the great fight of Bannockburn. It was in the abbey that he had thus endowed that William the Lion was buried in 1214.

William's son, Alexander II., was soon involved in ecclesiastical trouble. Siding with the English barons who rose against King John, he was excommunicated by the Pope, whose vassal John had become. Yet it was in this reign that one of the most important events in the history of the Scottish church took place. This was the establishment of annual councils, under what were called "conservators." The occasion of this was the non-existence of any metropolitan authority in Scotland, by which church councils for the realm could be summoned. The bishops were, therefore, authorized to hold synods, with temporary presidents, acting in virtue of the direct mandate of the

\* *Vide* Anderson, "Scotland in Early Christian Times." First Series, p. 241, &c.

Pope. From the year 1225, to the creation of archiepiscopal authority in Scotland, in 1472, the Scotch church was governed by its own synods. If nothing else, this arrangement enabled the churches to dispense with the questionable and costly visits of papal legates. The king was represented at all the synodal meetings. By this new custom the church in Scotland was certainly still more nationalized : and the power of legates, and the attractiveness of Scotland to them, greatly diminished. In addition to the monastic foundations of Alexander's reign, the introduction of the Mendicant Orders into Scotland marked his time : though it was not till 1329 that they had their own provincials in Scotland. Up to that time they were governed by English provincials. The favour of the King set a fashion for the mendicant orders, in providing for which the regular orders seem to have lost ground. Both Dominicans and Franciscans had many houses and endowments given them during the reigns of the two Alexanders.

Alexander III., the last king of the Celtic race in Scotland, succeeded his father in 1249, when he was only a boy of seven years old. He had, like his father, a healthy dislike to the visits of papal legates to Scotland, whose coming never made Scotland holier, and whose going always left it poorer. This Alexander it was who maliciously and jocularly stopped the English legate entering Scotland by picturing the ferocity of his subjects. And though the legate the year following summoned the Scotch prelates to his council in England, they were present only by a delegation, and the canons that were passed affecting

the Scotch church were simply ignored. In similar spirit Alexander and the Scotch clergy refused the contribution of the tenth of the benefices, that the Pope had ordered in aid of the crusade of Prince Edward of England. The reassessment of the value of benefices that the Pope ordered later on, with the same purpose of helping the crusades, wrought great friction with the whole of the Scotch church and government. All these things had their value in increasingly nationalizing the church and unifying the Scots nation. So that before long it was evident that the Anglo-Norman nobles, who were the chief of the State, were as Scotch in their antagonism to England, and to Roman church proposals and edicts that came with the English mark on them, as any Celt could be. One thing notable in this reign was the building of the last abbey that was founded in Scotland. The story itself is almost a romance. When John Baliol died, in 1269, his widow had his heart embalmed and put in an ivory coffer, before which every day she did reverence. She founded and was buried (with the coffer on her breast), in the abbey that thence was called *Dulci Corde*, or Sweetheart Abbey. This was the last of the Scotch abbeys. And, as if to foretell the coming of a new age, it was she who, also in honour of her husband and because of his wish, endowed what is now Balliol College, Oxford. In her last acts of piety and affection, the passing old life and the coming new life, illustrated by monastery and college, thus met.

When Alexander was killed by a fall from his horse, in 1286, a troublous time for Scotland began ; in which, for the most part, the Church of Scotland was not found wanting

in patriotism and energy. The little "Maid of Norway," granddaughter of Alexander, was heir to the crown. But she was a sickly child, whose minority could be only a temptation to rivalry and disorder among the nobles. Several of the chief of the nobility looked to be chosen king in place of the weakly girl. Robert Bruce had a large support. Edward I. of England, however, with papal sanction, proposed a marriage between his son and the Maid of Norway. But though it was agreed to by treaty of 1290, it came to nothing, for the poor child, round whom so much strife had gathered, died on her voyage to Scotland in the same year.

## CHAPTER VI

War of Scotch Independence—Patriotism of the Clergy—Bruce—Rise of the Stewarts, 1371—Beginning of the Reformation in Scotland—University of St. Andrews founded, 1414—Burning of Resby and Craw—University of Glasgow founded, 1450—St. Andrews made an Archbishopric, 1472—Glasgow made an Archbishopric, 1492.

THE war of Scottish independence that rapidly followed on the complications with Edward of England cannot here be told. It ended in 1328, with the full recognition of Scotch nationality and independence of government. Many of the prelates and ecclesiastics played a noble part in the strife. In truth, without their help and example in several crises, the Scotch side of the struggle would have been much darker than it was. It was in the thick of the struggle that such men as Lamberton Bishop of St. Andrews, Wishart Bishop of Glasgow, and David Bishop of Moray, so helped Bruce and stirred the nation that the clergy met in council, and declared that they had done Bruce homage as king. And this was with papal fulminations rolling against them from the English side, with which the interest of the Pope ran. The Bishop of Moray preached that it was more meritorious to fight for Bruce than to go on crusade against the Saracens. But good as

all this was, there can be little doubt that the terrible struggle relaxed the real religious life and moral fibre of the nation. It was coarser as a nation and less religious as a church than before, though church and nation were more welded together. Such hammer strokes as each had felt could only either rive or rivet. For good or ill they were more one than ever; and this was not without its influence in the movements of the new age that was now so near.

The son and successor of the Bruce was unworthy both his name and position. Vile and mean, the land must have been relieved when he died. His captivity in England wrought no good in him, but rather harm. He was one who would not learn even in the fool's dear school of experience. One notable thing, as affecting the church, happened in his reign, and that was the institution of the first collegiate church in Scotland, by the Earl of March, in 1342, at Dunbar. Dying childless, David II. gave place to his nephew, the son of Robert, the Steward of Scotland, with whom, in 1371, the Stewarts came into the royalty of Scotland by "the distaff side." His uneventful and certainly not hurtful reign was followed by that of his son, Robert III., a pure and gracious man, whose physical weakness was his greatest deficiency as a king, and was also the cause of unintended injury to Scotland. There is evidence of vitality during his reign, both in the church and in the estates of the realm, apart from the succession of dignitaries in the bishoprics and monasteries; for, by an act of the year 1401, it was provided that any one under sentence of excommunication might appeal, if aggrieved,



from the Ordinary to the Conservator, and from him to the Provincial Council. This was to last during the papal schism, and was wise and forethoughtful.

When Robert III. died in 1406 his son James was a prisoner in England, having been captured by an English cruiser when on his way to France, where his father thought he would be safer than in Scotland. James did not return to Scotland till 1424, he being then thirty-one years old. His public acts are the chief source of knowledge as to the condition of the country and church of Scotland at the time. In some things both realm and church were pitiful. The nobles were lawless, and in many instances mercenary and vile, even when judged by a standard in which Christianity has little place. The church had suffered in her estates and character from their greed and barbarism. So that it was an ill prospect that stretched out before the King on his return from captivity. During his minority and exile Highland fought against Lowland, and border warfare was seldom quiet. The clergy were sinking to the level of the nobles, and must often have been glad to keep by any means the estates of the church from the rapacity of the lords. The regent Albany seems to have sought the ends of his own ambition by means of both barons and ecclesiastics, yielding more or less to each. It was during his regency that the Church of Scotland was first stirred by the new thought and feeling of the religious reformers. The disturbed state of the country may have allowed Wickliffe's teaching to come across the border with little notice from the prelates. But in 1407 proceedings for heresy were taken against James Resby, an English priest

and a Wickliffite, the head and front of whose offending was,—that he had preached that the Pope was not the vicar of Christ, and that no one could be pope or vicar of Christ without personal holiness. Teaching such as this, with two papal courts claiming the allegiance of Western Christendom, one at Avignon and the other at Rome, touched ecclesiastics to the quick. If personal holiness had to do with ecclesiastical office it was a serious matter for most of them. Apparently in agreement with law, Resby was condemned and burnt. Certainly it was with the sympathy of the regent Albany, who is written of as a “hater of Lollards and heretics.” It must also have had the approval of the bishop of the diocese,—Wardlaw, of St. Andrews,—in whose cathedral city the next martyr suffered death. That Lollardy and so-called heresy were growing at the time is certain from this, that when the great event of the foundation of a university in Scotland, at St. Andrews, in 1414, had only two years’ history, a congregation of the university required an oath from all masters of arts, to defend the church against the Lollards and their abettors. In 1418, under the presidency of the regent, Scotland knit herself once more closely to the papacy, by accepting the decision of the Council of Constance, in the quarrel between the popes of Avignon and Rome. Scotland had sided with the “anti-pope.”

James I. returned from England in 1424 with his English wife, he being a strong, earnest, and fearless man: the ablest, and, maybe, the best of all the Stewarts that sat on the throne. He, too, set himself against religious reform. In his first parliament laws were passed against the

Lollards, others in favour of the restoration of church lands, and others for the purpose of curbing the power and breaking the lawlessness of the nobles. The king's sympathy made another martyr's death possible. In 1433 a Bohemian physician, Paul Craw, was burnt for heresy, at the suit of the same man who had instigated the murder of Resby,—the inquisitor, Lawrence of Lindores. At the same time James had an eye to the misdoings of the church and priesthood. He was eager in the matter of education. He tried to stop the prevalent simony by passing a law, that forbade any clerk to purchase a pension out of any benefice, secular or religious, thus cutting off a main stream of papal wealth. It was also enacted through him, that if any cleric wished to leave the country he must show good reason, and take oath that he would not be guilty of "baratrie," or the purchase of church livings with money. This, too, was against the open religious markets at Avignon and Rome. But all this and other possible good was stopped, in the infamous murder of James by a conspiracy of nobles in 1436. He had made them feel the royal hand as none had done before : and they murdered him. In some things, such as his treatment of his own kin of the family of the Duke of Albany, he was ruthless. But perhaps he remembered the provocation his uncle Albany had given, in the death of his brother and the sorrows of his father. Church and State were all the worse for his assassination.

With the death of James I. began the weary time of struggle between the nobles and the crown. It was a time full of tragedies and miseries. The minority of the king

naturally let loose the worst passions of the nobles, who always held them in a very slack leash. When the new king tried to assume real power, the friction brought out such hot passion as that with his own hand he stabbed Douglas in 1452. Yet, whether because of his father's endeavours to reform, purify, and uplift the clergy or not cannot be said, it is declared of James II.'s reign that religion flourished in it, with wise and earnest bishops, and learned teachers in various arts, and pure heads of monasteries. Certainly such bishops as Kennedy of St. Andrews, and Turnbull, through whom Glasgow University was founded in 1450, were an honour to the land. But such was the condition of the church that the immediate predecessor of Turnbull was Bishop Cameron, whose wickedness was such as to make the populace believe, that his deathbed was infested with the peculiar horrors that attend the decease of specially vile sinners. The annual synods of the church appear to have met during the time of trouble. At one in 1457 the clergy granted the king's right to present to benefices during the vacancy of the see in which the benefice was ; and this was confirmed by the council of 1459.

The accession of James III. had the great advantage of Bishop Kennedy's presence near the throne. But the good bishop's death in 1466 reopened old troubles among the nobles, who were ever ready to scheme or fight for their own hand. The king was not strong enough to cope with them. The end of their plotting was civil war, during which the king was killed, either in a battle, or assassinated after a battle, in 1488. James III.'s influence

on the Church was bad. Possibly by the influence of his favourites, presentations were made to high offices in the Church of men who were unfit for their position, and through whom the Church lost hold on the people. It was in this reign that St. Andrews became an archbishopric. The papal bull constituting it the metropolitan see was given in 1472. The Church of Scotland thus at length had metropolitan authority in itself. From the inclusion in the new province of the bishoprics of Candida Casa, Argyll, the Isles, and Orkney, it would seem that the claims of York over Galloway had ended, and that the overrule of the churches in the Danish possessions of the northern and western isles by the Archbishop of Drontheim, had also passed. If so, they could not have been long in abeyance, because, while Bishop Graham was at Rome for papal confirmation of his appointment to St. Andrews, Nevil, Archbishop of York, took advantage of his opportunity to revive the claim of York to the ecclesiastical supremacy of the whole of Scotland. This was ended by the bull of 1472, though the contention on behalf of Drontheim, lasted longer. Archbishop Graham found on his return to Scotland that his troubles had only begun. Both the king and the episcopate were against him. He was deposed, but there can be little doubt that personal feeling, greed, and ambition on the part of his enemies, had as much to do with the deposition of Graham as zeal for the purity of religion. The bull of deposition charges him with heresy and schism, but no particulars of the charge have come down. One singular feature of the whole is that Graham's greatest enemy, Archdeacon Sheves, became his successor.

Graham was kept in perpetual imprisonment, and died in prison in 1478. The metropolitan dignity did not suffer diminution in the care of Archbishop Sheves; and when firmly settled in his place he secured a bull from Innocent VIII., in 1487, making him primate of all Scotland and legate, with privileges like those of the Archbishop of Canterbury. With this dignity he had to take his turn of antagonism. Glasgow and the Scotch Parliament opposed his honours, and all the more easily because Glasgow had, as one of the canons of the cathedral, James IV. himself. It may be that it was through the King that in 1489 the Estates of the Realm agreed that Glasgow also should be made an archbishopric. In 1492 the papal bull was obtained for this purpose, giving privileges to Glasgow similar to those of the Archbishop of York.

## CHAPTER VII

Patronage in the Church—Persecution of the Lollards—Aberdeen University Founded, 1497—Flodden—Margaret, Sister of Henry VIII., Regent—Bad Influence of Henry—Burning of Patrick Hamilton and others—Marriage of James V. with Mary of Guise, 1538—Cardinal Beaton—Death of James and Birth of Mary Stewart, 1542.

THE reign of James IV., that began in 1488, took Scotland into the sixteenth century and into the flow of the new life that was moving all over Western Europe. It was an ill time for the country. Church abuses of the old type of the appropriation of property and offices by the nobles increased rather than diminished. Patronage was everywhere in the Church, and almost everywhere was scandalously abused. James IV.'s bastard was Archbishop of St. Andrews, when he was only sixteen years old. Notwithstanding worthy exceptions, the general character of church life was deplorable. It was not likely that when the high offices were so filled, the lower ones would be occupied by models of sanctity. The almost parricidal conduct of the King and his frequent adulteries, were condoned by a priesthood that found in a few pilgrimages to the shrines of saints, a call for almost unqualified eulogy.

It is almost a relief to read, as showing that a better life was growing, that in 1494 the Lollards were making such progress as to cause the arrest of thirty persons, who were tried for heresy. They were charged with things as might well appear to need a check in the judgment of a priesthood that was saturated with simony, and eaten through with the grossest worldliness. Yet there were some of the better sort even in the high places—such as Bishop Elphinstone, of Aberdeen—through whom the University of Aberdeen was founded in 1497. This was the third university formed in the fifteenth century, and all three came from ecclesiastics. It was the flowing of the fresh blood of the new life of the age. Abbeys and monasteries were no longer built, but schools and colleges were. Even compulsory education was known. For, by the Act of the fifth parliament of James IV., all barons and freeholders “of substance” were ordered to keep their eldest sons at school from the age of six to the age of nine, under a heavy penalty. In this reign, too, printing was brought to Scotland, under the warm patronage of the King. How far the movement of the new life might have been carried in church and university if James IV. had lived, can be only matter of conjecture. But the almost fatal field of Flodden in 1513 brought in a time of misery and trouble for the country, in which all good work seemed to end.

Flodden brought Scotland once more to the great perils of a royal minority. The King, thirteen earls, an archbishop,—such as he was,—two bishops,—of their sort,—and a crowd of the chief of the nation, were dead on the field of battle. Margaret, Queen-mother and Regent, was the sister



of Henry VIII. of England, and was not unlike him in his peculiar vilenesses. It did not bode well for Christianity anywhere that the same year—1513—saw a cultured heathen made Pope, under the title of Leo X. There was no need for prophecy to wait till after the event, with such a state of things in Scotland and the countries with which she had most to do. Margaret's matrimonial proclivities, like her brother's, brought trouble to both church and land. Her scandalous marriage with the Earl of Angus brought back the Duke of Albany as regent; and thence rose the two parties—the English and the French, that for more than a generation made havoc of Scotland. St. Andrews being vacant by the death of the bastard archbishop, there was a battle royal, or, rather, a battle episcopal, for the dignity. Albany gave the three competitors something each; but Forman, the papal nominee, got the archbishopric. This mean contest pictures the condition of things in Church and State at the time. The nobles were ready to fight and plunder all round; and their kinsmen in the high places of the Church, did not show any great difference of nature because of the change of environment. Though it is only fair to say, that there is but one recorded instance of a bishop being ever and equally ready for spiritual or carnal conflict. That one was Beaton, archbishop of Glasgow, who wore a coat of mail under his linen rochet. His varied gifts, thus evidenced, secured for him the See of St. Andrews in 1522; where he was of steady service to the young King, in opposing the tyranny of the Douglasses, and in thwarting the schemes of Henry VIII. against

Scotland. The young King's preference for the clergy, in opposition to the nobles, was very clear. But it may be questioned whether this did not work both King and Church more harm than good, in the long run. By his choice of ecclesiastics, as helpers in the government of the country, when he was free from the Earl of Angus in 1528, he made the barons angry, both with himself and the churchmen. Even in so useful an institution as his College of Justice, priests predominated: though there was the less cause of complaint in this, seeing that Church money supported the College. Very probably things like these had much to do with the readiness of many of the nobles to favour a change of religion: for thus, at one and the same time, they got rid of ecclesiastics who shut them out of the government, and also had unheard-of opportunities to plunder the Church and enrich themselves. This, when the opportunity came, they showed great zeal in doing, if in nothing else. As in England under Henry VIII., so in Scotland, the "nobility" were very religious and very earnest for purer Church life, when the waters of purification could be so guided as to float vast estates and wealth to their unworthy hands. Every one knows how badly, how even vilely, ecclesiastics were using Church property and their powers and privileges, in both countries. But with many who harried them out of their position and wealth, reform was little less, and no better than robbery. To this day, the property of many "noble" families has the curse of Church robbery on it. And it is a poor thing, and worse than a questionable honour, to have the ruins of some noble abbey on show for tourists, while the lands that

were given to support the abbey now minister to modern luxury and unchristian exclusiveness. It is, in truth, a sorry part that many of the barons played in the momentous events that the sixteenth century saw in Scotland. The grievous thing was, that the vices of the clergy gave only too many occasions for the greedy and unscrupulous "nobility" to take Church property, without a natural and indignant protest being raised all round. The infamous example of Henry VIII. on the other side of the border, found only too many and too ready imitators in Scotland. It scarcely needed the bandit suggestions, that the "royal reformer" in England made to the King of Scotland, to stir many of the leaders of Scotland to imitate his example.

There can be no doubt that the resumption of heretic burning added to the indignation of many with the ecclesiastical authorities who were now so eminent in the kingdom. It was early in 1528 that Patrick Hamilton, a well born and cultured man, was burned for "Lutheranism" in St. Andrews. He was a pupil of John Mair or Major the eminent scholar, who was also the instructor of George Buchanan and John Knox. Patrick Hamilton was deprived of all his dignities, orders and benefices, and then burned. Previously to this, in 1525, an act was passed, prohibiting the introduction of Lutheran books into Scotland; and the bishops were on the alert for both books and preachers. But in killing Patrick Hamilton they wakened a wide sympathy: and one Scotch gentleman advised the primate "to burn no more heretics; or if he did, to burn them in cellars, since the smoke of Patrick

Hamilton infected all on whom it blew." But as opportunity came, the burnings were repeated. In 1553 a young Benedictine monk was martyred at St. Andrews. The next year a priest and a layman were hanged and burned near Edinburgh, while many others fled the country through fear. Early in 1539 four clerics and a notary were burned in Edinburgh. In the same year a friar and a poet were sent to the stake in Glasgow. The bishops were always ready to burn heretics : but unhappily for the bishops, it was the wrong time for such zeal. And the zeal that could burn men, and even women, for difference of opinion, must have appeared to be in strange and shameful contrast with the other side of things, that permitted a Pope to receive an appeal from the King, for a dispensation to enter the ecclesiastical state, on behalf of his three illegitimate children, one of whom was born in adultery ; and that allowed the King to give five of the richest monasteries to his natural children, who were little more than babies, one of them being already the holder of several benefices.

The marriage of James V., first with the daughter of the King of France, in 1537 (who, however, lived only two months in Scotland), and then with Mary, daughter of the Duke of Guise, in 1538, so identified Scotland with French and papal interests, as to have a great and far-reaching effect on religion. England, or, rather, Henry VIII., was associated with rejection of the authority of the Pope. France was the stronghold of submission to Rome. The matrimonial alliance with France meant alienation from Henry VIII. and his policy. Henry steadily tried to

persuade James into taking ecclesiastical supremacy in Scotland into his own hands, and to enrich his poverty by the plunder of the monasteries, as his uncle had done in England. The friction of the contest became hotter for both, by the appointment of Cardinal Beaton to the primacy of Scotland, on the death of his uncle in 1539. The cardinal was a very able and ambitious man : of thoroughly French sympathies, and a devoted antagonist to the evil schemes of Henry VIII. Morally he was no better than the ecclesiastics of his time. He was courageous enough not to be ashamed of acknowledging his children, and he was affectionate enough to provide well for them. He was very zealous for his Church, the evidence of that being his readiness to resume the burning of "heretics." His first attempt, however, ended only in twice burning the effigy of Sir John Borthwick, who had escaped the cardinal's clutch. It is said that he tried to checkmate Henry's suggestion of plundering the Church by drawing up a list of men suspected of heresy, whose confiscated property would relieve the King's need and have the flavour of sanctity about the forfeiture. There is not much to choose between the proposals of the royal Head of the Church in England and the Cardinal Primate of the Church in Scotland. But Beaton was patriotic, with submission to the interests of his Church. And so long as he had the ear of the King that Church would be for Rome, and the country would be for a French alliance against England. But the English and anti-cleric faction among the nobles was growing stronger. "English angels," as Henry's most potent helpers with many of them were called,

wrought their favour to the schemes of Henry ; while with others, increasing conviction of the divine truth of the reformed doctrines was steadying their spirits into intense antagonism to the cardinal and his Church. Meanwhile, that Church was not growing purer, but, if it were possible, viler. In addition to ecclesiastical impurities, its reckless grinding of the poor in death dues and other things, and its subservience to the strong, were working their natural consequences. The King, too, in 1541, tried still more to limit and curb the power of the barons, by Acts of Parliament that were right enough, it maybe, in themselves, but were impolitic and beyond the power of the crown to carry out. The ill result of all this was, that when Henry thought himself slighted by James, and, therefore, declared war against Scotland, the Scotch "nobles" meanly refused to march for the King, when he wanted to carry the war into England. Bitterly mortified, James tried with a smaller army to break again across the border ; but the nobles refused to go, and rose against the commander whom James had sent. The English leader was not far off. He dashed at them with three hundred cavalry while the Scotch were mutinous ; and in the shameful rout of Solway Moss drove the Scotch army off the field. This is said to have broken James' heart. He died on December 14th, 1542. Seven days before he died his wife gave birth to a daughter, the "daughter of debate," Mary Stewart. "It came with a lass, and it will go with a lass," said James of the throne his family had held, and soon after died.

## CHAPTER VIII

Minority of Mary Stewart—French and English Parties—Persecution of Reformers—George Wishart—Murder of Cardinal Beaton—Siege of St. Andrews Castle—John Knox—English Invasion and Battle of Pinkie—Burning of Adam Wallace.

THE death of James V., by bringing Cardinal Beaton forward as regent, precipitated the crisis in the affairs of the Church and nation. The King's will, or a document purporting to be such, appointed him regent, with a council of three earls to assist. But the barons passed this by, and appointed the Earl of Arran to be regent. He was thought to be favourable to the reformed religion; but he was so weak a man that his favour was scarcely less hurtful than his enmity. But that the reformers were making great progress at this time, is clear from the fact that in 1543 an act was passed that permitted the reading of the Bible in English or Scotch; though, ludicrously, men were forbidden to form an opinion on their reading. It may be safely presumed that the preaching of the gospel was carried on vigorously by the reformers among the people, to whom any honest and earnest speech on spiritual things must have been a rare and welcome thing. But all the religious movements and questions now became

involved even more closely with the political. The King of England wanted the young Queen of Scotland for wife to his son Edward ; and by means of some of the released prisoners of Solway Moss, he strengthened the English party in Scotland. Henry's plan was earnestly and even tenaciously opposed by the clergy, headed by Cardinal Beaton, who renewed the league and alliance with France. The blunder of the Regent Arran's party in putting Beaton in prison brought the clergy into line at once, and they everywhere closed the churches. The release of the cardinal quickly followed. Then it was that his real power was seen, in bringing about the repudiation of the alliance with England, and in the readiness with which the clergy and the French or papal party got ready to resist Henry, by force of arms. The papal party were undoubtedly the patriotic section of the time. The nobles of the other side show up as badly as is possible, for men who hold such large stakes as the welfare of a church and the prosperity of a nation.

The English King's answer to the Scotch parliament's repudiation of his scheme is almost unmatched for brutality in the history of war. His orders to the Earl of Hertford in 1544 read like those of a raving madman. The inroad that followed was like a trail of fire through the Lowlands. The monasteries of Melrose, Kelso, Holyrood, Jedburgh, and Dryburgh, were burned with other places. This should not be forgotten. It was not the Scotch Protestants that burned the architectural glories of the Lowlands, but the soldiery of Henry, who were as much papist as protestant, and rather more so. As if to show an equally



cruel spirit to that of Henry, the Cardinal had just before this again taken to persecution. In the same year with Henry's inroad, Beaton held a court at Perth against heresy. Many were accused and banished. Others were killed. Four men were hanged; and a woman, wife of one of the men, who had a baby at her breast, was drowned. She was allowed to give her baby to the bystanders before her hands were tied. So far "the church" had mercy. Here again there is not much to choose between Henry and Beaton. But the king went beyond the cardinal in plotting his opponent's death; and, unhappily, Henry found Scottish nobles ready to further his design of putting Beaton out of the way. Beaton was a quick and untiring enemy; ready to give way to no one, and he was very full of life at this time. Neither to an enemy nor a colleague would he willingly yield anything. This was seen when, on visiting Glasgow with the regent and queen-mother, he refused to allow Dunbar, the Archbishop of Glasgow, to have his cross carried in the Cardinal's presence, though it was in Dunbar's own cathedral. Ecclesiastical law was on the side of Beaton: but the congregation did not consider this. The result was that the Cardinal's self-assertion brought about a scandalous riot in the cathedral between the two parties; in the midst of which, church history, silent as to the number of broken heads, tells that both the dignitaries had their pretty crosses broken. Beaton was nothing if not thorough. He and Henry might have paired. But Henry's plot with some of the Scotch leaders to assassinate the Cardinal outfaced Beaton's malignity. The plot is

undoubted. And, unless there were two Wisharts in the struggle of the time, there is reason to fear that George Wishart, the martyr, was privy to it. He had returned to Scotland in 1544, after a time of earnest work and preaching against the abuses of the Roman church. His last preaching journeys drew John Knox to Wishart's party. Perhaps Cardinal Beaton knew of the plot against his life, and suspected Wishart's knowledge of it. The Cardinal certainly tried to catch George Wishart, and in 1546 succeeded. The preacher was put on trial before the archbishops and prelates; and then burned in St. Andrews; a prayer for his judges being among his last words. Wishart's death caused great indignation in Scotland; and made some talk of "life for life." The word soon gave way to the deed. Beaton, in May, had returned to St. Andrews from Angus, where he had been to celebrate the marriage of one of his illegitimate daughters with the eldest son of the Earl of Crawford. On the 29th of May, 1546, sixteen determined men, friends of the martyr of the reformation, got into St. Andrews Castle, cleared it of workmen and servants, and stabbed the cardinal to death. Then they hung his body, it is said, out of the very window from which, two months before, he had looked at the dying agony of George Wishart. With the death,—the shameful death of Cardinal Beaton,—the mainspring of the papal party in Scotland broke. There was no one to take his place. He was an able and an eminent man: more than a match in ability and ambition for any of his opponents. He has been called "a great churchman." So much the worse for "the church." From that way of looking at

Cardinal Beaton, it may be judged what state the Church was in, and how far churchmanship and Christianity were synonymous, when Scotland was entering on the great stir of the Reformation.

The vile misdeed of the murder of Beaton was chiefly pleasing to the English party in Scotland and to Henry of England. To the papal party it was overwhelming. Of necessity, it carried evil consequences in its train. The assassins kept the Castle of St. Andrews, being joined by others: and with the help of the English they stood a long siege. A year after the murder John Knox joined the garrison, and was chosen by the religious in it (for there were such) as their preacher and teacher. His greatest admirers could have wished him anywhere but there. But it is due to him to say that he preached against the wickedness of some of the soldiers, as boldly as in later days he reprov'd Mary of Guise and her daughter. Knox brought only trouble on himself by becoming chaplain to St. Andrews Castle. For, when the Castle was taken in 1547 by the help of the French fleet, he and the leaders were carried prisoners to France. Then for nineteen months he served as a galley slave, with all the bitterness that such horror could inflict. Henry VIII. had died early in the same year: but his policy was followed by his successors in England. Secure of sympathy from a large number of unpatriotic Scotch nobles, who were in the pay of Henry, Somerset invaded Scotland. In this emergency the papal church leaders recognized the identity of the national interest with the safety of their church. But greater meanness cannot be imagined than that of the

barons who were intriguing for the supremacy of England in Scotland. Many priests and monks went with the army that advanced against Somerset; and marched with a white banner, on which was pictured the figure of what they called "the afflicted church." But the battle of Pinkie broke the military power of Scotland in a great slaughter, and trailed the consecrated banner in blood and dust. Had Somerset followed up his victory, Scotland would have been at his mercy,—church and all. But his return to England gave Scotland time to recover, notwithstanding the continuance of a desultory war on the border. The betrothal of the girl-queen of Scots to the Dauphin of France in 1548, and her departure for her mother's country, ended one chief project of Henry VIII. and gave Scotland a still closer alliance with France. Peace was proclaimed between England and France in 1550; and Scotland shared in the agreement. It was in the same year that the Scotch clergy showed how little they read the signs of the times, by again prosecuting for "heresy." Adam Wallace was brought before a council and the primate and regent. On his refusal to abjure, he was burned in Edinburgh, saying as the fires were lighted,— "the disciple is not above his Master." And this took place close to the holding of the council of 1549, the canons of which were enough to condemn any so-called religious community, that needed the passing of such regulations. Out of the mouth of its own councils of this time, the Scottish papal church can be judged unfit for the honour of men, and still more unworthy the submission of women. It seemed to matter little or nothing who was

bishop in any diocese. The same vile sins went on among the clerics and barons. But, happily, all the while the lowly preachers of the gospel were more and more leavening the mind, and touching the hearts of the townspeople and peasantry, and making ready for the great change of the year 1560.

## CHAPTER IX

Mary of Guise Regent, 1554—Return of Knox—His Influence—League of the Lords of the Congregation, 1557—Burning of Walter Milne—Bad Lives of Ecclesiastics—Conflict of the Reformers with the Queen-Regent—Monastery Burning—Mary Stewart, Queen of France—Death of the Queen-Regent—Treaty of Edinburgh—Appeal of Reformers to Parliament—Acceptance of “The Confession of Faith.”

MARY OF GUISE became Regent in 1554. She was a capable woman, like all of her name: a fervent Romanist; but apparently willing to play with the reformers, either to gain time for her plans, or for the continuance of peace. That she had any sympathy with the reformers is quite out of the question. But she was not so harsh with them as might have been expected. Her policy and the movements of both parties in the church and nation were hardened, and made more antagonistic by the return of Knox to Scotland in 1555. He came with the personal influence of John Calvin strong in him. That, added to his own temperament, was sure to crystallize many things that were yet fluent in the country. As, for instance, with the fact that at this time so strange was the relation

between the two parties, that many of the reformers used still to attend mass and join in the old forms of worship in the churches. Knox ended this. Compromise was foreign to his nature. Such a step as the withdrawal from association in worship with the papal party, especially in the face of new and revived laws, could be only like a formal declaration of war to the bishops. It was like a distinct challenge as to right of existence. It meant that the followers of the Gospel were no longer content to be put on trial. This was further strengthened by Knox administering the communion in several places, after the English or Genevan manner. In consequence he was cited to answer at Edinburgh, for what was felt to be a deadly blow at the continuance of the Roman church forms in the country. Knox went to Edinburgh : but the trial was not proceeded with. He, characteristically, took the opportunity of preaching in Edinburgh : which he did to the largest audience he had ever exhorted. A letter that he sent to the regent immediately after, asking her to give heed to the reformed doctrine, being somewhat contemptuously treated, Knox was greatly mortified : more so than was worthy his character. Similarly, he seems to have gone against all that is known of him, by soon after leaving Scotland for the continent. The reason for it no one can give. In his absence, he was tried, condemned and burned in effigy. But others continued the preaching. And when Paul Methven was summoned before the Regent on the usual charge of "heresy," he was accompanied by some rough and daring adherents of reform, who with steel bonnets on their heads and their fingers touching

their sword-hilts, told the Regent that they would no longer suffer the doings of the bishops. This was plain talk, rough and rude conduct, that only the bitter need of the time could account for or extenuate. The offence was against the woman. The bishops were worth no better or gentler words. So far as they were concerned, there was no wrong done. The Regent had to put up with the affront, because of her differences with the nobles and the English sympathizers. But she must have known, and the bishops too, that such an act would beget more of its kind. And, certainly, from this time there was no lack of distinctness of intention in the conduct of the reformers. A letter sent by the leaders to Knox brought back a reply that led to the most notable act, thus far, in the Scotch reformation. For on December 3, 1557, the leaders drew up a bond or covenant, after the manner of the time, in which, calling themselves "the congregation of God," and the Roman church "the congregation of Satan," they resolved that the "Book of Common Prayer," probably that of Edward VI., should be used in the churches, with expulsion of unfit or unwilling curates: and that preaching should be followed in private houses, till public preaching were granted by the government. By this was formed the League or Covenant of "The Lords of the Congregation."

This revolutionary and daring act could not have been, or, having been, would not have gone unpunished, if the reformers had not shown themselves to be increasingly strong, and the Regent had not needed to temporize all round, in order to make sure of the marriage of her daughter



with the Dauphin. But, whether with or without her knowledge and consent, the ecclesiastics precipitated their own downfall, by once more trying the deterrent power of burning. All through this time of struggle, it is vain to look for signs of common prudence in the bishops and archbishops. The resolutions of their provincial councils, against the gross impurities and corruption of the church and priesthood, were, at best, as some one has said, only like arranging for the sweeping of chimneys when the house was on fire. So that, it is like all that is known of them, to read that in 1558 they summoned, tried and shamefully burned a poor old priest of over eighty years of age. So vile did this seem, that the officers charged with carrying out the sentence refused : and Walter Milne was carried to the stake and burned by some of the primate's retainers. But the brave old man was the last to die in Scotland at the hands of Rome's adherents, for the truth of God and His Gospel. The people of St. Andrews raised a cairn of stones over his grave, and the leaders of the reformers demanded a change in even more imperative language than had yet been used. Their proposals were met by a compromise ; with which, and by the astuteness of the Queen-Regent, who still needed them, they were kept in play. But a letter that they sent to the Regent, with request for it to be laid before Parliament, being simply pocketed by her, they addressed a protest to the Estates of the Realm.

Through all the strife for church reform and liberty of worship, the one consistent thing is the badness of the lives of the ecclesiastics. It is almost grotesque to read some

things in connection with this. If they were not so bad they would be ludicrous. As with the Bishop of Aberdeen : who, having asked his chapter for advice about church reformation, suppression of heresy, &c., was counselled by them on January 5th, 1559, among other things, to compel the "churchmen" of his diocese to put away their concubines. And, in order that there might be more hope of his episcopal admonitions taking effect, he was himself entreated to set the example, by putting away his own concubine. There is only too much evidence that the Bishop of Aberdeen was not an exception ; save in this,—that he sought good advice and got it. Whether he followed it or not, history does not say.

It was only two months after this, that what proved to be the last provincial council of the Papal Church in Scotland for 327 years, was summoned by the Primate, Archbishop Hamilton. It sat for more than a month. The first four canons of this council are enough to account for, if not to justify, the swift and even harsh movement of the change that was passing so rapidly over the life of Scotland and its church. A petition from "The Congregation" was presented to the council ; and, also, an anonymous remonstrance from some in the Scotch Papal Church, who wanted it to be reformed from the inside. Had the ecclesiastical leaders meant true and good work in the council, the petition and the remonstrance would have been of use. But neither wrought any good result. The heads of the Church had not the good of men at heart. They once more arranged for "sweeping the chimneys" while the house was furiously burning. They arranged for the next meet-

ing of the synod to be in the following year. But the adjournment was for three centuries and a quarter.\*

The Queen-Regent chose the Easter that was then close at hand for the issuing of a proclamation, enforcing the canons of the council, in as far as they concerned the reformers, who gave no heed to the decree. The regent's tone had now altogether changed ; apparently under the influence of her brothers in France, who were the heads of "The Catholic League." They induced her to join that conspiracy for the restoration of Romish authority in Europe. Several of the reformed preachers were summoned to Stirling for trial. Resolving to stand by their preachers, the Congregation gathered in numbers to Perth ; where they were joined, in the very nick of time, by John Knox, who had returned to Scotland after three years' absence. They were persuaded, it is said at the Queen's request, to stay at Perth, while one of the leaders went on to Stirling to arrange matters, happily, if possible. But when the summoned men did not appear at Stirling, they were outlawed ; and their sureties were fined. While the adherents of the Congregation were sore about this, a sermon of John Knox's against idolatry, and the act of a priest in going through the mass immediately after the sermon in the same church, roused the people ; who thereupon rushed through the city burning and destroying the monasteries. The Queen-Regent marched against Perth, and was finally admitted by treaty : in agreement with

\* "The Abbey of Fort Augustus was selected in 1886 as the most fitting spot for the assembly of the first national council of the restored hierarchy." "Bellesheim," vol. iv., p. 336, note.

which the Congregation left Perth, and in violation of which the Regent put papists in authority, and set herself utterly against the Congregation. The leaders of the reform had now summoned a large assembly at St. Andrews. On his way to that meeting Knox preached wherever he could ; and wherever he preached, church desecration and destruction of images followed. The threats of the archbishop of St. Andrews did not deter Knox from preaching in the primate's cathedral : and, as in the other cases, the mob destroyed the monasteries and spoiled the cathedral and churches. With this in addition, that at St. Andrews the magistrates helped the mob. There was now as bad as civil war between the Lords of the Congregation and the Queen-Regent. And when, after a delay that was not honourable to the Queen, the Congregation again seized Perth, the nearness of the Abbey of Scone, and the evil character and ill-standing of the commendator of the abbey—the Bishop of Moray, proved to be a temptation too great for the temper of the mob. They burned the one abbey that, of all others, Scotchmen of every class might have wished spared. The day after, the mob at Stirling destroyed the monasteries there and at Cambuskenneth : while the Earl of Argyll and Lord James Stewart, whose presence had encouraged the outrages, went on to Edinburgh by way of Linlithgow, which was treated in the same way. At the end of June they entered the capital ; where the same demolitions went on. Glasgow had also been a sufferer from the same things. But a truce was come to soon after ; and the Queen-Regent regained Edinburgh.

Henry II. of France died on July 8th, 1559, and the

Queen of Scots thus became Queen of France. Thereupon the papal party in France sent French troops to help the Queen-Regent in Scotland. Notwithstanding the fervent preaching that, all through the country, drew the populace away from the Roman church, the Congregation might have now been put down for the time, but for their asking and getting English aid. In this they were no worse, nor any better, than the clericals and the papal party. Neither side shows up very well in the records of the time. French money and men were matched against English men and money. When, in the early part of 1560, the reformers made a definite treaty with the English, professedly against French influence in Scotland, the end of the struggle, in its then form, was in sight. The Queen-Regent at this time showed signs of failing life. In her weakness she was admitted into Edinburgh Castle, where she died on June 10th, 1560. Her last hours were among the most gracious of her life. They were womanly and Christian. She died, after interviews with the leaders on both sides, asking and giving pardon for any offence received or inflicted during the weary experience of her life in Scotland. She must have seen before she died that the movement of reform was stronger and deeper than she thought. For only a little time before she passed away, the titular Archbishop of Athens, who was Bishop of Galloway, the sub-prior of St. Andrews, the Scotch Provincial of the Blackfriars and others, had cast in their lot with the Reformed church. The death of the Regent made both parties more sensible of the weariness of civil war, and on July 8th, 1560, "The Treaty of Edinburgh" was

proclaimed, by which the war was ended, and Parliament summoned, in the name of the King and Queen of the Scots, for August 1st. In this parliament, it was announced, the matters in debate were to be arranged. The end of this part of the strife left the Congregation as strong as its enemies, and no time was lost by the leaders of the Reformed church in arranging for the systematic teaching of the country. A Presbyterian form of government began to show itself, with likeness to episcopal supervision at the same time. Ministers were appointed to the chief places in the country, and districts were placed under the oversight of what were called "superintendents."

When parliament met a petition was immediately presented on behalf of the more eager among the reformers, praying that "idolatry should be abolished; the sacraments administered in their original purity; the discipline of the ancient church restored; and the patrimony usurped by the Pope applied to the maintenance of a true ministry, the founding of schools, and the support of the poor." The reference to church property was not noticed, but the reformers were asked to prepare a statement for parliament of what they believed and desired. In four days they brought up "The Confession of the Faith and Doctrine believed and professed by the Protestants of the Realm of Scotland." This Confession was read over, with opportunity for objection on the part of any. The Primate and bishops present made none. On August 17th, 1560, it was put to the vote whether the Confession should be the established creed of Scotland. The Primate and two bishops made objection now, demanding delay, and pro-

missing once more to "sweep the chimneys" when the house was tumbling about their ears. But they did not argue against the doctrines of the Confession. It was read over again, article by article, and, with singularly few dissentients, was accepted. The aged Lord Lindsay rose thereupon, and declared that now he could say with Simeon, "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation." Seven days after the Estates again assembled and passed three Acts, which ended the papal domination in Scotland. By these papal jurisdiction was abolished; all statutes in favour of Romish worship, &c., were repealed; and the saying or hearing mass was made a crime. The reformers had taken a leaf out of the papal book, with which they were only too well acquainted. The great movers in the reform were men who had been in Rome's own orders, and she herself was to blame for the spirit with which they did their work. Most agree now that penal statutes against forms of belief are atrocious, and that their favourers only "hold down the truth in unrighteousness." But they who are ever ready to persecute for disbelief of their opinion, have no right to complain when the same measure is meted to them.

History tells few more wonderful things than the utter defeat and degradation of the church in Scotland, that had, to all seeming, everything to give it advantage against its opponents. But it had ceased, in everything save the name, to be a church. Or, if there can be a church with right of authority, &c., in the condition of the Church of Rome in Scotland and elsewhere at that time, then the

world can do better without a so-called church than with it. What Dean Colet said of the Church in England of that time might as truly, if not more fitly, have been said of the Church in Scotland : " We are troubled with heretics, but no heresy of theirs is so fatal to us and to the people at large as the vicious and depraved lives of the clergy. That is the worst heresy of all."



## CHAPTER X

Difficulties of the Reformers—"The First Book of Discipline"—First "General Assembly of The Reformed Church of Scotland," 1560—Return of Mary to Scotland, 1561—Interview with John Knox—Division of Church Property—Work of the Assembly—Strife between Mary and Knox—The First Moderator of Assembly—"The Book of Common Order," 1564—Mary's Marriage with Darnley : and with Bothwell—Her Abdication, 1567—Legislation of 1567—More Plundering of Church Property—Tulchan Bishops—Death of Knox.

THE real difficulties of the reformers began with the abolition of Romish authority in Scotland. It was really a question whether the men who had so markedly succeeded in destroying the power of one church, would be equally able to fill its place more worthily and efficiently with another. Were they anything more than revolutionaries? That had yet to be seen. Nay, it went even further, for it was easily possible to understand that men might be able to draw up a paper confession of faith, and be very earnest in doing so, who would be quite incapable of meeting the difficulties of the religious condition of Scotland, complicated, as it was, with the political, and with the Powers of England and France. Had Scotland been free from French and English entanglements, there

would have been a comparatively simple task for the reconstructors. And the work would have been relieved of some of its most laborious demands, if there had not been so much church property to tempt the greedy earls and barons, who were only too ready to hustle one another for church plunder. Many of them had no more reverence for sacred things than the proverbial indifference of a French sapper. "The Book of Discipline" was the outcome of the first attempt to formulate and arrange the affairs of the reformed church. So early as April 29th, 1560, it would seem, a commission had been given for such a purpose. The book, when produced, dealt with the offices, the worship, and the property of the church. The last was the difficulty. For while many approved the proposed plans, they who had already profited by the robbery of church property, preferred their own pockets to any provision for worship, education, and the poor. They therefore scornfully opposed the project, calling it, in Maitland's phrase, "a devout imagination." They were not devout, and they were very practical. The provisions of "The Book of Discipline" were for an order of government that, while kin to the Episcopal in some of its features, as was inevitable, was much more Presbyterian in character and tendency; and for forms of worship and administration of the sacraments, that were as far from the Romish type as was possible at the time. All religious truth and beliefs were to be held from the Bible, and all ecclesiastical authority was to rise from the people of God, who were to call and set apart those who were deemed worthy of so high a status as that of a minister of the

Word of God. The system proposed was democratic in constitution and republican in polity. The Cardinal of Lorraine was shrewd enough to see the drift of Scotch affairs; as he showed when he said to the English ambassador in Paris, about the doings of the Scotch leaders, that "they would bring the realm to a republic, and say, in their words, that they are the king's subjects." There was no such deliberate intention, but the stream was moving that way for the time.

The "discipline" that was proposed for the church was very severe. The country had seen so much of scandal in the lives of professed ministers of Christ, that it is easy to understand the severity with which sins of uncleanness were to be visited. The provision for the education of the young was ample and far-seeing; constructive and comprehensive in a high degree. With every church there was to be a school; in every town a college or grammar-school: while the universities were to be generously endowed. Whatever had been done by the church previously seemed poor, spasmodic and local, compared with the scheme of education that was now proposed. So was it with the provision for the poor. Able-bodied vagrants were to be compelled to work: but the aged and infirm poor were to be supported. All this was to be done, and could have been done, out of the endowments of the church, if the religious reformers had been allowed to carry out the proposals of the "Book of Discipline." "The Gospel would be preached, our children educated, our poor provided for, without cost. No one would lose anything: only some of our great proprietors would never have pos-

sessed their extensive domains. Some great lords would be but country gentlemen with small estates, untroubled with dreams about nobility : and others might rejoice in ancient titles, but lack the broad acres which now give them support. Public officers, and not private factors, would be lifting the rents of our ancient monasteries : and yet the present holders could not be said to have lost what, according to our supposition, they never possessed. The community would have reaped, as it ought to have reaped, the benefit of the church's accumulated wealth."\* Knox saw the spirit of the Council, which could not be induced to accept the "First Book of Discipline." He preached against the plunderers of the Church as vigorously as he ever spoke against the Romanists. It is an instance of his mildness on this matter, to quote him saying,—“There were none within the realm more unmerciful to the poor ministers than were they who had great rents of the churches. But in that we have perceived the old proverb to be true, ‘nothing can suffice a wretch’ ; and again, ‘the belly hath no ears.’” What the church leaders could do they did : but their work was circumscribed by the avarice and unscrupulousness of those whom “the sin of covetousness had made reformers.”

The first “General Assembly of the Reformed Church of Scotland” met on December 20th, 1560. The second met in the following May, from which a petition went to the Privy Council that shows how the property of the church was being “conveyed” into the hands of the “nobility.” The petition, also of this Assembly, for the

\* Cunningham, Vol. I., p. 367.

destruction of the yet remaining monuments of idolatry, brought about another demolition of religious houses, that can be understood only by the fear of the "return of the rooks to the nest." But while all these things were going on, events were moving toward a still graver crisis. Francis II. of France died December 4th, 1560. After that Mary Stewart was not welcome at the French court, as she had been while queen. She left France on August 14th, 1561, and reached Scotland on the 19th. In going to Scotland she was to be pitied, for her race, for her breeding, and for her place in the history of France and Scotland. With the strain of the Guise and Medici blood in her could come no graciousness for reformers: and after her training in France, and the sights there of how papal Rome dealt with "heresy," there could be no pity expected in her for "heretics." Her exchange of the church of Rome in France for the new life of the church of Scotland was inevitably disastrous. To have John Knox instead of the Cardinal of Lorraine must have almost stunned her, when she realized the change. She soon found the difference. Mary's private mass on her first Sunday in Scotland roused the reformers against the "idolatry" of the service. This charge of idolatry should be borne in mind all through this sad time. Whatever else they believed, Knox and his party held that the performance of the Mass was an act of the same nature as idol-worship: against which God's utter judgments had been pronounced. Influenced, like the Romanists, and, maybe, because they had been Papists, by the Old Testament rather than by the New Testament, they hesitated not to deal with the Mass

in the way that Moses treated idolatry. It is still a question whether the issue that was thus raised was not better than the wire-drawn reasonings, and distinctions, and word jugglings, by which some later thinkers have tried to disprove the plain accusation of the Bible-loving reformers. The two sides in the controversy were clear. To one the wafer was the body and blood of Christ, and was adored. To the other the "host" was simply manipulated dough. To adore that was of a piece with image-worship, against which the wrath of God had often burned. It was a plain putting of the case. And it can always be brought down to that alternative. They who bow down to a man-made form must seem to others to be idolaters, no matter how sincere they may be, and no matter how they baptize their act with specious names and periphrases. When Knox preached against the Queen's mass, and said that one mass in Scotland was more fearful to him than if 10,000 enemies had landed on their shores, he was jeered at by the courtiers, and told he was talking beside his text. But, then, whatever courtiers have been in the world of fashion, they have always been out of court in the world of conscience. The courtiers of Scotland were not worthy their Queen. On her arrival Mary was very prudent and gracious, as she could easily be. The influence of this was seen in a few days: for her sweet, young womanliness made many think that the questions then at issue were not of the vast importance that others thought; and brought about a loosening of the fibres of judgment in many. Mary made a mistake in sending for Knox, after his sermon. For their talk soon got out of the religious circle;

and Mary's consternation at being told by the friend of George Buchanan that "subjects" might resist and bind princes, was significant of how she had expected the land to lie before her. It was well that she had the real condition of things thus early brought up by one who, if he had the roughness of an Elijah or John the Baptist, had also the fearlessness of their zeal before kings and queens. They who admire the Hebrew prophets ought not to be offended by the more modern expression of their spirit.

The story of the Scotch Church, on from this time to the passing of Mary from the scene, is in a tangle with the political strife of the day. When the General Assembly met in Edinburgh in December, 1561, the Queen's friends among the reformers (for there were such), declined to be present, on the ground that the Assembly had no right to meet without the consent of the Queen. To which Knox's reply was,—“Take from us the freedom of Assemblies, and take from us the Evangel.” Then there followed the Queen's refusal to ratify the “Book of Discipline,” at which none could wonder. Among later requests of the Assembly was one for some fixed support to be given to the reformed preachers. Thereupon the Privy Council determined to leave two-thirds of the rich benefices of the church with the old papal clergy, and to divide the other third between the reformed ministers and the crown. On which Knox's caustic, but deserved comment was,—“I see two parts freely given to the devil, and the third must be divided between God and the devil.” And he evidently had no confidence that the poor ministers would get their

sixth. Both his feeling and fear are explained by what should not be forgotten, viz., that during the civil war the prelates and others had, in many instances, made over church property to their friends and dependants, and many of the earls and barons had seized other portions of church estates. These were the real holders of much of the church's wealth, though, nominally, the papal clergy were the possessors of it. The seeming generosity of the nobles to the older clergy was a real endowment of themselves. They did not even give the Queen her share of the division. Moray, Argyll, Erskine, and others, tapped the stream, and let only a mere trickle reach Mary. Poor, unhoused monks and nuns got very little. What could the reformed preachers and poorer clergy expect from the great plunderers? Only as much as, and no more than a half-drowned sailor might look for from pirates or wreckers. They got no more.

In the yet continuing controversy between the papal clergy and the reformers, the high dignitaries were, perhaps, too occupied in securing what estates they could for themselves to defend their church. They left it to take its chance, and the only defence of it at this time came from such noble hearts among the inferior clergy as Ninian Winzet, schoolmaster of Linlithgow, and others. His able defence of his church must have commanded the respect of his enemies. As to the commendation of the dignitaries of his church, such a man was honoured in being without it. His scathing indictment of the papal bishops and the plundering nobles is as forcible as anything Knox could have wished to say; and many a prelate must have had a



bad quarter of an hour, when he read the vigorous defence of the Roman faith that came from the pen of the upright priest of Linlithgow.

The Assemblies of the Reformed Church continued to be held half-yearly, generally in June and December. For the time, their work was largely that of arranging for the regular preaching of the Gospel in all parts of the kingdom. They did this work well. So, too, even their enemies have confessed that their zeal for purity of life in their ministers, contrasted with the immoral carelessness of the bishops and others. The Assembly's work was much hindered, as it was also much helped, by the feudal power of the nobles. One would take his district with him for reform. Another would keep his whole feudal following in the Roman way. But the work was steadily spreading, and getting a stronger footing wherever it found place to stand. And, taking it all together, there was quite as much healthy independence of those who were high in the State as could have been expected. There was frequently antagonism between the court party and the Assembly, though Mary's policy led her at times to go great lengths in favour or toleration of the reformers. This was because of her need of their aid to give her hope of succeeding to the English crown.

The relation of the reformed church in Scotland to the English church was somewhat singular at this time. Though many of the Protestant leaders in Scotland had no conscientious objection to Episcopacy, yet the English Church was episcopal with a headship in Queen Elizabeth that would have made the Scotch Assembly shiver, if any one had proposed such a thing among them. But there was ecclesi-

astical intercourse between the two churches, even to the sending and receiving of synodal letters about persons and church practices. Mary was clear-headed in estimating the value of the support of the English Protestants in case Elizabeth died ; and she could not hope for that support if the reformers in Scotland could call her their enemy. In consequence she went so far in favour of the reformers, at times, as to make some of the papal side think that she was only half-hearted to them, whatever she might be to the Protestants. But the continued friction between Mary and Knox must have shown all how impossible was any lasting friendliness between the two ; and without friendliness for Knox, no confidence was possible for the reformers in Mary. The interviews between the Queen and the preacher always ended in bitterness. Knox's sermon against the Queen's dancing, and another against her talked-of marriage, and other things widened the breach. And though Mary administered the law against the mass, even to imprisoning some of the priests and papal dignitaries who had dared to perform it, Knox never trusted her, and his antagonism was strong and unbending as ever. The Queen must have been greatly perplexed at this time. For in June, 1564, while she was in the fret of trying to keep in with both parties, and finding it miserable work at the best, Pope Pius IV. sent to her the Acts of the Council of Trent, urging her to dismiss all heretics from high offices of State. Literally, the Pope did not know what he was writing about, and had done far better if he had never written the letter. But when Mary and Secretary Maitland had the chance of laying hands on Knox, they almost jumped at

it. They thought they had him in a cleft stick, when he illegally convened the reformed leaders to be present at the trial of some Edinburgh rioters, whose zeal for reform had taken too violent shape. But Knox was too strong for them, and got a verdict in his favour in spite of them. It was the irregularity of this convention that led, in all likelihood, to the appointment of a moderator for the Assembly's meetings, from whom all summonses of the leaders might go. John Willock, Superintendent of Glasgow, was the first moderator, and the Assembly that he moderated in December, 1564, brought in "The Book of Common Order," by which the church services were to be regulated. This book was probably substituted for the English Book of Common Prayer.

The work of the reformers now became still more complicated and hindered by their association with the ambitious men who were led by the Earl of Moray. This party set itself against Mary's marriage with Henry Darnley, and even formed a league for armed resistance. But while in touch with their selfish scheming, the Assembly showed a nobler spirit and aim. When it met in June, 1565, it resolved on petitioning the Queen against the Mass and other sins: but earnestly prayed for some sure provision on behalf of the poor ministers; and for the appropriation of the revenues of the friars, to the maintenance of schools and the support of the poor. It also nobly asked, that poor labourers of the ground should be relieved of the "unreasonable payment of tithes, taken over their heads without their consent." This was better work than supporting the ambition of Moray, Argyll, and the like.

Mary and Darnley were married on July 29th, 1565 : and against it Knox preached, in the hearing of Darnley, three weeks after. Moray, with whom Knox was now reconciled after eighteen months' quarrel, broke out into open rebellion with his friends. Notwithstanding the hope of English support, the rising failed ; and the conspirators were driven out of Scotland. These things may have determined Mary to show herself more against the reformers than ever. She is said to have subscribed the Treaty of Bayonne, which was fathered by the Duke of Alva and mothered by Catherine de Medici, against "heretics." If she did so, it was one of Mary's great mistakes : for it could only do her harm. The Queen also boldly filled up vacant sees from the ranks of the Roman clergy : some of her nominees being far nobler men than their predecessors. But one of her nominations would have disgraced the worst days of the Scotch church ; though the nominee was believed to be favourable to the reformers. This was the designation of Alexander Campbell to the see of Brechin : who, when he was appointed, did what was expected of him, by handing over the property of the bishopric to his patron, the Earl of Argyll. About this time it is certain that the links between Mary and the papacy were drawn closer : for the new pope, Pius V., in July, 1566, sent a nuncio to her, with a subsidy of 100,000 crowns, to help her in her struggle. The nuncio was, however, frightened by what he heard in Paris of the state of Scotland, and never came to the Queen. He and Mary charged each other with lukewarmness for the failure of the mission.

The miserable events of the murder of Rizzio, the

probable murder of Darnley, and the brutal capture of Mary by Bothwell, whom she soon after married, affected all parts of the church directly and indirectly. If Knox was shamefully privy to the conspiracy against Rizzio, as some allege (he certainly approved it afterward), his name must bear the infamy. But his wrong-doing ought to be contrasted with the brave conduct of his colleague,—Craig,—who refused to marry Mary to Bothwell; and only consented on receipt of a document from Mary, ordering the banns to be published. Even then he said from the pulpit :—“ I take heaven and earth to witness, that I abhor and detest this marriage as odious and scandalous to the world : and seeing that the best part of the realm did approve it, either by flattery or by their silence, I would desire the faithful to pray earnestly that God will turn to the comfort of the realm that which is done against reason and conscience.” It was in the end of these miseries that the Assembly was sitting in June, 1567, with George Buchanan for Moderator. In that Assembly a league of the nobles that had been formed against Mary and Bothwell, put their signatures to a document, in which they promised all that the Reformed Church wanted; even to securing that the son of Mary and Darnley should be trained by four trusted reformers. The heir to the throne had been born on June 19th, 1566. His baptism on December 17th was the last public ceremonial in which the Romish bishops took part in Scotland. When Mary signed her abdication in Lochleven Castle on July 24th, 1567, and Moray was declared Regent on August 22nd, few could but see that the work of the reformation in Scotland was as good as accomplished,

and that the papal domination had really passed from the Church of Scotland. This was made clear by the acts of the parliament of December, 1567. That parliament re-enacted the statutes of 1560; bound the Church of Scotland to the lines laid down by the reformers; refused public office to any but those of the reformed faith: and provided that all future monarchs should swear at their coronation to maintain the reformation of religion. In the light of what were then far-off events, notably such as the Disruption of 1843, other enactments were of supreme importance. For instance, it was legislated—"that the examination and admission of ministers should lie with the church, and that the presentation should lie with the ancient laic patrons; but that if the patron failed to present a properly qualified person to the superintendent within six months, the right of presentation should lapse to the church. In the event of the superintendent refusing to induct the presentee of the patron, it was provided that there might be an appeal to the provincial synod, and from the provincial synod to the General Assembly, whose sentence was to be final."\* But the "First Book of Discipline" had not been sanctioned. Nor was it likely to be so far as its proposals for church property were concerned: for on one side there was the greed of the nobles, which seemed to grow by opportunity of indulgence; and on the other was the fact, which was almost contradictory of recent legislation, that the papal hierarchy in Scotland still constituted, and were recognized as forming, the Third Estate of the realm.

\* *Vide* Cunningham, Vol. I., p. 415.

The General Assembly of December, 1567, was chiefly disciplinary; and showed the earnest purpose of the reformers to keep their church pure from the scandals that had degraded the papal community. Before their next session Mary was a prisoner in England, at the tender mercies of Elizabeth. So Mary Stewart passed from directly affecting the Church of Scotland. The next meeting of the Assembly, in July, 1568, showed the growing spirit of the Reformed Church against the interference and domination of the secular power. For they then ordered the printer of a book called "The Fall of the Roman Kirk," to call in the book, because in it he had styled the King "the Supreme Head of the Primitive Church." What the printer meant, or the writer, was best known to himself; but the ordinary meaning of such words was not to be allowed by men whose allegiance was to Christ alone in the church. The assassination of the Regent Moray in January, 1570, brought in a time of renewed trouble for the Reformed Church. The regents who followed were not favourable to the Protestants as Moray had been. They were rather heads of a party that had the King in charge, against the party that were plotting and fighting for the imprisoned mother of the King.

Regent Lennox hung the last papal archbishop of St. Andrews, John Hamilton, on a charge of complicity in the murders of Darnley and Moray. Hamilton was an able man; but it is a poor thing that the best that can be said of the last Primate of Scotland is that "he was a prelate of great ability and respectable learning. His private life, like that of too many of his order, was

irregular.”\* After his death the papal members of the chapter of St. Andrews elected Robert Hay to the see, but he was never consecrated. Thus, and in other ways, the ecclesiastical holders of church property were dying out, without any to succeed them in legal tenure of the lands of the see, or give leases to the tenants. This gave fresh opportunities to the lay plunderers that they were quick to seize. For, by the parliament of August, 1571, it was enacted that all such leaseholders and tenants should, for the future, hold their land directly from the King. He being a minor, it would have been against all Scotch tradition among the nobles, if they did not make much for their own pockets out of this. But it would have been more honest to have openly confiscated the whole, instead of scrambling for the estates and benefices of the church, as mud-larks do for pence. It was not so honourable, and it was quite as dirty as the mud-larks’ way. The Reformed Church’s claim for help was as bad as laughed at. “The Archbishop of St. Andrews was scarcely cut down from his gallows when the Earl of Morton got a gift of his archbishopric (*i.e.*, the estates) from Regent Lennox. Morton then gave it to the rector of the University, ‘for a consideration.’” Whereupon Knox, who preached on the day of the new archbishop’s admission, pronounced an anathema on both patron and prelate. But—and this was the main thing with them—they had the plunder.

It was to meet this condition of things that an irregular convention of the church was held at Leith in January, 1572, by which commissioners were appointed to meet

\* Grub, Vol. II., p. 169.



with others selected by the Privy Council. When they met they easily came to singularly unanimous judgment—that names of prelates and bounds of dioceses should be as before the Reformation, the bishops having power like superintendents, with subjection to the General Assembly; that abbots and priors should still be parts of the spiritual estate, with a little more care taken in their admission, and with support when admitted; that qualified ministers should be put all over the country and supported, after signing the Confession of Faith and giving oath of allegiance to the King; and that all deaneries, provostries of college churches, prebends and chaplaincies founded on temporal lands, should be given to students in grammar, arts, theology, law, and medicine. On these lines of compromise, which were not yet accepted by the Assembly, presentations were quickly and profitably made to bishoprics, etc. The “noble” patrons kept the greater part of the revenues, and gave the titles to their nominees. Hence the bitter saying of Adamson,—“There be three kinds of bishops: my lord bishop, my lord’s bishop, and the Lord’s bishop. My lord bishop was in the papistry; my lord’s bishop is now, when my lord gets the fat of the benefice, and the bishop makes his title sure; the Lord’s bishop is the true minister of the Gospel.” Thus began what were afterwards known as “Tulchan bishops,” who were put up to make sure of the easy flow of the church’s money to the lords. The Assembly of March 6th, 1572, accepted the agreement, with protest against the various papist titles that were retained; and equal protest that they received all only as “an interim.” By this means a species of

episcopacy was for the time retained in the Reformed church of Scotland. Archbishops and Bishops sat in the General Assembly, but only as simple members. Knox in the main agreed to the compromise, but early in the progress of it he wrote to the Assembly of 1571 against the simony that any one could see was running freely, and would be strengthened by the new arrangement. Knox died at the end of the year of the compromise, on November 24th, 1572; worn or wearied out, yet seeing more of the fruit of his toil than is given to many men, in the struggles of religious and political parties. Far from perfect, he will yet compare with any of his time, and not suffer from the comparison. It was over his yet open grave that the Earl of Morton, recently made Regent and no friend to the reformed preachers, said—"There lies one who neither feared nor flattered flesh."

## CHAPTER XI

Andrew Melville—Abolition of Episcopacy—"Second Book of Discipline"—Scotch Presbyterianism *v.* Stewart Episcopalianism—Assembly's Petition to the King—Romanist Hopes—James' wish to Restore Episcopalianism—His Success—Rising against James—Recovery of Presbyterianism—"Magna Charta of the Church of Scotland," 1592.

FOR two or three years the General Assembly met chiefly to report and administer discipline. The compromise with episcopacy and "tulchan bishops" was working; but notwithstanding the support of the Regent Morton, it is clear that it was going the way of all compromises. It would almost appear that Knox and others had no objection to episcopacy in itself: but another spirit was growing in the sessions of the Assembly. For the Assembly of 1575, moderated by the Bishop of Glasgow, had business to do, that evidences the continuance of some of the old and forbidden religious customs; and also betokens the rising of objections against the episcopal form of government, as being unlawful because not consistent with the Word of God. This, in all probability, was due to the growing influence of Andrew Melville; who, perhaps more than any other, had to do with the

establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland. This was that Melville with whom the chief patron of the "tulchan episcopate"—Morton the Regent—had so sharp a tussle, when his mean attempt at bribery failed. Morton said: "There will never be quietness in this country till half a dozen of you be hanged or banished." To which Melville answered,—“Tush! threaten your courtiers in that way: it is all the same to me whether I rot in the air or the ground. The earth is the Lord's. My fatherland is wherever well-doing is. I have been ready to give my life, where it would not have been half so well spent, at the pleasure of my God. I lived out of your country as well as in it. Let God be glorified. It is out of your power to hang or exile His truth.”\* Melville had come back to Scotland in 1574 from Geneva, full of the effects of communion with the French exiles, who had been driven away from France by the massacre of St. Bartholomew. He was quickly made Principal of Glasgow University: for he was a notable scholar. When, then, John Durie rose in the Assembly of August 1575, and challenged the divine origin of episcopacy, and later on, when the Assembly had the question put,—whether bishops, as now in Scotland, have their function in the Word of God, and whether chapters for creating them should be tolerated in this reformed church?—Melville's speech against both bishops and chapters wrought a great effect. The committee that was appointed to consider and report on the question, answered—that it was inexpedient to answer the first question; and that the name of bishop rightly belonged to

\* *Vide* Melville's Diary.

every minister who had the charge of the congregation : but that some might be chosen for convenience to oversee districts. In agreement with this, the Assembly of 1576 required the bishops who were without charge, to immediately choose the congregation to which they would minister. Carrying on the same work, the Assembly of 1578 forbade titles of honour to bishops : and in that of 1580, "the whole Assembly of the Kirk, in one voice, found and declared the pretended office of a bishop to be unlawful, having neither foundation nor warrant in the Word of God, and ordained all such persons as brooked the said office to demit the same as an office to which they were not called by God, and to cease from preaching the Word, or administering the sacraments, till they should be admitted anew by the General Assembly, under pain of excommunication."\* Thus the Assembly of the Church of Scotland put aside all unbrotherly difference of rank and degree in the Church, and assigned to the preachers the higher status of simple ministers of the Gospel of Christ. The fuller consequence of this was the acceptance of "The Second Book of Discipline," in 1581. This notable document, though it did not formally enunciate Presbyterianism, was a clear indication that the Church was steadily moving in that direction. A more distinct position was taken against secular patrons. Patronage was taken from the crown and nobility, and given to the Eldership and the Congregation: the latter having (and this is worthy of note) the right of consent or refusal in the appointment of any minister :

\* Book of the Universal Kirk. Quoted by Cunningham.

while the Eldership had judicial power of election and removal. This, for the time, was one of the most important questions that could come before the Assembly : and later history showed the wisdom of their judgment. But though lay patronage was thus opposed, the magistrate was required to defend the Church, to provide for it and to see to the carrying out of its sentences, without intruding on the Church's jurisdiction. To secure this was to prove a harder thing than they thought. In the Assembly of the following year a still more distinct step was taken in favour of Presbyterianism. For on a commission from the King, it was determined to divide the churches of the country into fifty presbyteries, and to begin by the immediate formation of presbyteries in the larger towns.

While these events seemed to make surely for the Presbyterian settlement of religion, other influences began to bring sore difficulties and trials. The boy-king now came under the will of his favourites—the two Stewarts : one his Frenchified cousin, Esme Stewart, and the other Captain Stewart, the younger son of Lord Ochiltree. Esme Stewart was made Duke of Lennox, and Captain Stewart was created Earl of Arran. Under their influence the nature of James, which never advanced beyond a cunning boyishness, was turned against the Presbyterian Assembly in favour of Episcopalianism, with an accompanying inclination on the part of the King to be the pope of the new episcopacy. The articles submitted by Archbishop Adamson to the English archbishops must have been peculiarly pleasant to the awkward precocity of the young King, because of the combination they suggest of the regal

and papal power. James and his ill-mannered favourites soon began to clash with the Assembly. The death of the Archbishop of Glasgow brought about the first and a characteristic difficulty. Lennox thought that he might get hold of the revenues of the see, by appointing some minister who would engage to "convey" them to him for the "consideration" of the title and some part of the endowment. He found his man in Montgomery, the minister of Stirling, who agreed to make over to Lennox and his heirs everything belonging to the bishopric, on receipt of an annual payment of £1,000 (Scots), with some horse fodder and poultry. The Assembly of 1581 refused, in a very unsatisfactory way, to institute Montgomery. The following March he tried to take possession of the cathedral, with the Privy Council on his side. To the act of the Council, the Assembly replied by refusing to acknowledge its authority in ecclesiastical matters. The Assembly of April, 1582, persisted against Montgomery: and the King sent a messenger at arms to inhibit their acts, on pain of rebellion. Notwithstanding this, the Assembly were about to excommunicate Montgomery, when he submitted to them, and relinquished the bishopric. But he did not keep his word: and on his pretensions being resumed, the Glasgow Presbytery met. They were opposed by the Privy Council, acting through the Provost of Glasgow and others, who violently attacked the Moderator and put him in the Tollbooth. The Presbytery, however, kept to their duty: and on their report, the Edinburgh Presbytery excommunicated Montgomery. This was the first of the contests between Scotch Presbyterianism and Stewart

Episcopalianism, of which the history for some time was to be sadly full.

This first fight, however, was not yet finished. The Assembly met on June 27th, 1582. Melville preached the sermon, and struck a note that was repeated time after time, even to the troubles of the Disruption of 1843. He protested against the absolute authority "whereby many intended to pull the crown off Christ's head, and to wring the sceptre out of His hands." "The crown rights of Christ" was a rallying cry then and long after. The Assembly, in the spirit of Melville's protest, sent commissioners to the king at Perth: and when their petition of grievance was read, Arran called out—"Who dare subscribe these treasonable articles?" To which Melville immediately answered,—“We dare, and will subscribe them, and give our lives to the cause.” Thereupon all the commissioners signed the paper. This cowed Arran: and being soon after followed by "the Raid of Ruthven," as the capture of the King at Ruthven Castle on August 22nd, 1582, was called, the holding of supreme power was transferred for awhile. Arran was imprisoned, and Lennox was driven out of Scotland. This was felt and even declared to be a great relief of pressure on the Assembly, though they must have known that there was little sympathy in the young King, with the principles for which they were ready to suffer.

The influence of Lennox with the King had naturally revived and stimulated both the hopes and efforts of the Romanists in Scotland. To the papal authorities Scotland was once more coming to be a mission country, with Jesuits



for missionaries. So early as 1579 some members of the newly-formed "Society of Jesus" had landed in Scotland; and having France for their base of operations, they worked with hope for the restoration of the country to papal obedience. In July, 1581, Mary in England wrote to Pope Gregory XIII. for help to the college at Pont-à-Mousson, afterwards at Douai; and also for the Scotch college in Paris; in hope that thereby young men might be trained for mission service in Scotland. It seems certain that the Jesuit emissaries were favourably received by Lennox, notwithstanding his pretended conversion to the reformed faith. In consequence of his favour to them, Jesuit agents were sent to Rome and Spain to get, if possible, money for an expedition to Scotland. But the "Raid of Ruthven" ended the hope of help from Lennox.

The Assembly of April, 1583, legislated as if there were no possibility of altering its decisions: but in June the King escaped, and once more the tables were turned. No violent action was at first taken by James who, however, could not forgive the exile and death of his favourite Lennox. But the next year the Assembly was, naturally enough, required by James to retract its approval of the "Raid of Ruthven." The members waived the question, "on account of the small number present." They soon found that the King was bent on establishing Episcopalianism. He found a ready helper in Adamson, Archbishop of St. Andrews, who had recently come back from conference with those peculiar ecclesiastics—the Elizabethan bishops in England. It is not difficult to see how fascinating the mixture of king and pope in his own strange

person was to James Stewart. The Parliament of May, 1584, subserviently helped him by as bad as ratifying his kingship and creating his popeship, in the subordinating the episcopate to the regal supremacy. In fact, Episcopalianism was established in Scotland, with James VI. as its head! That church and its head were fitly matched. The power of the Assembly and the presbyteries was handed over to a Scotch episcopate. But, to accept the supremacy of the King, and such a king, in things spiritual, was to take the heart out of the Church of Scotland. To allow a James VI. to be a creator of bishops, they being literally his creatures, and to have no appeal beyond or beside the King, was a thing impossible to the Scotch Kirk. The opposition of the Assembly was, however, for a time fruitless. Melville and others had to fly. But "the black acts," as they were called, were so hated by the people, that a bishop hardly dared to show himself in the streets. Thus far the despicable scheme of making the Scotch monarchy like that of England, and supreme in Church and State, had the appearance of success. Yet the workers of the project could scarcely have congratulated one another on the result. A saving clause in the deed of submission that ministers were required to sign, drew in a number, by signature "agreeably to the Word of God." Others were fiercely dealt with by Arran, acting for King and bishops. Even such ministers as Craig and Durie were silenced. An exile wrote that all were silent "except a very few who sigh and sob under the cross." Protestant Episcopacy seemed at length to be fixed in Scotland; with James as Head of the Church, and Arran for his vicar-general.

Again secular strife brought the wheel round. At the end of 1585 Maxwell, a Romanist lord who had quarrelled with Arran, leagued with some of the exiled nobles against the favourite. They marched on Stirling and there captured the Head of the Church. Arran escaped: and the King, with the charity that befitted the Church's Head, received the conspirators into favour. But though this relieved the strain on the presbyteries, it brought them no favour with James. He emptied his very vulgar vocabulary in abuse on them; and the lords told the ministers that they (the lords) must look to their own interest first (when ever had a Scotch lord done anything else?), and that then the church should have its turn. When some of the returned preachers talked against these things in the pulpit, they were promptly sent off to prison. So, too, was Lord Maxwell, for having Mass and Christmas junketing, in 1585.


The General Assembly resumed its sessions in May, 1586, during which the conduct of Archbishop Adamson came under sharp review. He submitted to the judgment of the Assembly: who then resolved that an act of excommunication pronounced against Adamson by the Synod of Fife, should be considered as not given. In the later sittings of the Assembly a recognition of bishops was made: but they were to be subject to the provincial synod; to present to vacant benefices only according to the judgment of the local presbytery; and to have all their conduct under the review of the General Assembly. In this arrangement, and by the way in which it was brought about, Episcopalianism in Scotland was un-

doubtedly weakened ; and the strength of the presbyteries was once more acknowledged.

The Assembly of 1587 went beyond this. It assumed the aggressive against the episcopate vigorously ; for it sent to the meeting of the Three Estates in July commissioners, who asked for the removal of the prelates from parliament, as having no right of representing the Assembly. But though the petition or demand was not granted, an act was passed that weakened the episcopate, quite as much as acceding to the Assembly's request would have done : for the temporalities of all the bishoprics were annexed to the Crown. And, as if to show increased favour to the presbyteries, the King took a Presbyterian chaplain with him when he went to Denmark for a wife ; where he was married by the chaplain. So, too, when the new queen came to Scotland she was crowned by one of the Edinburgh ministers : and the King took so early opportunity as the next Sunday, to indulge his fondness for speech-making, by thanking the ministers and people in the High-church for the nation's quiet while he had been away in Denmark. He made a number of good-boy-promises for the future. This he repeated at the Assembly of August, 1590, in what reads now like an incredibly absurd and insincere speech. His good-will to the Assembly lasted long enough to give it opportunity for making its position still more secure. But James' necessity drove him in that direction, and in 1592 he found it wise to yield to some of the Assembly's demands. For the Parliament that met in June of that year decreed, in answer to the Assembly, the liberty of the Church, with

legal authority to its courts, and the abrogation of the acts of 1584. Presentations were transferred from the bishops to the presbyteries, on condition of receiving any qualified ministers who were presented by the patrons. This did not go as far as the Assembly wanted : but it went far enough to give the victory to the presbyter in his long conflict with the prelate. With this, which has been called the Magna Charta of the Church of Scotland, the rule of the Palace practically ended, and the rule of the Presbytery began ; though, for a time, domination of the Palace was asserted, with a daring that was matched only by its ignorant insolence.

THE RULE OF PRESBYTERS



## CHAPTER XII

Presbyterian Difficulties — Persecution of Romanists — Melville and James — Desire of James to Restore Episcopalianism — The "Gowrie Conspiracy" — James in the "Promised Land."

THOUGH the Presbytery was now acknowledged to be successful and the most ruling force in Scotch church affairs, it entered, in the moment of its triumph, on its greatest struggle. Both the history of the Assembly and the general records of the time tell how great its difficulties were. A still half-barbarous people who were most barbarous where they were most papalized; a peasantry whose vices the presbytery would not cloak, but lament and try to cleanse; a vigorous Romish mission ever zealously trying to win back its deservedly lost hold on Scotland; the Pope and Spain ready to stir up and subsidize expeditions against Scotland, or use the country as a base of operations against England; the greater part of the church estates held by the earls and barons with a grip that made recovery or redemption of the property impossible; the country still largely under the influence of the older and merrier customs, that mixed religion and nonsense till the mixture was a blend, in which the



nonsense often predominated ; a King whose foxy cunning enabled him to see that the democratic principles of the New Testament, as represented by the Presbytery, were against his mean ideas of kingship and rule ;—these things, and others like them, almost prescribed a direction and limit to the life and work of the Presbytery, that were difficult, if not dangerous. Especially was danger to be looked for from the King. The fascination of the Tudor episcopate in England was luring James. To have bishops as Elizabeth had ; to be half the man in man's clothes that she was in women's dress, would have delighted him ; and he tried to get these things in his own singular fashion. When Elizabeth died, and with the Tudor bishops about him, it ought to have been possible for James to figure in masculine dress without reproach. But a Scotch presbytery always made James feel such a little creature, and pose like a short man trying to look tall. When he became the Head of the Church in England, the mention of presbytery was only a temptation for James to use bad language in a most uncanonical fashion.

One early and, it maybe, inevitable mistake of the Presbyterians was the vain attempt to combine the great privileges and powers of an Establishment with a high church independence of the secular power. They were not the last to try the vain experiment. This independence, while Christian enough in the New Testament fashion, will always be a failure when linked with legalized exclusive authority and secular dignity. If Church and State are to play that game together, each will have to knuckle down in turn with the changes in the play. But

history shows that the State will generally manage to get the Church down the more frequently. The State in this can get its way without much sense of shame, and with great gain : but the Church always plays its part with loss and disgrace. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland was soon to prove this, as the English Episcopal church has often done.

It can be easily understood, but it is none the less to be greatly regretted, that the Assembly showed itself so hot and eager in persecuting the Romanists. The power to persecute was a temptation. True, it was paying back the papal party in their own coin : but it was dirty and dishonourable coinage, at best. And among the few things for which men have to thank James VI. is his holding the reins somewhat tightly when the Scotch ministers would have run almost headlong in persecuting the Papists. Though it is well known, that if James could have gained one pound Scots by it, he would have persecuted as badly as any. When Dr. Ker was caught at the Cumbraes with most compromising papers about him, and the lords Huntly, Angus and Errol were involved in an uprising, the Assembly petitioned the King, in the spring of 1593, to pass laws that would have instituted an inquisition in Scotland. The Parliament of July did follow the lead of the Assembly in this direction to some extent ; but it was denounced by one of the ministers as " a black parliament," because it did not go far enough in persecuting. This freedom, not to say license, in the pulpit always irritated James : and not without cause. The ministers did not spare anything or any one. The Queen's way of

passing time ; the episcopal baptism of James' son ; his own foul language, &c., were all reviewed and censured, as if he were no more than a huckster in the Canongate. All this had its very noble side ; and no one can say but that the men who took up such a position to king and court, were always ready to abide the consequences of their actions.

The Assembly of May, 1594, in spite of the King, ratified a sentence of excommunication that the Synod of Fife had passed on the Romanist lords Huntly and Errol ; though where the jurisdiction of the Synod came in is a puzzle. But though this was irregular, the ministers soon had their opportunity. For an act of oblivion had been passed, with the hearty consent of the King, on the two papist earls ; with some provisions of which they did not comply. In consequence, the Parliament of that year gave commission to the very willing Earl of Argyll to pursue them with fire and sword. But he being well and shamefully beaten, James himself took the field, with some of the presbyters accompanying him in mail, and harried the estates of the outlawed earls. This broke the organized power of the Romanists ; and soon after the two earls left Scotland, in March 1595. This gave to James the rare, and almost new, delight of the expressed approval of the presbyteries. And when the Assembly met in March 1596, while it touched dangerous ground, the King was in too good humour with himself, in the new character of military victor, and reconciled husband (for he had been quarrelling with his wife), to find much fault. After a day of mourning over sins and offences, in connection with which James

had a deputation to set his sins before his face, the Assembly dissolved, and went home with great self-congratulation.

During the summer of 1596 the Estates of the Realm, though opposed by the ministers, agreed to recall the Romanist earls Huntly and Errol. They were not very far off, having returned to Scotland secretly. Thereupon a deputation of the ministers remonstrated with the King, Andrew Melville speaking to him after this fashion:—"And, therefore, sir, as divers times before, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland. There is Christ Jesus the King, and His kingdom the Kirk, whose subject King James VI. is, and of whose kingdom, not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. And they whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over His Church, and govern His spiritual kingdom, have sufficient power and authority of Him so to do, both together and severally, which no Christian king should control or discharge, but fortify and assist. And, sir, when you were in your swaddling clothes, Christ Jesus reigned freely in this land, and His officers and ministers convened for the ruling and welfare of His Church, which was ever for your welfare, defence and preservation. As to the wisdom of your counsel, which I call devilish and pernicious, it is this, that you must be served by all sorts of men to come to your purpose and grandeur, Jew and Gentile, Papist and Protestant: but because the ministers and Protestants in Scotland are too strong, and control the king, they must be weakened and brought low, by stirring up a party opposed to them: and the king being equal and indifferent,

both shall be fain to fly to him : so shall he be well served. But, sir, if God's wisdom be the only true wisdom, this will prove mere mad folly, for His curse can but light upon it."\* This and similar talk and acts will serve to explain the scanty love that James had for Presbyterians, and his vast appreciation of bishops trained by Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth. The deputation to James was soon followed by the appointment of a committee of safety, called the Council of the Church, who were to live in Edinburgh and see that the Church took no harm. This Council was a standing menace to the King. In the same month in which this was done, David Black preached a sermon full of abuse of Elizabeth, James, his wife, the Lords of Session, &c. It was an all-round censure. He was summoned for it before the Privy Council, but refused to acknowledge its jurisdiction, the other ministers backing him up. They, in fact, went so far as to send an appeal in support of Black to all presbyteries. This angered James exceedingly ; and Black's trial being carried on, he was sentenced to imprisonment. This only made bad worse, and on a report that the King had private converse with one of the popish lords, a riot broke out in the streets of Edinburgh. The next day James went to Linlithgow, removing the courts of law from Edinburgh. The Privy Council declared the riot to be treason, and the burgesses of the city became fearful and anxious for the welfare of the capital. They, therefore, submitted to James, who entered Edinburgh as a conqueror on January 1st, 1597, when the ministers had to fly.

\* Melville's Diary : quoted by Cunningham.

From this time some detect in James VI. signs of a deliberate aim at restoring episcopacy in the Scotch church. He summoned a meeting of the Assembly at Perth for the last day of February 1597, having previously circulated fifty-five questions among the members, the purpose of which, at the mildest, could be only to suggest dissatisfaction with the then condition of church ways and discipline. The north-country ministers attended the Perth Assembly in large numbers; and it does not appear to have been difficult to stir jealousy in them against the "popes of Edinburgh." Notwithstanding that the lawfulness of the Assembly was challenged by those who did not like the King's way, the attendants constituted themselves, and pleased the King by agreeing to all he wanted in the fifty-five questions. Delighted with this, James took on him to summon another Assembly for May 10th at Dundee; at which he appeared in person, making very promising suggestions of help, and proposing that a standing body, chosen out of the Assembly, should be appointed to confer with him as to the best way of doing the pleasant things he held out. The adoption of this was the beginning of James' episcopate, and was seen to be such by Melville's party. "It was as a wedge taken out of the church, to rend her with her own forces, and the very needle that drew in the thread of bishops."\* Previously, in the same Assembly, the King had brought the members round to agreeing, that his sanction should be deemed essential to the validity of the acts of all future Assemblies. It was like giving up a birthright; and they who agreed to it could

\* Calderwood.

have had no high conception of the nature and promise of the Church's counsels and work. The parliament of December, in answer to an appeal from the commissioners of the Assembly, agreed that so many of the ministers as the King might choose to be prelates should sit in parliament, with power of voting, as in time past. What was now wanted was to get the Assembly's consent. Still keeping the meeting in the north, or in touch with it, James held the next Assembly at Dundee, in March 1598. Andrew Melville was ruled out of the Assembly, as having no right to attend. During the debate on this, one of the ministers got up and told the too dictatorial King,—“ Sir, you are to remember that you sit not here as imperator, but as a Christian.” James must have been well pleased with the way things were going, for he let this pass. By a small majority, secured by the northern ministers, the Assembly voted as the King wished. James' chief efforts were now persistently set against the Presbytery. The year 1599 saw the unintended publication of the “Basili-con Doron,” a book of instruction written by the King for his son Henry. In this he poured out his heart in abuse of the “Puritans.” When it was known by the Assembly, the indignation was intense. But James was getting his way ; for in 1600 the General Assembly, again meeting in the north at Montrose, arranged for the carrying out of the King's wish, and, though with many restrictions, determined to be represented in parliament by “commissioners.” The word “bishop” was as yet intolerable to them. James agreed to the conditions, for he was getting the substance of his scheme ; but even Archbishop Spottiswood said,—“it

was neither the King's intention, nor the mind of the wiser sort, to have these cautions stand in force." The vacant bishoprics of Ross and Caithness were at once filled up by the appointment of King's favourers. This was significant of James' purpose in all that had been done. The last year of the century did not end without further trouble between the King and the Edinburgh ministers. The "Gowrie Conspiracy" had made a noise, and some of the ministers of the capital seem to have been sceptical as to the conspiracy and the King's danger in it. Some even said that the conspiracy was all on the other side, having, as the result, the death of the young Earl of Gowrie and his brother. But James required every one to be very thankful for his deliverance from the Ruthvens; who, apparently, had tried to seize him and govern through him, as had often been done with other kings. James would have the weekly service changed from Friday to Tuesday, in commemoration of the deliverance for which he thought no one could be too thankful. The scepticism of the Edinburgh ministers, either about the asserted deliverance, or the value of it, if it were as the King said, led to the interdicting of some from preaching in Scotland. If they would not publicly thank God for the King's gladness, they should not preach Christ's gospel. The Church agreed to the change of days for a while; but neither the "Gowrie Conspiracy" nor the later "Gunpowder Plot" could create a St. James Stewart for the Scotch Kirk. Every one will acknowledge that it must have been very galling to James, to have such a matter left as at least an open question before God and man.



The year 1601 gave James an opportunity that was after his own heart. It was shown to the Assembly that met in May, that there were many errors in the translation of the Scriptures, which might be easily altered ; and that changes were desirable in the metrical psalms and the liturgy. On these things James descanted to the wonder and delight of the Assembly ; and the result was, that the most learned ministers were charged to see to the better translation of the Bible ; and all were asked to make suggestions for the improvement of the liturgy. This was good work : and, like his favour to the still young university of Edinburgh, was to the credit of James VI. It may be that out of this the new version of the English Bible came. For, only two years after that Assembly, James was what he had long craved to be—King of England and genuine Head of a Church, through the death of Queen Elizabeth on the 24th of March, 1603. On Sunday, April 3rd, James went to St. Giles' church ; and after the sermon made a speech of farewell, in which, with many kind expressions, there were some droll suggestions, that only James could have originated. On May 6th he was in London ; “the Promised Land,” as he called it : and was soon at work preparing the country for the beheading of his younger son, and the destruction of his house.

### CHAPTER XIII

James' Interference with the Assembly—A "Bishop's Parliament."—  
Andrew Melville in James' Power—Further Interference with the  
Assembly—"Court of High Commission"—The Assembly Episco-  
palian, and the Episcopate Anglicized—The Romanists in Scotland  
—James in Edinburgh—"The Perth Articles."

It was altogether more to James' heart to be among bishops, and especially those of as servile a type as the Church has ever seen. Doubtless it was going far enough in one direction for Andrew Melville to call James "God's silly, *i.e.* simple vassal," to his face and to refuse his dominance in Church affairs: but it was much worse, and going farther in the other direction, for an English archbishop, at the Hampton Court Conference with the Puritans, to cry out in response to the King's coarse discursiveness,—“undoubtedly your majesty speaks by the special assistance of God's Spirit.” Better anything of Melville's than that. As James abused the Puritans and presbyteries in the conference, and patted the Episcopalians with “no bishop, no king,” so in the Parliament of 1604 he insulted the Puritans by a depreciatory comparison of them with the Romanists. After such things it could

scarcely have surprised the Scotch Assembly, to find the meeting of that year arbitrarily prorogued by the King to the next year. And when July 1605 came, a circular letter from the King's Commissioner was sent to the presbyteries to stay their representatives from coming to the Assembly. Only nineteen appeared; and they dissolved with a protest and an adjournment to September. For this, some of the ministers, on the representation of the Commissioner, were cast into prison; and on October 14th were brought before the Privy Council. They refused to acknowledge its authority in the Church. James, stirred by the "Gunpowder Plot," sent down to Edinburgh to have them tried for treason; and the trial is well described by Lord Hailes thus:—"we see here, the prime minister, in order to obtain a sentence agreeable to the King, address the judges with promises and threats, pack the jury, and then deal with them without scruple or ceremony." The result of the trial was the sentence of the ministers to prison, there to wait the King's pleasure; which came in the form of perpetual banishment, on pain of death for return to Scotland.

The Scotch Parliament of 1606 showed the changed condition of the Church. The archbishops and bishops rode in lordly procession between the earls and barons. Both archbishops were now Protestants. Glasgow had been held up to this time by Archbishop Beaton, a Romanist, resident in Paris; whom the King had allowed to have the benefice till he died. On his death it was given to Spottiswood; and he it was who rode with Gladstones of St. Andrews, in the self-asserting unbrotherliness of the

Episcopate, among the secular lords of the realm. Blackburn, bishop of Aberdeen, "thought such pomp unbecoming the simplicity of a minister, and walked to parliament." This was altogether a bishop's parliament. Its chief work was to arrange the holding of the property of the various sees. Secure in this, the bishops had time to contend for precedence ; which was probably ended by a letter of the Archbishop of St. Andrews to the King as the fount of honour and wisdom, in which he begged the monarch "to give instructions as to the precedence of the archbishops and bishops." And this was while their former brethren were lying in prison at the risk of death.

James now felt missionary zeal towards the Presbyterians of Scotland. Only he reversed the missionary custom, and sent for those he wanted to convert. He summoned eight of the Scotch ministers as of one side, and five of the Scotch bishops as of the other, to Hampton Court, for a course of conversion and establishing in the King's favourite religion. The presbyterians, every one a man of mark, were taken to the episcopal church, and for a succession of days were preached to, and preached at, in the presence of the court, by three English bishops and a dean, on the rights of the Episcopate, the supremacy of the Crown in religion, and the impiety of the office of lay elder. If a question were asked as to the argument and divinity of the sermons, the preachers might have fair claim made to have anticipated some modern medical theories ; for the degree and extent of dilution certainly made this course homœopathic in treatment, though not curative in results. A more imbecile, irritating, and insulting arrangement and

dealing with sane and cultured men cannot be imagined. Small wonder need there be that Melville lost patience, when, after the course of preaching, he and his brethren were refused return to Scotland. The pity was that he gave the silly King the chance that James wanted. For having written some satirical Latin verses on the altar furniture of the Chapel Royal, Andrew Melville was summoned before the Council. There he so far lost control of himself as to take hold of the lawn sleeves of Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, and denounce his dress as "Romish rags"; and charge Bancroft himself with being the author of an offensive book against the King of Scotland. For this Melville was committed to the Tower, where he was imprisoned three years; being at the end allowed to leave the country. He went to Sedan, where he was made professor of divinity. He lived for a while longer, but in broken health. James must surely have felt that he was in "the Land of Promise" when he found himself on the English throne, with obsequious bishops and courtiers, and Andrew Melville in the Tower of London. As to the decency or legality of the detention of Melville, it would have been too much to expect James and Bancroft to interest themselves in such matters. With all his faults, Andrew Melville was too good and great a man to have been at the disposal of such as the King and the English Primate. He unfortunately gave them their chance. They made the most of it. The same year the sentence was carried out on the imprisoned ministers in Scotland. They were banished the country for holding an Assembly of their church. A vast gathering of people sang the exiles

into a good heart with the 23rd Psalm on the sands of Leith, after prayer by Welsh, one of the sentenced, and a son-in-law of John Knox. With the old words of trust ringing in their hearts they sailed to exile, as so many were to do before the country had its final settlement with the Stewarts. Other ministers were sent to the most desolate parts of the country.

The ground being now almost clear of any opponents whom James feared, he wanted an Assembly. But even the King did not dare to call it a "General Assembly." That stood fixed in church order for the following July. But in December 1607 an Assembly, nominated by missive of the King, and therefore in no sense representative of the presbyteries, met at Linlithgow. The King's letter said what was to be done. They were to decide that every presbytery should have a perpetual moderator. The meeting agreed to this, even nominating moderators—the bishops in every case being moderators in their episcopal cities. But the churches and some of the presbyteries protested, and a few of the nominated moderators would not have the honour that degraded their church. The General Assembly of July 1608 strengthened itself against Romanism by resolutions against the Jesuits and the unreconciled papist lords, but gave more solidity to the position of the bishops. All the new features of the bishops' power had been continued unchallenged, and they were gradually being allowed to accumulate a vested interest in their own conceit and consequence. The next step was taken by the parliament of June 1609, by which the bishops were permitted to re-erect their consistorial

courts. This, in turn, prepared for the act of the King, who, by an audacious exercise of "prerogative," erected a "Court of High Commission" for each of the archbishops. There was to be no appeal from the sentence of these courts. They could summon, fine, imprison, and depose as they pleased. The name of the Commission was already disliked in England, as marking the favourite means of Tudor tyranny. Now the obnoxious thing was to be in Scotland, giving arbitrary power to each archbishop, as president of the Commission, with any four seculars, to depose and excommunicate any minister. And at the time this was done the archbishops, according to the law of the land, were only simple ministers of the Scotch Kirk. Work of this sort was peculiarly congenial to James, and so was the next serious undertaking of parliament on his behalf—viz., to arrange by law for the colour, fashion, &c., of the dress of the ministers and lawyers. Now it was that the black gown was imposed legally. And thus it came, according to some, that "Black Prelacy" was contrasted with "True Blue Presbyterianism"; the black gown of the Episcopalian being in sharp separation from the blue gown of the Presbyterian.

James and his Episcopalian counsellors now felt that the course was clear for them to do as they pleased in Scotland. About this they did not hesitate. The Assembly of June 1610 met at Glasgow, was formed of royal nominees, and, like most of the Assemblies of this time, was simply for the registration of decisions that had been already settled in private conference. The Archbishop of Glasgow was Moderator, and its decisions were so pro-

nounced as that even a Roman Catholic historian could say, that it conferred on the new prelates "powers of even wider and more comprehensive scope than those which had formerly been possessed by the Catholic episcopate." And, what was equally to the purpose, a sum of 5,000 pounds Scots was distributed among the moderators of presbyteries, as reward for supporting the Head of the English Church in his designs on the Scotch Kirk.

Hitherto the Scotch Protestant bishops had been only presbyterian. But James wanted them to be complete and entire after the English pattern. He therefore summoned the Archbishop of Glasgow and the Bishops of Brechin and Galloway to London, where, on October 21st, 1510, they were consecrated in the English way by the Bishops of London, Ely, Rochester, and Worcester. The three completed prelates then returned to Scotland; and, by May 1611, it was possible to report to the King that all the other bishops had been duly consecrated. They had been made by the King, and such a king! It was fitting, therefore, that he should be able to rejoice in the work of his hands. Yet the act of 1592 barred the bishops' from legal standing in Scotland. This was cleared out of the way by parliament in 1612; and the new bishops were higher up than ever above their former "brethren." At last it seemed that Episcopalianism of the English type was master of the field in Scotland.

With all this zeal and scheming for episcopacy, there was a quick pursuit of Romanists in Scotland, whenever possible. The mission work of the exiled papists had not slackened, many of the Jesuits labouring hard, at risk of



limb and life, in their duty. The priests trained in the Scotch colleges at Douai and Rome, and the Scotch Benedictines of Ratisbon and Wurzburg, were notably zealous. Several of the missionaries were caught and banished. But the year 1614 was disgraced by the martyrdom of John Ogilvie, a Jesuit. He fell into the hands of Spottiswood, archbishop of Glasgow, who, according to Roman Catholic annals, struck his helpless prisoner before the whole court at the trial, and exposed him to much abuse. Ogilvie's answers to Spottiswood must have made him blush. "I am accused," said the martyr, "of declining the King's authority, and I will do it still in matters of religion, for with such matters he hath nothing to do; and this which I say, the best of your ministers do maintain, and if they be wise, will continue of the same mind." It shows James' feeling that he would have had Ogilvie banished if he had only been saying mass, but he was to be killed if he maintained the supremacy of the Pope over kings. There was no doubt of Ogilvie's belief concerning this, so he was hanged in Glasgow High Street, dying like a brave man with a conscience.

At this time Roman church affairs in Scotland were administered by an arch-priest, who was appointed by the Pope for England and Scotland. There was a divided judgment among the Romanists as to the policy of taking the oath of allegiance to James, Blackwell, the arch-priest, being in favour of it. On this account he was deposed, his successor, Birkhead, being appointed to oppose it. Few of the papal clergy took the oath; and the martyrdom of Ogilvie must have been a rallying call to such as did.

Notwithstanding, or perhaps because of, his share in the shame of Ogilvie's death, Spottiswood was made Primate of Scotland by the Head of the English Church, on the death of Gladstones, Archbishop of St. Andrews, in 1615. A mischievous act closed the year, in the union of the two Courts of High Commission, with five members, including an archbishop, for a quorum. This made five irresponsible men masters of Scotland.

The supremacy of the anglicized episcopate was made evident at the Assembly of August 1616; for, without any election, the Primate took the Moderator's chair, as if of course. This Assembly planned a new confession of faith, a catechism and liturgy, at the special order of the King, who, having done this, seemed to think that the country of his birth was at length fit to receive a visit from the Head of the English Church. Accordingly, after sending down to Scotland English carpenters, who were to alter Holyrood Chapel for him, and organs, and gilded statues of the apostles and evangelists, to be put up in the stalls for his good company in worship, James reached Edinburgh on May 16th, 1617. The bishops warned the King against the images, as having excited public feeling. James, therefore, at once remembered that he was not in London, and kept the images in their packings. But he took his revenge by having a thoroughly Anglican service in the Chapel Royal, the ominous presence of Laud, then Dean of Gloucester, with other English ecclesiastics, being prominent. He also inflicted one of his tiresome speeches on the parliament of June 28th, in which his own good intentions were, as usual, highly commended. As a

sample of the good intentions that, in his case, certainly paved the way to ruin for his family, he hazarded a proposal, the chief effect of which would be to do away with the General Assemblies, and to put the government of the Church into the hands of the King and bishops. The lords, of course, assented. But the ministers then in Edinburgh earnestly protested; and even one of the bishops signed the protest. Hewat, a minister of Edinburgh, engaged to deliver the document. In doing this, an altercation with Archbishop Spottiswood near the King's bedroom brought out the King in undressed, if not naked, majesty. Maybe it was the lack of clothing as much as the anger of the King that startled Hewat. He also frightened James, who withdrew his proposals; but, after his despicable fashion, threw Hewat and Simpson into prison after depriving them of their offices, and banished David Calderwood from the kingdom. While in Edinburgh, James also tried to have added to the canons of the church that were then being arranged others of his own, on confirmation of children, private baptism and communion, kneeling at the Lord's Supper, and observance of festivals. He had tried to get these things before he came to Scotland, but the bishops feared the result. Now they thought that they could promise the King an Assembly that would carry out his wishes. On November 25th, 1617, the Assembly was convened, but it would not do what the bishops wanted. James was very angry, and, always mean, he prohibited the stipends being paid to the ministers who would not do what he wished. This lever the Archbishop of St. Andrews worked at the next

Assembly in August 1618; though his assumption of the Moderator's chair without election was challenged by one of the ministers, who were now ruthlessly thrust into the background. The King's preposterous letter was read. It was fit for an Elizabethan episcopate, but not for a Scotch General Assembly. The Primate backed it up in a suitably insolent spirit, and the King's party got their way. These things now became part of the ecclesiastical law of Scotland—viz., kneeling at communion, private communion and baptism, confirmation and blessing of children at eight years of age by the bishop, and the observance of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter-day, Ascension-day, and Whitsunday. The ministers were ordered to read "The Five Articles of Perth" in their churches. Many refused to do it. When, on acceptance by the Privy Council, the Acts were proclaimed in Edinburgh, numbers of the citizens deliberately refused to observe the commanded holy-days when they came round. They left the churches where their consciences were being outraged, and went where a simpler ritual was observed. Persecution for these things began. Dickson, an Edinburgh minister, and many others were deprived and cast into prison by the handy instrumentality of the High Commission under the Archbishop. The Perth Articles were ratified by Parliament in 1621. This was done by a comparatively small majority, the votes of the bishops and higher nobles securing the numbers by which the act was carried. The opposition to the obnoxious customs, however, continued; and even historians who were in favour of the Perth Articles, have written of the earnest opponents of them as "some of the

most devout and conscientious of their countrymen.”\* In Edinburgh the opposition to the new arrangements begat positive secession from the state churches ; and now “ conventicles ” of “ Brownists ” and “ Anabaptists ” come to be mentioned. And this movement must have been of some magnitude, because attendance at the “ conventicles ” was forbidden by royal proclamation. The weapons of the King and bishops in this warfare were chiefly carnal.

The government of the Roman Catholic Church in Scotland continued to be by the Arch-priest of Britain till 1621, when, in consequence of the wish of the English Romanists for episcopal oversight, William Bishop was consecrated Bishop of Chalcedon, *in partibus*, at Paris in 1623, and made vicar-apostolic of England and Scotland. But complaints were soon made of his neglecting Scotland, and he himself petitioned the Pope, in 1624, to be relieved of the Scotch part of his duties. The Scotch themselves wished it, because of the ignorance of their affairs in the English Romanists, and the trouble that it caused. This in time led to the withdrawal of the Scotch from the overrule of the English vicar-apostolic ; but it was not till 1653 that a missionary prefect was appointed for Scotland, Father Ballantyne being the first.

\* Grub.

## CHAPTER XIV

A Rehoboam for a "Solomon"—Charles I. and Church Property—His Visit to Scotland—"The Book of Canons"—The Stool-throwing in St. Giles'—Rioting.

WHEN Melville and Welsh, both exiles from Scotland, died in 1622, the Presbyterians must have vainly looked for leaders—even if they had the heart to be led. When James died, in 1625, they were as low and dispirited as their enemies could wish. Yet the enacting and enforcement of the Perth Articles had formed a turning point. Conviction and feeling became once more intense, and ready to give out fire when struck. The reign of Charles I. was to show the vitality of the life that seemed to be beaten down; and to demonstrate that in Scotland, and in England too, the great question was between tyranny in the Church, principalities and powers and world-rulers of darkness on one side; and on the other, the right of the covenant people of God to follow the light He gave to their expectant souls. The very start of Charles I. in Scotch Church affairs was ominous and intolerable. Before his father died plans had been made for quartering Edinburgh, and giving two ministers to each of the four

districts. These ministers were not to be chosen by the people, but by the magistrates and town council ; and they were to be collated by the Archbishop of St. Andrews. The bishops were generally as submissive to the King as a Jesuit to his general, without half the justification for the submission. Charles sanctioned the arrangement ; but, in his self-dooming wall-eyedness, required the people to give up the trying and judging of ministers. The magistrates agreed ; but gave the King notice that the practice had been followed since the Reformation. The King's answer ought to have shown the Presbyterians that they had gotten a Rehoboam in place of a Solomon. Charles answered that what they said " showed what a reformation that was, and how evil-advised : yet we believe not that either superintendent or minister would ever subject their doctrine to the trial of the popular voice : this is an Anabaptistical frenzy."\* " The trial of the popular voice " Charles did well to dread. The only good thing in this answer is that it showed the King's hand early, and made it clear that any who trusted him on the presbyterian side, after that, were likely to have their pains for their pay.

The preoccupation of Charles I. with English affairs, which he made to be a trouble to himself from the first, doubtless had something to do with the fact that, on the whole, the Church in Scotland was quiet for a while after his accession. General Assemblies were not held after the notable one at Perth, though the presbyteries continued to meet. The bishops used their power more wisely and carefully than might have been expected. If, in con-

\* Grub.

sequence, their power still further grew, it is more than can be said of the customs commanded in the Perth Articles: for the form of taking the Communion was still a trouble and cause of contention; while the festivals of the Church were even in a greater degree rather subjects of wrangling than occasions of "holy mirth." Charles' preference for Episcopalianism wrought one good thing. Like his father, he showed a disposition to enrich the revived bishoprics and rearrange tithes, by restoring the church lands that had been alienated during James VI.'s minority. The very thought of this was enough to array against him all the false holders of Church estates. Violent alarm was felt by the threatened possessors of the property: in answer to whose resistance a commission was appointed in 1627, from which came the arrangement that was finally sanctioned by parliament in 1633. This arrangement, which was of the nature of a compromise, was of great service; simplifying many things that were a cause of annoyance and difficulty to landowners, tenants, ministers and titheowners. In the plan thus adopted, Church lands were left to those who had them, with the proviso that they were to pay part of the rent to the Crown, with an acknowledgment of the Crown's feudal superiority. By payment of about nine years' purchase, the tithe could be extinguished; or, failing that, the tithe in kind could be altered to a rent-charge, from which a stipend was to be paid to the minister of the parish, and an annuity to the Crown. But while this was good for the whole community, and very good for the Church, it must have left bitter feelings in many against the King; and may have led to



the enmity of some of the nobles, in the events that were so soon to alter the history of the country.

Charles visited Scotland to be crowned in 1633, then holding the parliament by which these measures were ratified. Laud, Bishop of London, was with him ; and with zeal that, in the circumstances, amounted to impertinence, the bishop tried to Anglicize, if not Romanize, the services and the men who had to perform them ; paying no regard to the fact that he and his King were in Edinburgh and not London. At the meeting of the Parliament in June, two acts were passed that extended the royal prerogative to all causes, spiritual and temporal, and almost fixed Episcopacy as the State religion of Scotland. The voting did not pass unchallenged ; but the objections were tyrannously overborne by the King. The high hand that was used in this business and in the events that grew out of it, such as the prosecution of Lord Balmerino for having a copy of a protest in his possession, began to stir excited indignation once more. When Laud was made archbishop of Canterbury in the autumn of the same year, it needed no special intelligence to see the forecast shadows of coming troubles. Before he returned to London Charles created the bishopric of Edinburgh, out of what had been the archdeaconry of Lothian, with Dr. Forbes for its first prelate. The restoration of St. Giles' church to its original form, in order to fit it to be the cathedral of the new see, was a clear intimation that Episcopacy, and not Presbyterianism, would have the favour of the King. Architecturally Charles was right ; but politically he and Laud were almost playing the fool.

Their good taste in architecture and clerical dress and paintings may be allowed ; but that is a poor set-off against what a nation thought was a systematic and violent assault on its convictions and liberties.

It should ever be remembered that whatever zeal for Episcopacy James and Charles showed, their aim was an episcopate that would be an instrument, as it was a creature, of the Crown. At no point was this left out of sight. The appointment of bishops to be judges of the Court of Exchequer in 1634, the gift of the High Chancellorship to the Archbishop of St. Andrews in 1635, which was a great irritation of the nobility ; and the promulgation in 1636 of the " Book of Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical for the government of the Church of Scotland," not only exalted the bishops more than ever, but put the life of the Church in their hands ; while they, in turn, were mere dependants of the King. " The Book of Common Order " that had been drafted by John Knox was, at the time of the introduction of " The Book of Canons," in use as the liturgy of the Church of Scotland. The use of this book, and all customs other than those of the new canons, were to be put away, under threat of punishment. The bishops and clergy were to enforce the book ; and all the people, on the mere word of the King, were ordered to conform to it. The " Canons " had the more than suspicious warrant of Laud : and their only authority was that of the royal supremacy. And, with especial insult to the ministers, they were required to bind themselves to use a liturgy that, as yet, they had not seen. Charles and Laud must have felt very sure of their

way with the bishops in Scotland, or they would not have made such a scornful demand. But protests were quickly made. Warning letters were sent in to the Privy Council : while the disapproval of the congregations was clearly heard. Even if the ministers had basely consented to the use of the new and unseen book, there were still the people to be considered. For the religious instinct of the congregations told them beforehand, and the sight of the book justified their forecast, that the "Book of Canons" would be a book for religious slaves : for men that wanted to live, think and worship in fetters : for men that were willing to hold out their hands and allow such men as Charles I. and his "most religious and gracious" son Charles II., to put fetters on, in the very presence of God. It was in such dangers that Rutherford wrote—"Stand to your liberties, for the Word of God alloweth you a vote in the choosing of your pastor." "Run and bear up the head of your dying and swooning mother-church, and plead for the production of her ancient charters. They hold out and put out, they hold in and bring in at their pleasure men in God's house : they stole the keys from Christ's church, and came in like the thief and the robber, not by the door Christ : and now their song is Authority, Authority! Obedience to church governors." "Help me to lift up Christ upon His throne : and to lift Him up above all the thrones of the clay kings, the dying sceptre-bearers of this world."

Easter of the year 1637 was fixed as the time when the new commands were to be openly obeyed : but through fear and divided counsels, the order was not given till it

could take effect on July 23rd. Few obeyed the order to read the announcement of the prayer book on the previous Sunday. Evidence is in plenty that the Presbyterians regarded the new book as a move in the direction of reconciling Romanists, even at the cost of hurting themselves. And there was no extravagance in the judgment. The 23rd of July brought the historic scene of the stool-throwing. The Archbishop of St. Andrews, the Bishop of Edinburgh and the Dean were in St. Giles', Edinburgh, to give a fitting start to the worship of God according to the orders of such eminently suitable judges as Laud and Charles I. In St. Giles' church there is now a plate that very simply and ingenuously tells the result: for in 1883 a brass was erected with this inscription: "To James Hannay, D.D., Dean of the Cathedral, 1634-39. He was the First and the Last who read the Service Book in this church. This memorial is erected in happier times by his Descendant." The congregation rose in uproar at the reading. The handy stools on which some were sitting were thrown at the clergy; the credit or discredit of the first throw being variously given to one or other of the women. The women were very vigorous; though the clever and far throwing made the sex of some open to question. One chronicler says, "many of the lasses were prentices in disguise, for they threw stools to a great length." They reached farther than they threw: as Dr. Hannay's brass tells. The interposing of the Primate was worse than useless. The service was ended with a small congregation, with locked doors, and a riotous mob accompanying the worship in open-air fashion outside. The

bishops were maltreated when they came out: the building materials of the new Tron church being as handy outside, as the stools had been inside St. Giles'. Greyfriars church saw similar disturbance when the bishop of Argyll brought in the new service. The Privy Council, of course, denounced the riot; though some of them must have felt that there was quite as much religion in the rioting, as in the action of the high and titled people in London, who were forcing on a nation forms of worship against which their souls rose. The bishops sent word of the opposition to London. But meanwhile, as bad was growing to worse in every way, the service books were withdrawn till the end of September: by which time, it was hoped, "the King's pleasure" might be known. It was as if a new Nebuchadnezzar had risen: only, instead of the order for worship being made known by the Asiatic king's strangely composed band "of all kinds of music," this new Christian worship was proclaimed by "tuck of drum" at the market cross. The music was simpler than Nebuchadnezzar's, but the act was quite as heathenish. Charles' letter was sharp, and to the effect that the country was to worship God by the new book. All the while the country was literally rising. Petitions were coming in numbers against the new Anglican usages; the south of Scotland being specially incensed against the new modes of worshipping God by order from Whitehall. The King's October letter and the proclamations of the Council made the Edinburgh people still more angry: and they even terrified the city authorities with fear for their lives. Proclamations were now of no use: and by the 15th of November, on which the Presbyterians

had determined to hold special meetings in Edinburgh, the opposition was so organized and enlarged as to hold many of the nobles, the young Earl of Montrose being prominent among those who took their stand on the popular side. Through all the weary strife, nothing is so remarkable as the persistent blindness of Laud and Charles. The violence of the mob is not to be more regretted than the mood that would not see that the Presbyterians entirely refused to acknowledge the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Sovereign, or allow any use of "prerogative" in church matters, or even royal authority without consent of what were, in their judgment, divinely constituted courts. They must have seen that if a king in London could dictate to them how to pray in Aberdeen, and forbid any other way of communing with God, why should he not go on to prescribe belief? And to many it must have seemed that a *religious* popery would be better than a royal: and that there might be more Christian consistency in taking orders concerning worship from a minister of religion in the Vatican, than from a mere king or queen at Whitehall.

## CHAPTER XV

“The Tables”—“The Covenant”—Charles’ Duplicity—Assembly of 1638—The Shadow of the Sword—The Covenanters and their Triumph—“A Contented King.”

THE gathering on November 15th at Edinburgh was very large, and met the Council’s charge of illegality by being willing to meet and act by commissioners. The Privy Council consented to this, and so helped to raise a power in Scotland that soon overshadowed their own. Four permanent committees were formed, and sat at different tables in the Parliament House: one being of the nobles; another of a gentleman for every county; a third of a minister for every presbytery; and the fourth of a burgher for every town; with a representative from each table as a central committee sitting in perpetual session at Edinburgh. Their power almost immediately became so great, that where the orders of the Council and the King could not run, the mandates of “The Tables” were willingly honoured. They came to be the rulers of Scotland for the time. Nothing could show their great power more than that they appeared before the Privy Council on December 21st, and demanded the removal of the bishops

from the Council, as parties to the troubles that were around them all. Add that the lay members of the Privy Council did not resent the demand, and the feeling of the time may be gauged. The Council sent a report to the King in London. But Laud was at his elbow; Strafford's counsel was driving him farther on in ignorant despotism; and Spottiswood, Archbishop of St. Andrews, was sycophantly comparing Charles' tyranny to the action of the sun against frost, and the wind against mist. The King followed their advice; and the proclamation of February 19th, 1638, at Stirling, was another Nebuchadnezzar performance; which was met by angry protest, both at Stirling and Linlithgow. At Edinburgh, the herald's proclamation was received with jeering, and the royal officers were compelled to stop and listen while a protestation was read aloud, to the delight of the crowd.

This brought in the crisis that led to the great Confession and Covenant by which Presbyterian Scotland leagued itself for the hard work that was before it. The old covenanting custom, for such it was, that was now adopted, drew out the very heart of the vast majority of the people. By the 28th of February, only nine days from the jeering reception of the King's proclamation, the Covenant was ready for signature. The first part of it was a copy of the Confession of 1581: the second summarized the acts of Parliament that condemned Romanism, and settled the Reformation in Scotland: the third was really the new Covenant, in which the subscribers took oath, in the name of God, that they would profess and



defend their religion against all errors and corruptions ; and that they would stand by the King in support of true religion, liberty and law ; and by each other in defence of these things against all enemies. The first signature to the Covenant was that of the old Earl of Sutherland, who was followed by the whole congregation in Greyfriars church. Then the Covenant was taken out to the churchyard and laid on a gravestone. There, till darkness made it impossible to see, the signing went on with an enthusiasm that has seldom been seen in national affairs. Similar intensity marked the reception of the Covenant throughout the country. In two months the great majority of the nation had signed ; some with tears of joy. Nothing can be said that would reduce the importance of this great act. Neither suggestions of exaggerated story, nor slighting notices of the event, can lessen the far-reaching meaning of the Covenant of Scotland. If it were an illegal document, the King's illegal acts might justify it ; or, at least, take the teeth out of the objection of many to it, on the score of its being against law. If some opposed it, their antagonism, for the most part, was floated away from having influence by the full stream of the national feeling. The messenger of the Privy Council was able to tell the King that the whole nation was in a fever of excitement ; and it was later on reported in London, that the Covenanters were rapidly undoing many things that had been thought settled, restoring the old Presbyterian ways, and even bringing back the exiles.

There was truth in what was reported to London ; and Charles, who felt that, while the Covenant stood, " he had

no more power than a Duke of Venice," was not disposed to deal with the Covenant as a light thing. The King's Commissioner to Scotland—the Marquis of Hamilton—found the Covenant blocking his way at every turn, and told Charles that he must prepare for force, if he would keep Scotland. Then Charles acted like himself in the underhand suggestion to Hamilton, that he should temporize with the Covenanters till an armed force could be made ready. But on Hamilton's report in person, the King's policy somewhat changed; and the Commissioner returned to Scotland in August 1638, with permission to hold a General Assembly; the concession, however, being most mischievously qualified with the refusal of a lay vote in the choice of representatives from the presbyteries, and with the limitation of the Assembly's interference with acts of parliament, to the use of only remonstrance and petition. Much indignation was naturally stirred by this; especially among the nobles, many of whom wanted power in every direction. When Charles and Hamilton again met, the King was persuaded to sign the Confession of 1581, which was the first part of the Covenant. The members of the Privy Council of Scotland were very glad because of this, and had it proclaimed at the cross. Then they announced an Assembly at Glasgow for November, and a meeting of parliament for the following May. But the appetite of the victors had been whetted by success; and some of them found cause of protest against this; forward among whom was the Earl of Montrose.

The Covenanters now made eager preparation for the coming Assembly, sending instructions to the presbyteries,

among other things, as to the way in which they were to choose their delegates. The Episcopalians complained of this, as "packing" the Assembly. To which the Covenanters replied that it was needed, because of the ignorance that had come about in some of the presbyteries during the time of the Episcopalian domination. They soon went beyond this in wishing to cite the bishops before the Assembly, not only for deficiency and inaccuracy of doctrine, but also for wrongs, of which it is blankly incredible that such men as the bishops could then have been guilty. It was a foul wrong to bring the charges, with no more evidence in support than was produced. The Assembly met in Glasgow cathedral on November 21st, 1638. Alexander Henderson was chosen Moderator. The refusal of the Episcopalians to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Assembly was received with scorn, and when Hamilton, as King's Commissioner, could bear the opposition he met with no longer, he dissolved the Assembly. This was met by a protest, which was read as he was going out, to the effect that his departure would not stop the Assembly doing the work they had in hand. They were strengthened in their resolve by the open junction of the Earl of Argyll with their party at this time. Undeterred by the withdrawal of the Commissioner, the Assembly proceeded to decree the nullity of all Assemblies since 1605; to depose all the prelates and to excommunicate some; to remove many of the Episcopalian ministers; to re-establish Presbyterianism; and, after other work, to appoint the next Assembly for July 1639, at Edinburgh. The city and university of Aberdeen were almost alone in

their rejection of the acts of the Assembly and their defiance of its authority.

After this, both sides seemed to think that, whatever had been done or undone by the talk of the Assembly, the time had come for an appeal to the sword. Charles had set a bad example in this direction some time before, and now the Covenanters showed energetic imitation. Under General Leslie, a military adventurer from the German wars, their army was equipped and drilled; while Charles, on his part, summoned his army to take the field at York in April 1639. Montrose went as a Covenanting general against Huntly in the north, brought him prisoner to Edinburgh, and the covenanting army entered Aberdeen. By May the Covenanters and Charles were looking at one another across the Tweed—ready for battle, but neither side liking to begin. On an appeal for an understanding terms were arranged, by which a free Assembly and Parliament were promised, and both armies were disbanded. But Charles could not let well alone. He could not forgive the Assembly of 1638. The Covenanters practically passed that Assembly by, but they re-enacted its many decisions in the Assembly of August 1639. They went farther, trying, with the spirit of the persecutor, to force the Covenant on others, and following the King's example again, in not being able to let well alone. The sitting of Parliament immediately after the Assembly was made of little use to the Covenanters, for the King twice prorogued it. In so carelessly judging the condition of Scotland as to be able to do this, Charles did for himself what was, perhaps, the most mischievous thing of his life. The

refusal of the English Parliament of April 1640 to grant supplies to Charles, ought to have made him more careful of his dealings with the Covenanters, who had many sympathizers in England. The unwise imprisonment in the Tower of the Earl of Loudoun, a representative in London of the Covenanters, because of a more than suspicious letter written by him and other nobles to the King of France, only added to the irritation. The Assembly next met at Aberdeen on July 29th, 1640, with a strong military support. Among other things, this Assembly began a strife that afterwards bore bitter fruit; for it condemned private meetings for worship conducted by laymen, that were being held, after the Brownist or Independent type, in many parts of the country. Though it condemned them, the Assembly could not stop them.

While the Assembly met at Aberdeen the Covenanters were forcing submission to it in the north by arms, Argyll and Munro being the leaders of the expedition, and preparing for a march into England under Leslie. Their troops crossed the Tweed on August 21st, 1640, Montrose being at the head of the vanguard. They forced the passage of the Tyne with little resistance from an English force stationed at the river, and by the end of the month they held Newcastle, the King being at York. The demand of the English for a parliament, and the strong insistence of the Covenanters, compelled Charles to summon a parliament in November 1640, which was known as the Long Parliament. The Covenanters lay at Newcastle, receiving a subsidy for being quiet, while their commissioners went to London, where they were received

with great honour by the strong Puritan party. Terms of peace were at length agreed upon, but they were not ratified till August 1641. In the negotiations there was ample evidence given that the Covenanters desired to have the Covenant as the one religious Establishment of England and Scotland. They wanted this almost as earnestly as Charles and Laud wanted Episcopalianism established in both countries. It was in this spirit that the Assembly of July 1641, meeting at St. Andrews and afterwards at Edinburgh, answered a letter from the Puritans in England, to the effect that the theory of the Independents as distinct from Presbyterianism was not to be approved, and declared their rejection of it "to be warranted by the light of nature, to be founded on the Word of God, and conformable to the pattern of the primitive and apostolical churches."\* This Assembly commissioned the Moderator to form a catechism, a confession, a rule for worship, and a form of church government. For the time, the Covenanters were undoubtedly masters both in Church and State, though some of the nobles began to show signs of not being so wholehearted to the party as they had been. This loosening of adhesion may have been because of seeing the drift of the Covenanters towards tyranny, and partly through the personal influence of the King with some of them. Of such was Montrose, who, though to the end of his life he professed that he held the Covenant, certainly did not believe that the Covenanting authorities should take the place of the downcast bishops. From this time his help of the Covenanters visibly decreased.

\* Grub.

Charles visited Scotland in August 1641, and after practically ratifying all that the Covenanters had done, and giving them all that they asked, he left Scotland on November 18th, "a contented King from a contented people." His satisfaction was greater than that of his Episcopalian historians, according to one of whom "he had surrendered to a faction the authority which God had given him for the benefit of all his people; he had abandoned his friends, rewarded his enemies, compromised his own personal dignity, and done wrong to his religious convictions."\* One of the least hurtful things the King consented to was the division of the endowments of the bishoprics, to a large extent, among the universities. This was a loss to Episcopalianism, but it was a gain to Scotland.

\* Grub, Vol. III., p. 87.

## CHAPTER XVI

The Assembly and the English Puritans—New Presbyter and Old Priest—Theological Work of the Assembly—The Assembly and the “Engagers”—The Covenanters and the Younger Charles—Act against Patronage.

THERE can be little doubt that the course of events in Scotland had influence in England, and that the Puritans were encouraged by the success of the Covenanters. When the Assembly met at St. Andrews in July 1642, the Earl of Dunfermline, as King's Commissioner, read a letter from Charles, which was of necessity “gracious.” But very ominously another letter was read from the English Parliament, which laid the blame of the trouble that was coming on “papists and dissolute clergy.” To both letters the Assembly sent answers; and with much hope that the time was coming when the Covenant would rule in England as well as Scotland, they appointed a committee to confer with the King and the English Parliament, and prepared for the expected change. The King's answer promised reform, but warned the Assembly against the Parliament as caring nothing for Presbyterianism. The Parliament agreed in the wish for unity, etc., as against Episcopalianism, but gave no promise to adopt



Presbyterianism. At this time the Assembly was perhaps stronger than the Privy Council and the Convention of Estates that met in February 1643. When the Assembly hinted to the Convention that the cause of their brethren in England was the cause of Scotland also, the Convention gave orders for troops to be raised to go on service against the moss troopers of the border. The Convention had read between the lines, and the movement of the soldiers was in the right direction. The General Assembly of August 1643 received commissioners from the English Parliament, who definitely asked for Scotch help. The answer to this was finally a civil and religious league, together with the adoption of the "Solemn League and Covenant," as it now stands. The ambiguity of the document in some parts has been thought intentional, because of the English delegates' wish not to exclude the Independents; and the equal desire on the Scotch side to secure an established form of Presbyterianism throughout the three parts of the kingdom. In this wish the Covenanters were tyrannical. "The League and Covenant" was sent to the Parliament in England, and on September 22nd, 1643, it was read in St. Margaret's church, Westminster, clause by clause, and accepted by the lords and commons there assembled. In many parts of England it was also well received. In consequence of this, the next Scotch mission to England was an army of 20,000 men under Leslie, Earl of Leven; and they were sent to help the Parliament against Charles.

This part of history scarcely reads like church story. Yet there was religion on all sides of the struggle. Charles

was conscientious in his preference for Episcopalianism, and would have done better for himself if he had given less earnest support to it. Though it ought not to be forgotten that through all the conflict, his jealousy of the lay element in the church, and of the people in national affairs, was intense: in which, however, he was only like many of the Presbyterian lords. The Covenanters, in all their bitterness and terrible conceit of being exclusively right, served God in what they thought was the only way acceptable to Him. And the broad generosity of the Independents, which was quite consistent with giving and taking hard knocks, and was so soon to be in conflict with both Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism, was no less a matter of conscience and of religious contention for the liberty wherewith Christ makes men free. The Scotch march into England was against Episcopacy, and for Kirk and Covenant. Toleration of any other form of religion seems to have been inconceivable to many of the Covenanters. Their delegates to the Westminster Assembly in 1643 earnestly strove for the adoption of presbyterian government in the church; and they so far succeeded that the "Directory for the Public Worship of God," which the Assembly passed in 1644, was so congenial that the Scotch Assembly of Edinburgh in 1645 sanctioned it, and ordered it to be read by all the ministers in the kingdom. What they held, the Covenanters were ready to enforce with the sword. No one can wonder that Milton's strong words were against them; and that he saw and declared, with etymological and religious truth, that

"New presbyter is but old priest writ large";

and also protested against their readiness to—

“adjure the civil sword,  
To force our consciences that Christ set free” ;

and against the uncharity that could be thus described,—

“ Men whose life, learning, faith, and pure intent  
Would have been held in high esteem with Paul,  
Must now be named and printed heretics.”

This was no exaggeration ; and the Covenanting Presbyterians were ready to mete out to Episcopalians, Romanists, or Independents, the measure such words describe. Any one who would not be hidebound by Covenanting formulas was exposed to their wrath. The Covenanter preachers were often worst of all. An instance of this may be given from the life of Montrose. He had gone quite round to the King, and in 1645 was the only hope that Charles had in Scotland. The Parliament and Assembly of that year were startled in their sessions by the news of one of Montrose's victories. Recalling Leslie from England, they sent him against Montrose ; and at Philiphaugh the royal troops were surprised and disastrously beaten. The preachers called and clamoured for the death of the prisoners, who were shot down in the open plain : those of high birth, such as Sir R. Spottiswood, son of the archbishop of St. Andrews, being hanged or beheaded. One objection of the Covenanters to mercy being shown to the prisoners is taken from the pleadings of Sir R. Spottiswood, who tried to answer the statement that “if quarter be sustained, the whole nation, and especially the Estates of Parliament, will be guilty of a breach of the Covenant,

and of their oath in Parliament anent the prosecution of malignants."\* The intractability of the Covenanters showed itself everywhere. When negotiations for peace went on between Parliament and the King at Uxbridge, they, if any, wrecked the hope of quiet. They would have Charles not only abolish Episcopacy, but also establish Presbytery; and, in addition, take the Solemn League and Covenant, and compel others to do so. They were able to adopt this tone in England at the time, for their following had largely increased, especially in London; where, it is said, that of 121 ministers all but two were presbyterians. When Charles gave himself up to the Scotch army and found himself a prisoner, he was willing to debate the question of Episcopate against Presbytery; and in a controversy with Henderson, the best of the Covenanters, the King and his adversary bore themselves worthily. Had Charles subscribed the Covenant and established Presbyterianism, he would have been master of the situation; but he would not. If English Episcopalianism has a martyrology Charles Stewart must have a place in it. It was not difficult for the Scotch Presbyterians to give up Charles, the Episcopalian, to the English Parliament. Charles Stewart, the Covenanter, would have altered everything. When the King, in Carisbrook Castle, would have come round to the Scotch terms, he was, as so frequently, a little too late.

The theological work of the Assembly during these years of trouble was very important. By the year 1648, the "Form of Church Government," the "Directory for Public

\* Cunningham.

Worship," the "Westminster Confession of Faith," the "Larger and Shorter Catechisms," had all been accepted: some of them to become most potent agents in forming Scotch thought and feeling. The new version of the Psalms was made at this time. All this was good work of its kind: but the General Assembly of 1647 showed very clearly that systematic theology and charity are not necessarily companions. That Assembly told the English Presbyterians to be on the watch against the unclean spirit that, with seven other worse devils, was coming into England, in the shape of those who wanted liberty of conscience. And, lest "the gangrene," as they also called it, should spread into Scotland, an act was passed prohibiting the importation of books written by the Independents. The Assembly of 1648 had difficult work to do. The "Commission of the Assembly," a kind of standing committee, was in collision with the Parliament of Scotland; and the Assembly backed up the movements of the Commission. They had hot indignation for the act of the Parliament in forming an army under the Duke of Hamilton, for the reason that "to unite with Malignants against Sectaries was to join hands with a black devil to beat a white one." The army of the "Engagers," as the Scotch parliamentary party came to be named, was soundly beaten by Cromwell; Hamilton being taken prisoner. This gave the government into the hands of the extreme Covenanters by the "Whiggamore's Raid" into Edinburgh in 1648. The "Engagers" withdrew: and when the Assembly of 1649 met, all who had to do with the act of Parliament in sending Hamilton to England were dealt with as "malig-

nants." At the same time the Covenanters agreed with the proclamation of Charles II. as King of Scotland, on condition that he took the Covenant. This almost verges on farce. The son of Henrietta Maria and the Covenant make as profane and ludicrous a conjunction as the world has ever seen. The same meeting of the Estates that sent a Commission to Charles in Holland, with the offer of the Scotch crown on these terms, also took the important step of passing an act declaring that the patronage of churches was an evil, and without the sanction of the Word of God. All such things as presentations were abolished ; and the charge of the churches was given over entirely to the Assembly. The July Assembly of 1649 was also well engaged in church work : for, in order to carry out the new statute against patronage, the Assembly, after much controversy, determined that, in case of a vacancy, the Kirk-session should elect the minister ; and if their choice were approved by the congregation, the Presbytery were then to try his qualifications. If satisfied, they were to admit him to the benefice. But if the major part of the congregation dissented from the choice, the Presbytery were to judge the case, and if the objections were well founded, they were to appoint a new election. If objection came from a minority, it was not to be entertained, save on good cause shown. The Presbytery were to fit malignant or disaffected congregations with a minister.\* This arrangement has weighty bearing on the troubles of a much later time.

\* Grub, Vol. III., p. 143.

## CHAPTER XVII

Charles II. a Covenanter—Cromwell in Scotland—"Protesters" and "Resolutioners"—Dismission of the Assembly by Colonel Cotterel—Episcopalians and Romanists—Charles II. King—"The Recissory Act"—Appointment of Prelates—Leighton.

IN June 1650 Charles, who had now promised to take the Covenant, landed in Scotland; but not before he had subscribed the hated thing. When he reached Edinburgh he found himself among the hardest of the Covenanters; and he must have thought the price he had paid was heavy, when on a fast day six sermons were preached without interruption: some of them being of more than questionable taste. Henry IV. of France judging Paris worth a mass was nothing to this. But even the elder son of Charles I. had the decency, for a time, to refuse his signature to a document that the Covenanters put before him; which was an insult to his dead father's memory, and to his living mother. On his refusal to sign, the Assembly showed that they knew they were the stronger; and, with unspeakable meanness, Charles signed what they asked on August 16th, 1650. The vileness of Charles was equalled only by the shame of the ministers who pressed him to the signature. When Cromwell marched north to call the

Covenanters to account for the proclamation of Charles as King, the preachers again seemed determined to do what would hurt their own cause. Cromwell's letter from Musselburgh on August 3rd, 1650, is worth any one's reading. It was sent "To the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland," or "The Commissioners of the Kirk": and while it was a singular letter, from a general on the march to the enemy he is anxious to fight, no one can say but that it was well deserved. Cromwell had scorn for "King and Covenant," and reminded the Assembly that "there may be a Covenant with Death and Hell," under well-sounding phrases. His advice was what the Covenanters most needed and were least inclined to follow. "Is it, therefore, infallibly agreeable to the Word of God, all that *you* say? I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken."\* It was good counsel, and is still for all bigots and exclusives: but the Covenanters' leaders would not follow it. They showed their spirit in the affairs of the war with Cromwell. The army was "purified" of malignants: and for a while it seemed able to defend the country against Cromwell. The battle of Dunbar on September 3rd, 1650, however, broke the power of the Covenanters: though it did not liberate their narrow judgment. For, among the best reasons they could give on the day of fasting for their great loss, this was one,—that they had allowed "a malignant and profane guard of horse to be about the King and to fight for his cause." Cromwell's mastery of Edinburgh did not interfere with the services and preaching of the Covenanters: though they

\* Letter 136: "Cromwell's Letters and Speeches."



took pains to abuse him because he permitted "men of civil employments" to preach. To which his answer by letters of the 9th and 12th of September, 1650, to the governor of Edinburgh Castle, was the sharpest and most needed lesson the Covenanting preachers had received for many a day: sharper, in truth, to them than Cromwell's sword had been at Dunbar.\* One part of the Covenanters went farther than those whom the Commonwealth general had to teach. With a better, but as hard a spirit as the others of their party, they protested against the Covenant being taken by Charles, as a piece of hypocrisy: and though, while they formed the Western Army, they gave some cause of apprehension, a part of Cromwell's army soon broke them in pieces. Their Remonstrance, however, was not forgotten: and their name of Remonstrants also remained. The Covenanters crowned Charles at Scone on January 1st, 1651: with reading of the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant, which were sworn to and subscribed by Charles. The Marquis of Argyll was chief official for the day, save the preacher, whose words must have taken much of the glitter from the show for the newly-crowned Covenanter.

The General Assembly of July 1651 met at St. Andrews, and had at once to deal with the action of the Assembly's Commission in giving an answer to the Estates, that seemed to relax the stringency of the rules against the admission of "malignants" into the army. It was a strange question for an ecclesiastical court, but from their point of view it was full of religious meaning. The

\* Grub, Vol. III., p. 148. Carlyle: "Cromwell's Letters and Speeches."

“Act of Classes,” which refused army service to certain classes of the community that might be suspected of “malignancy,” had been repealed by the Estates. On the Assembly’s approval of this a protest was given in, and on this another division was made of “Protesters” against “Resolutioners.” By the time the Assembly again met, which was in July 1652, Charles Stewart, their “Covenanted” King, was a fugitive after the battle of Worcester, and the English were masters of Scotland as they had never been before. It was good for Scotland that the English Commonwealth was lord. The Protesters again made their protest; and the Resolutioners resolved to inflict church discipline on them, unless they withdrew their protestation. Once more the Assembly met, in July 1653; but they had not finished the roll-call when the English Colonel Cotterel entered the church, and, with small concern for the Assembly’s dignity, marched the members out between files of soldiers to the Bruntsfield Links, stood them still while their names were taken down, and then told them to go and not meet again. The Assembly did not meet after this for forty years; but the meetings of the subordinate church courts were not interfered with, nor was free worship hindered. It is no exaggeration to say that while Cromwell was dominant, Scotland was far better off than she would have been, if the ecclesiastical and political strife that was hurting everything had been permitted to go on unchecked. The conflict between Resolutioners and Protesters still was felt; but the supreme hand was too strong for them to hurt each other. Love did not grow: it was almost forgotten as a necessary part of

Christianity. Yet, if they would not love each other as brethren, the Covenanters were held too firmly in hand by Cromwell to do violence either to their ecclesiastical enemies or their embittered friends. The case of Sir Alexander Irvine is an instance of the good wrought, or the ill prevented by the Cromwellian mastery of Scotland. Irvine was royalist, and would not take the Covenant. On being threatened by the Presbytery of Aberdeen with ecclesiastical penalties, the royalist sought the protection of the Commonwealth authorities. His appeal to Colonel Overton, commander of the English republican troops in the district, was efficacious; though the Presbytery threatened Irvine with excommunication if he did not withdraw his appeal. The strong, clean hand of the English Commonwealth guarded the royalist from the Covenanters. It may be that the Aberdeen presbytery was irritated by signs of the growth near by them of convictions that were akin to the beliefs of the English Independents. But whatever their motive, they were barred from persecuting Sir A. Irvine: and he owed his safety to a hand stronger and cleaner than that of any of the Stewarts, covenanted or uncovenanted.

At this time there was only one surviving bishop of the Scotch prelates—Sydserf, who was living in France. Episcopalianism was in collapse, as having no root in the deep affections of the people. The Romanist records of this time are brighter and more hopeful than those of the Stewart bishops. Whether with warrant or without, the members of the Scotch mission reported favourably to Rome of their work and its results. Their words make it

appear that the Protector, while his hand was armed and ready against Romish persecution on the continent, laid the Papists in Scotland under debt for keeping back persecution from them. A "Report of the Superior of the Scottish Mission to the Congregation of Propaganda" in Rome says, that "the decree which was last year extorted from the Protector Cromwell, by the importunity and calumnies of the ministers, against priests and Catholics, remained unenforced for six months, for all the authorities were reluctant to carry it out, until, at the beginning of Lent, certain Anabaptist magistrates consented to do so, after much pressure from the ministers."\* Such an acknowledgment means much. The various Romanist missions to Scotland, and particularly to the north, were full of devotion, and must have had a measure of success even on the showing of the Covenanters. Jesuit, Capuchin, Benedictine, Irish Franciscan, and Lazarist missionaries were sent; and, perhaps, the cause of wonder ought to be found not in the fact of their success, but in the smallness of its amount. The death of the Protector Cromwell, on September 3rd, 1658, brought in a new time for all parties, for which very few were prepared.

On the death of the Protector, the Scotch ministers sent James Sharp, afterwards "the unprincipled renegade Archbishop of St. Andrews," to London, to look after the interests of the Scotch Church. Later on he went to Breda, to congratulate Charles II. on being proclaimed King. When Charles came to London, Argyll and others met him. Argyll, who had crowned Charles the Cove

\* Bellesheim Vol. IV., pp. 46 and 344.

nanter King of Scotland, was seized, cast into the Tower, then sent down to Scotland for trial ; there sentenced to death ; and, dying, made a braver end than his life would have warranted any to expect. Others of the same party were arrested ; one or two were put to death, and some fled the country. Rutherford, the earnest and mystical preacher and pastor, escaped arrest for "high treason" by a summons to "a superior court." His answer to the messenger was : "Tell them I have got a summons already, before a Superior Court of Judicatory, and I behove to answer my first summons ; and, ere your day arrive, I shall be where few kings and great folks come." He died on March 20th, 1661, saying, "Glory, glory dwelleth in Immanuel's land." Sharp returned to Edinburgh with a letter from the King to the Presbytery of the capital, in which Charles declared his resolution "to protect and preserve the government of the Church of Scotland as it is by law settled," &c. The Presbytery were delighted : though some of the more sagacious and wary somewhat bitterly rallied their brethren, on taking the infinitive mood for the indicative. The parliament known as "Middleton's Drinking Parliament" met in January 1661, with the Earl of Middleton as King's Commissioner ; and made short work of the hindrances to Charles. It gave to the royal prerogative all that the Stewarts wished : made the Solemn League and Covenant to be no longer of force ; and, by the "Recissory Act," undid twenty years' legislation in favour of Presbyterianism. By this recission, Episcopacy was practically re-established in Scotland, with Charles II. as Head of the Church, and with the headship

more real than his grandfather had ever thought possible. The letter of the King was read to the Privy Council of Scotland on September 5th, 1661; and it plainly said that "government by bishops," with all that the phrase meant, was to be the rule of the State Church of Scotland. Some of the Presbyterians were very indignant at the dishonesty of Charles: but if he knew of their anger, he must have laughed to think that now he had them under the harrow.

With the return of Charles, the "Covenanted King," began one of the saddest, if not the most mournful part of the history of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. It lasted for nearly a generation. But it was also one of the Church's most glorious times. Once more degraded from high and governmental estate, though still owned by the great majority of the nation, the Presbytery yet ruled, and got a closer grip on the people's affection. In this time, if ever, it justified the adoption of its magnificent symbol of the burning but unburned bush. Presbyterians may be proud to believe that such as Charles II. thought it needful to humiliate their church's polity and to weaken her life. No Episcopalian can be thankful that the instruments of the re-establishment of his church in Scotland, or anywhere else, are to be found in the Stewarts and their clerical and titled hangers-on. If any one should think that Charles I. was a strange martyr for a church to have, all Episcopalians must feel that Charles II. was a stranger "nursing father" for the same church.

As already told, there was at this time only one Scottish bishop left—Sydsersf. Others had, therefore, to be con-

secrated in England. Sharp, who was destined to the Scottish primacy, Fairfowl, Leighton the true saint, and Hamilton, were consecrated in Westminster Abbey on December 15th, 1661. Leighton and Sharp had first to be ordained deacons and priests : and this was privately done. Leighton was very gentle. He received Episcopal orders, although in Laud's time, his father, Dr. Leighton, for writing a book against prelates, had been sentenced to lifelong imprisonment, with a fine of £10,000 ; to be whipped in Westminster pillory, and then and there to have an ear cut off, one side of his nose slit, and one of his cheeks branded with the letters SS. He bore this torture ; and a week after, at Cheapside pillory, had the other side of his head and face cut, slit and branded in the same way. Leighton the son passed this by ; out of Christian feeling, it may be believed. His father had not another cheek to turn and give to the smiter : but surely the son's conduct sufficed. As to the other new bishops, they were "after their kind." Even Episcopalian historians can say little for them ; and of the men whom they, in turn, consecrated to the vacant sees, it is said that they "were of respectable character, but not one among them" (save the Bishop of Aberdeen) "was remarkable for learning or ability" :\* and if, as is possible, "any of them had merely Presbyterian orders, there is no evidence that they were re-ordained."\*

\* Grub,

## CHAPTER XVIII

Restoration of Episcopacy, and of the Court of High Commission—  
Persecution of the Covenanters—King and Pope in One—Murder of  
Archbishop Sharp—Rising of the Covenanters—The Cameronians—  
Test Act—Cruel Persecution.

THE Scotch Parliament reassembled on May 8th, 1662 : and, first of all, it restored the Episcopal government of the Church, the bishops being made responsible only to King Charles II. ; and, in token of their full restoration to rank as well as power, it recalled the bishops as lords of parliament. Of equal importance with this was the act of June 11th ; by which the ministers who had been inducted to benefices since 1649, when the power of patrons was taken away, were declared to have no claim to the livings, and the benefices were declared to be vacant. But a time of grace was allowed. For, if before the 20th of September any such ministers obtained presentation from a patron and induction from a bishop, they were to be legally holders of the livings. When the day came, it was found that, just as a month before 2,000 English ministers had gone out of the Establishment for conscience' sake, so 300 Scotch ministers gave up all, rather than submit to prelatial ordination and royal supremacy. The diocesan



synods that followed the restoration of the bishops were well attended in the north : but in the south and west were significantly neglected. From the north came the men to fill the sad emptiness of the pulpits and parishes : but, unless the evidence of the time is greatly exaggerated, the new ministers, in many instances, ought to have been put on the cutty stool of repentance for a long time, before they were permitted to enter the pulpit.\* The outcast ministers soon began to hold "conventicles" in the neighbourhood of their former parishes : and this having the effect of emptying the churches where the new "curates" were, the ministers were forbidden to preach, and the people were ordered to go to church, under heavy penalties. The "curates" were required to report the names of the people who absented themselves from the parish churches : and this, naturally enough, caused the Episcopal ministers to be regarded in many districts as little better than ordained spies.† When dragooning and other miseries were inflicted on the reluctant and clerically reported families, it could not be expected that Episcopalianism would grow sweeter to the Scotch.

The Court of High Commission was reinstated in 1664: but for some reason it failed, though its range of power was ample enough. It was discontinued after a year of revival : but, for two or three years, the Privy Council, on which were the two archbishops, took care that the Covenanters and Presbyterians generally should have no chance of gathering strength again. The Privy Council

\* Cunningham and Grub.

† So Scott makes Claverhouse speak in "Old Mortality," Ch. 35.

had a handy instrument in a professional soldier, Sir J. Turner, whose barbarities made the Covenanters of the West nearly mad. They rose at the report of a specially shameful wrong done to an old Covenanter ; caught Turner, but did not hurt a hair of his head, though he deserved hanging high as Haman. But the success of the Covenanters proved to be their hurt. The Privy Council, in alarm, let loose against them another professional soldier, who had learned his ghastly business in Russia and in the wars with the Tartars and Turks,—General Dalziell. He beat the Covenanters with his disciplined troops ; and the prisoners that he was able to hand over to the Privy Council were tortured and executed with relentless severity. They suffered and died, for the greater part, very bravely. After this Dalziell was laid on the trail of the Covenanters in the West : and his obedience to his employer at Whitehall is evident from the fact that now the Episcopal churches in that district began to fill : but it was with broken-spirited men and heart-weary women.

In 1667 the government of Scotland was put into the hands of some who were opposed to the Earl of Rothes and Archbishop Sharp, and to their policy of severe measures against the Covenanters. With the coming of the new party to power, an offer of peace was made to those who had been involved in the recent rising ; and the army was disbanded. Some accepted, others refused the offer. Notwithstanding an attempt on Archbishop Sharp's life in 1668, a proposal was made in the following year to return some of the ejected Presbyterian ministers to vacant parishes, on the condition of limitation of service to their

own parishioners. The extremes on both sides did not like this. Some of the prelates objected, and some of the Covenanters opposed it. Archbishop Burnet of Glasgow and his synod even sent a remonstrance to the King. This was too much for Charles and his supporters. Burnet had, in consequence, to resign his see. But his example made even Sharp think that royal supremacy might be carried too far; and that it was at the least possible to imagine a more saintly channel for the ruling power and virtues of the Church to flow along, than the peculiar graces of the second Charles Stewart. Sharp's sermon at the opening of Parliament, in October 1669, accordingly maintained that the claims of the Pope, the King and the General Assembly to ecclesiastical supremacy were alike untenable.\* The Council apparently did not care to have to deal with two archbishops at the same time: but they got a new statute passed, that made the Scotch Church, in faith as well as polity, subject to the absolute will of the King; that King being Charles II. at Whitehall, and the heir to the throne being the Romanist James Stewart. Now the Episcopalians had gotten, as some said, a king and pope in one. The first act of the regal pope was a letter, in which he unseated Burnet, Archbishop of Glasgow. Burnet had done well: and his degradation at such hands was a great honour.

The archbishopric of Glasgow was offered to Bishop Leighton in 1670: but he would not have it till two years after. In the meantime he tried most anxiously to bring about a reconciliation between Presbyterians and Episcopa-

\* Grub.

lians. He failed : and was not thought better of by either party for the effort. The parliament of 1670 is chiefly notable for the ruthless act that it passed against conventicles. To preach at an open-air meeting now, was to be met by death and confiscation of property. Other acts of a similar spirit were passed against the Covenanters. The same bloodthirsty legislation went on in 1672 : till the Bass Rock had to be turned into a prison, because of the number of sufferers for conscience' sake. Though, strangely, the year 1672 saw an act of indulgence passed, by which some of the ejected ministers were allowed to resume their duties. A few accepted, but others refused ; these taking the high and easily seen position, of denying the right of the civil power to give them leave or bounds to preach and minister, when their office was from Christ Himself. Leighton's gentle spirit grew very weary of the strife, and he resigned his archbishopric in 1674. He went to England, there living in peace and sanctity ; dying in 1684 at the " Bell Inn," Warwick Lane, London. He wished to die in an inn : and his desire was gratified.

The oppression of the Government seems to have made even some of the Episcopalians think that the thraldom of the King was too grievous to be borne. For in 1674-5 a movement was made by three of the Bishops and the Presbyters of Edinburgh, to call a national synod. The Primate and Lauderdale were against it : Sharp going so far as to write to Archbishop Sheldon, asking him to use his influence with the Head of the Church at Whitehall, in order to stop the calling of an Assembly. Bishop Ramsay of Dunblane, however, challenged the Primate's opposi-

tion. But Sharp soon had a letter from the King removing Ramsay to the Isles. Other opponents were similarly dealt with. It was not till 1676 that the Bishop of Dunblane made submission, on which he was restored to his see. The resistance or disobedience of the Covenanters, and the holding of conventicles still continuing, a commission was given in 1677, by which the "Highland Host," as the horde of semi-barbarians from the north was called, was given free quarters on the Covenanters in the west, in order to promote Episcopalianism. The Primate was credited with agency, as well as sympathy, in these things; and naturally he became increasingly hateful to the Covenanters. Unhappily for himself, he chanced to cross Magus Moor in the carriage of which he seems to have been somewhat proud, when a number of fanatics, who were hunting for a specially hated deputy-sheriff named Carmichael, heard that the Primate was not far off. Very soon they caught the Archbishop and murdered him with peculiar brutality. He was killed on May 3rd, 1679.

This wickedness only brought fresh trouble. The Council proclaimed the conventicles. Some of the western Covenanters, on the anniversary of the "restoration" of Charles II., entered Rutherglen, put out the bonfires, burned the acts of Parliament against Presbyterians, and fixed a protest to the market cross. Graham of Claverhouse, as bold and cruel a man as either side could show, tried to stop a conventicle that met on the following Sunday, but was made to run by the armed Covenanters. They, much uplifted by their success, marched towards Glasgow. Charles, on hearing of this, sent

his bastard son, the Duke of Monmouth, with some English regiments, to Scotland. But when the two armies met on Sunday, June 22nd, 1679, the Covenanters were quarrelling on points of religion, instead of looking to their arms and array. They were beaten at Bothwell Bridge, to the satisfaction of even Claverhouse; and the gaols of Edinburgh were not enough to hold the prisoners. They were, therefore, driven into Greyfriars churchyard, and kept there four or five months in all weathers. Then some were tortured and executed; 250 were shipped as slaves to Barbadoes; but mercifully most of them were drowned, for the ship was wrecked on the Orkneys.

The divisions among the Presbyterians now grew more acute in their cruel troubles, than they were in time of prosperity. The very extreme Covenanters looked on all who submitted to Charles, the king who had broken the Covenant, as unworthy their communion. They, therefore, withdrew from all such, many of them living as outlaws among the hills. Their chief minister was Richard Cameron, from whom they were called Cameronians; and their array in military force was the beginning of what was honourably known, for many generations, as the Cameronian Regiment. On June 22nd, 1680, Cameron and Cargill led a band of their followers into Sanquhar, publicly disowned Charles Stewart, declared war against him, protested against the papist Duke of York, and announced that they held themselves ready to do as they had been done by. A month after the soldiery surprised them; and Cameron, whose prayer before the battle,—"Lord, take the ripe and spare the green," is well

known, was among the killed. Some of the prisoners were executed with horrors that, even in Scotland under the Stewarts, had not been exceeded. Cargill still gathered the Cameronians; and in October, at a meeting in Stirlingshire, publicly excommunicated the King, and a number of the leaders of the country for their breach of the Covenant, and their persecution of Christ's people. Some smile at the action; but there was quite as much reality, and more sanctity in it, than in excommunications fulminated from the Vatican by Charles' friends.

Parliament met in July, 1681, with the Duke of York as Royal Commissioner. He was now an open Papist. The legislation of this Parliament lifted the King to a position that even a change in his religion could not affect. He was to be held King by Divine right, no matter what he believed, or any one said. This was followed by a Test Act; by which every one that held a public office of any kind had to accept the Confession of 1567; to acknowledge the King as absolutely supreme above all and everything; to hold the unlawfulness of meeting about public affairs of any kind, without the King's consent; and to promise never to attempt any change in the government of the country. Even some of the Episcopalian state-churchmen drew back at this, and saw that the Act was contradictory to itself, if the Confession of 1567 were adopted. A smoothing explanation of the Act was made; but, notwithstanding, nearly eighty ministers of the Established Church left their livings rather than swear to such a slave-making absurdity. The Earl of Argyll accepted the test; but

with explanations that caused him to be imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle, on a charge of high treason. On trial he was found guilty : but he escaped from the Castle, and went to Holland with a death-sentence passed against him. A significant comment on the Test Act, and the King's fitness for the power now given to him, was made by the abject letter of the Scotch Primate to Archbishop Sancroft, written early in 1682 ; in which he begs the English prelate to advise the King not to dispose of the Scotch bishoprics till the prelates had been heard. He complained of the intrusion of some by the interposition of "great men" ; whose nominees, though they might be useful to their patrons, dared not be, nor were willing to be, faithful to the Church. The appointment of bishops by a Divine-right King was evidently not working well.

The years that followed were saddened by much persecution of the Presbyterians. The Rye House Plot of 1683 made the Government more eager to master, if not kill out, the Covenanting opposition and all Nonconformity. It was declared that "gentleness had failed," and that hardness must be tried. The Cameronians were especially hunted down : and they began to retaliate. In October, 1684, they declared by their "Apologetic Declaration," that they would deal with their persecutors as enemies of God and the Covenant. There must have been some solid strength among the Covenanters ; for there can be little doubt that this announcement brought fear to the hearts of their enemies. To combat the Declaration, an "Abjuration Oath" was formed ; with the provision that if



any one declined to take it he was to be shot there and then. Such an order put into the hands of Claverhouse and his soldiers could have only one result. Shootings and hangings, and, in two cases, the drowning of women tied to stakes in a rising tide, now went on, with a gross soldiery for judges and executioners.

## CHAPTER XIX

James II.—Rising of Argyll—A Romish Head of the Church—William of Orange—His Favour to the Presbyterians—Abolition of State Church Episcopalianism—Patronage—Assembly meets again in 1690—Friction with William — “Oath of Assurance”—Episcopal Ministers in the Establishment—Martyrdom of Aikenhead—Education—Barrier Act.

WHILE Scotland was in such sad experience, Charles II. died on February 6th, 1685 ; cheating both Presbyterians and Episcopalians at the last, in his more than probable “reconciliation” with the Papal church. The Romanists claim that he was “reconciled” at the hands of the Benedictine Huddlestone. Few heathens would envy them their convert, or congratulate them on his “deathbed repentance.” When James II. came to the throne no one, save the Romanists and any through whom Romish interests might be served, could have expected a change for the better. The Covenanters and other Nonconformists could only expect a change for the worse, if it were possible. The Parliament of April 3rd, 1685, reached the low water mark of subservience to the Stewarts, and antagonism to the Presbyterians and Covenanters ; while the meshes of the net by which the Nonconformists were to be caught,

were made finer and stronger than ever. Unhappily, while the Parliament was abasing itself before James, the abortive attempt of Argyll to raise a rebellion in the West of Scotland was made. The Cameronians would not have anything to do with one who had refused the Covenant ; and the other Presbyterians were of a very feeble heart. Argyll was captured ; and, without trial, was beheaded under the old sentence of death that had been passed on him. He was happier in having to die, than many of the Presbyterians and Covenanters were in having to live through the horrors of the overcrowded vaults of Dunottar Castle, or to endure the miseries of the middle passage to American slavery.

When Parliament met in April, 1686, it was to find James posing as one desirous for liberty of conscience. This was in the interests of Romanists. It stirred both Parliament and the churches. The opposition to the King's purpose brought out the prerogative, to which the Scotch bishops had delivered themselves body and soul. James removed the Bishop of Dunkeld, a brave man ; and soon after deprived the Archbishop of Glasgow, a very timid man, whose timidity proved his bane. The easier going kind of Presbyterians accepted and thanked James for his concessions. The Cameronians, more honestly and wisely, stood off, and would not have James and his policy on any terms. The one thing that had been forbidden in the concession of 1687 was the holding of field conventicles. The Cameronians continued them defiantly : but Renwick, their leader, a brave and noble man, paid with his life for the persistence that he showed. He died on February 17th,

1687 : thanking the Lord on the scaffold for giving him the crown of martyrdom. His death was the last martyrdom for the Covenant in Scotland. But meanwhile James had attacked the liberty of the English bishops ; and right Divine and headship of the Church of England by a Papist King were in peril. The English prelates would have seen Presbyterian Scotland ruined before they would have acknowledged any wrong in their Church's head. But it was different when he touched them in his rough, Stewart way. The fear of his son-in-law, William of Orange, was now heavy on James, and made him call for Scotch aid. The Scotch bishops sent him word of their good wishes for the success of his arms. Yet, not sure that their blessing would be of great avail, they commissioned two of their number to go to London, and consult with the English prelates on the sad state of public affairs. Only one of the two bishops went : and he found no Head of the Church, nor Divine-right King in London to receive him. For by that time James had run away to France, and William of Orange was in England. To the Scotch bishops, after the Episcopal blessing on James, this must have been like the sight of Dagon fallen in pieces on the threshold of his shrine, to the slave of Ashdod who opened the temple doors in the morning. The Papist Head of the Scotch Church was gone : the King by Divine right was not to be found.

Naturally the Scotch Romanists grew more hopeful during the reigns of Charles and his brother James ; but it is certain that little progress was made by them. Their missionaries and others were earnest enough, but the penal

laws and, save in some parts of the Highlands and the Western Isles, the utter alienation of the people, made any great success impossible. The landing of William of Orange, and his successful movement on London stirred the Covenanters with a greater hope than the accession of James had given to the Romanists. Their courage rose as with the strength of youth. Excesses were almost a certainty. Edinburgh and Glasgow were ready for riot, on account of the signs of popish worship that had been introduced. Western Scotland made Christmas day that year notable by the gathering of the Cameronians ; and soon there were reports of forcible exclusion of Episcopalian ministers from the churches and manses. William was not long without having to face the contentions of the Scotch churches. He was sought by the Presbyterians, and by the Episcopalians through their messenger, Bishop Rose ; but, receiving more promises of support from the Presbyterians, William had "to be excused for standing by the presbytery." Doubtless he was the more disposed to this by his friendship for William Carstares, a man who had borne piteous torture and exile for Presbyterianism. In his exile he had won the complete confidence of William. All Carstares' influence must have been in favour of the Presbyterians.

On March 14, 1689, the Scotch Estates were convened. From the outset the deliberations ran in favour of William and the Presbytery ; and on April 4th the Estates declared the throne of Scotland to be vacant, and on the 11th determined to offer it to William, with a Claim of Right, that declared "that prelacy ought to be abolished,"

The proclamation enforcing prayer for the new monarch was read all through Scotland ; and where Episcopalian ministers would not read it they were deprived of their livings. The Claim of Right and offer of the throne were sent up to London ; and on May 11th the Earl of Argyll read the coronation oath to William and Mary. To a clause that would have made him a persecutor, William gave a very positive refusal ; and the commissioners agreed to his protest. The king and queen then accepted the Scotch throne, and took the oaths. The Covenanters would have had William take the Covenant, but that had to pass. When Parliament again met in June, after adjournment, the Aberdeen Presbytery petitioned that a General Assembly of the Church might be called. This was not agreed to ; but in July an act was passed that abolished Episcopalianism as the State religion, yet left other matters untouched. In its next session, that of April, 1690, Parliament legalized the Establishment that still exists in Scotland. The supremacy of the Crown in things spiritual was abolished ; the Westminster Confession was adopted as the standard of the Church ; and the Presbyterian form of government was authorized. The question, the burning question, of patronage now came to the front. The nomination to vacancies was taken from patrons, (compensation being made to them,) and given to the elders and heritors. If a congregation disapproved a nominee, it was arranged that the objectors were to give reasons to the Presbytery, by whom the matter was to be settled. Only the necessity of William's position led him to consent to this. Sir W. Lockhart wrote to Melville,

—"The King, as to the settlement of Presbytery, seems only to stick at the patronages."\* In Royal boroughs the appointment of ministers was vested in the magistrates, town council, and Kirk session. The Cameronians and others were not satisfied with this legislation for the Church. The Covenant had not been recognized; and they could not see that this was well.

Presbyterianism was now the national Establishment. It was arranged that the Assembly should meet in October, 1690. When it met, after forty years' interval, the King's letter pointedly warned them against a persecuting spirit:—"We never could be of the mind that violence was suited to the advocacy of true religion; nor do we intend that our authority should ever be a tool to the irregular passions of any party." This was wholesome language. The pity was, that it was the alien King, and not the Assembly, that uttered it. The answer of the Assembly was remarkably quiet. William's letter is the more noteworthy because of the strange conjunction of two kinds of nonjurors against him. These were the Covenanters, who would none of him, because he had passed by the Covenant; and there were the Episcopalians, who would not give up their allegiance to the Stewarts. His letter was a protection for both; though at this time the Covenanters were well able to take care of themselves. After appointing a national fast, and arranging, among other things, for the supply of Gaelic Bibles and catechisms to the almost barbarous Highland districts, the Assembly appointed two commissions to visit

\* Cunningham, Vol. II., p. 285, note.

the country north and south of the Tay, for purposes of church discipline. The commissioners did their work badly, like children, or bad men suddenly trusted with power. Their acts were against the spirit of the King. The good feeling of William in the direction of toleration was clearly evidenced, in the appeal that some of the ejected Episcopalian ministers made to him, by a deputation that followed him to Flanders. William wrote, protesting against the severity that was being used. But neither this, nor a second letter, had any effect on the headstrong presbyters. After this, William's double adjournment of the Assembly till January 15, 1692, cannot be wondered at; but it greatly offended the Presbyterians. Their success was stirring their pride.

When the Assembly met in January 1692, it consisted chiefly of representatives from South Scotland. King William evidently wished the Presbyterians and Episcopalians to agree to live together, if they could not worship together. But he also tried to bring them into union of worship. He therefore proposed a Declaration, on making which, Episcopalian ministers were to be received into the Presbyterian Established Church. The Declaration promised concurrence with Presbyterian government; and an acceptance of the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms. It is certain that, more or less earnestly or honestly, many Episcopalian ministers sent in petitions for reception into the Presbyterian Church. But the Assembly had no mind to receive them: and the royal commissioner adjourned the Assembly *sine die*: whereupon the Moderator, acting on the long-standing custom of not adjourning save to a



specified day, named the third Wednesday in August 1693 as the time for the next session. The friction between the Assembly and William was now growing hot: but all believers in toleration and Christian forbearance will blame the Assembly for the trouble. The irritation was not softened by the feeling of the Presbyterians to the "Oath of Assurance," that all office-holders were required to take: which was to the effect that William and Mary were monarchs *de jure* as well as *de facto*. This was also opposed by the Episcopalians, but on other ground than that taken by the Presbyterians. The Presbyterians objected to the claim of the secular power to have a right to make ministerial tenure of office depend on an oath: especially one not sanctioned by the church courts. It was a plain and honourable objection. When the time was nearing at which the Assembly had determined to meet, the possible clash with the King was avoided by the Estates formally asking William to call an Assembly near the day chosen. This steered clear of the difficulty, which might have become very serious. The trouble of the Oath of Assurance, however, was not ended: for in the Assembly of March 1694, the Presbyterian ministers appealed to the Privy Council to be relieved from the need of subscribing the oath. The King's Commissioner had instruction to insist on the oath, or to dissolve the Assembly: but seeing the positive spirit of the members, he sent a messenger to London to ask for the King's reconsideration of the whole matter. The royal advisers in London counselled imperative measures: and the story runs that insistent orders were being sent, when Carstares heard of it, stopped the

messenger, saw the King and persuaded him to the contrary. When the Assembly heard that William had dispensed with the oath, it not only loudly praised him, but met his wishes by appointing a commission to receive the Episcopalian ministers who were willing to enter the Establishment according to the recent enactments. Many of them took advantage of their opportunity.

The arrangement that thus permitted Episcopalian ministers to hold livings was very advantageous to the country. To have dispossessed them would have renewed old sorrows in many districts : and Presbyterian ministers could not have been found to replace them. They stayed on : and at the time of the union between England and Scotland in 1707, there were still 165 Episcopalian ministers in the Scotch Establishment, holding the livings in their parishes. But the spirit of toleration had really grown very little : and religious equality was only the dream of a few. The death of Aikenhead is a sad instance of the domination of a hard intolerance. He was a youth of eighteen, and was hung for talking against the way in which the Bible was generally regarded, and against the mystery of the Trinity. When the ministers might have saved him, they would not. Even the delay of a few days to the poor convict was refused, and he was hung with the Bible in his hand. He was the last to die for conscience in Scotland, though he abjured his opinions and begged for mercy. With the thought of the last martyr, if such he can be called, comes the sadness that he was one who died holding the Bible as his consolation ; and that he died at the hands of those who professed to hold the Scriptures even more

dearly than he. The Parliament of 1696 did work that is a pleasant and noble set-off against the record of bigotry. It was this Parliament that enacted that every parish should provide a commodious school-house, and a fair stipend for a schoolmaster. This had been the longing of the first Reformers. In 1633 and 1646 similar legislation had passed, but it was all repealed at the restoration of the Stewarts. Now education was made compulsory, and the Assembly backed the Parliament with all its authority. "Before one generation had passed away, it began to be evident that the common people of Scotland were superior in intelligence to the common people of any other country in Europe. To whatever land the Scotchman might wander, to whatever calling he might betake himself, in America or in India, in trade or in war, the advantage which he derived from his early training raised him above his competitors. If he was taken into a warehouse as a porter, he soon became foreman. If he enlisted in the army, he soon became a sergeant, etc."\*

By "The Barrier Act" of 1697 the Assembly guarded the Church against unexpected and unconsidered changes, by ordaining that before anything could be enacted it should come as an "overture" to the Assembly, and then be remitted to the presbyteries for their consideration. The wisdom of the regulation was self-evident. From the work of Parliament in 1698, it is clear that Presbyterianism was spreading with difficulty in some parts of the country. "The Rabbling Act" was directed against the riots that were raised in various districts of the north, when Presby-

\* Macaulay's History, Chapter XXII.

terian ministers were intruded. And from the Assembly's decrees of the same year it is evident that the Cameronians were reproaching the Kirk for "Erastianism." "The Seasonable Admonition" of the Assembly declares emphatically the divine right of Presbyterianism, and affirms their confident belief that they "have a better foundation for this our church government than the inclinations of the people or the laws of men." Which conviction is a very helpful one in any age of controversy. The Assemblies of 1700 and 1701 appear to have had little to do beyond the ordinary duties of their commission. It may be that the Darien money-making expedition, which was little better than the South Sea Bubble, brought worldly preoccupation even to the most saintly minds. But the Assembly of 1702 was closed by King William's death on March 8th. He was certainly not appreciated by the Scotch presbyters, but, against themselves, he had kept them from many sins of persecution; and thus, it may be, from begetting a reaction that might have hurt them in every direction.

## CHAPTER XX

Queen Anne—Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge—Case of Greenshields—Act of Toleration—Act Restoring Patronage, 1712.

QUEEN ANNE'S accession was met on the part of the Assembly, by the acknowledgment of her title to the crown, and by a promise of support. When the Assembly met in March 1703, the Queen's message claimed gentle consideration for those who were not of the Establishment, though Protestant. To which the Assembly's reply, if respectful, was yet very firm in maintaining the Divine right of Presbyterianism. The Assembly, also, was strong enough, when the Estates met in May, to secure the throwing out of a bill, that was brought in by the Earl of Strathmore, for the toleration of all Protestant dissenters. While their antagonism was chiefly against the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians refused to acknowledge equal Christian rights to any others. The Episcopalians were at this time under necessity of providing for the continuance of their church life, in consequence of the death of some of their bishops. Only five of their prelates were living; and one of them was disabled. It was, therefore, resolved to consecrate two bishops without territorial jurisdiction.

John Sage and John Fullerton were the ministers chosen for the office. They were both worthy the honour; and were consecrated in a private oratory in 1705, by the Archbishop of Glasgow and the Bishops of Edinburgh and Dunblane. In 1716 the Bishop of Edinburgh, by the death of his diocesan colleagues, became the only Scotch bishop with territorial authority. There were other prelates: but they were only bishops *in partibus Presbyterianorum*.

The year 1707 was notable for the forming of the "Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge:" the work of which was largely devoted to the neglected parts of the north, and the Western Isles. But this, and all such work, must have been overshadowed by the approach to an issue, of the movement that had been authorized, when the Parliament of 1705 consented to the nomination of commissioners, who were to meet delegates on the side of England, and consult about the "Treaty of Union with England." The work was not finished till 1707: when, after a provision that Presbyterianism should be the only State Church government in Scotland, and the insertion of a similar declaration on behalf of the Episcopal Church in England, the union of the two countries was decreed. Just as in Scotland some of the extreme Presbyterians opposed the clause that secured the Episcopal Church for England, as condoning sin; so, in the English House of Lords, four of the bishops objected to the Scottish act of security for the Presbytery. To whom the Archbishop of Canterbury said, with a judgment wider than the appreciation it met, "that he had no scruple in approving of it

within the bounds of Scotland: that he thought the narrow notions of all churches had been their ruin: and that he believed the Church of Scotland to be as true a Protestant church as the Church of England, though it was not so perfect."\* On March 25th, 1707, the Act of Union was recorded: the Parliament of Scotland adjourned to the 22nd of April; but met no more. The Presbyterian Church and the General Assembly were thus left as the only powers in Scotland that had legislative authority.

One great, if not immediate, result of the Act of Union was to relieve the Church of Scotland from the questionable benefits of the close influence of the nobles. Their interest was now in London: their treasure was there: and where that was, their heart followed. It was good for the Church that they for the most part betook themselves thither. The Church had lost more than it had gained by them. The relief of their presence made the Kirk more the church of the people; more democratic than before, if possible: though, as it left the ministers of religion the undisturbed masters of the country, it was not without its qualifying dangers. Even in recent times it has been said, that "the god of Scotland is the minister!" On the whole, it was well for Scotland that the measure of truth in this, was equally applicable to the state of the country immediately after the passing of the Act of Union. Religion across the border had little attraction for the ministers. Though they belonged to an "Establishment," coquetting with the English Established Church was impossible to the Presbyterians. Prelacy was rightly and justifiably abhorrent to

\* Carstares' State Papers, quoted by Cunningham.

them. Exchange of compliments between the two "Establishments" has been left for modern times: in which signs have not been wanting, that show readiness on the part of Scotch Kirkmen to make common cause with English prelatists, on the ground of the preservation in both countries of "State patronage," if not "State control." Other judgments and impulses ruled the Kirk in 1707. The Assembly of that year even took special action against the attempt to bring in the usages of the Anglican liturgy in the Episcopalian meeting-houses. It called attention to the fact that such "introduction was not so much as once attempted even during the late prelacy." It appealed to the ministers to preach against the practice, and to the government to stop the practice. The non-establishment of the Episcopalians had become an appeal to the instinct of liberty. Since 1637 they had used no liturgy in Scotland: but now their preference for forms begot a craving for the liturgy of the larger church of their order in England. That liturgy was actually used publicly by an Episcopalian minister named Greenshields: and on him the Presbytery pounced, making his action the occasion of a test case. Greenshields naturally refused to acknowledge Presbyterian jurisdiction: and for continuing the exercise of his office and the liturgy he was imprisoned. But he carried his case on till it reached the English House of Lords, which finally, in April, 1711, gave judgment in favour of Greenshields, and against the Scotch Court of Session.

This decision, which may have been due to a change of ministry in Parliament, was followed by the passing of an



Act of Toleration for Scotland early in 1712, in spite of a petition against it by the Commission of the Assembly. The Act was entirely in favour and in the interest of the Episcopalians, but was qualified by the requirement to take the Oaths of Allegiance and Abjuration, and to pray for the Queen, Sophia of Hanover, and all the royal family, during Divine service. Whether the prayers were expected to have any efficacy, or to have more in heaven than on earth, may be an open question. Certainly there was more policy than piety in the demand. It served also to make trouble for the Presbyterian Established Church, the ministers of which were required by the same Act to take the same oath and to say the same prayers. To give them trouble did not grieve the Government. The lines of their prayerfulness were assigned by Parliament in the same particulars as those laid down for the Episcopalians; and they were compelled by the State to ask the Almighty to help and keep an Episcopalian monarch for England and Scotland. Here, too, it may be questioned whether much was expected by the London politicians, from a parliamentary direction as to how the Scotch were to say their prayers. The governments that patronize State churches seldom encourage pious emotions, when they teach men "how to pray and what to pray for." Nor can their directions be thought very devout toward God, or at all considerate for the Christian who looks to them for the limits of his prayers, and the subjects of his intercession before God. It may be that the Christian who takes his praying orders or his prayer-book from a parliament, is of such a sort that a nondescript House of Commons or government is holy enough to counsel him as

to what he ought to say before The Eternal. Probably churches, like nations, have the government they deserve. The Toleration Act, in addition to its provisions for praying, guarded against the possibility of civil loss from excommunication, for it gave the ecclesiastical authorities no claim on the magistrate to enforce their sentences. By this refusal of the aid of "the secular arm," it greatly reduced the power of the church courts. Naturally, the Established Churchmen could not see this to be just; nor was the Act passed because it was *just*. Such a thought, in all probability, never entered the mind of the Government. None the less, the legislation was righteous, as far as it went, though "toleration" in religion is itself an insult and an injustice to the "tolerated." Such, however, is still the condition before the law of the majority of Christians in England and Scotland. Their Christianity must be very real in some things, for they meekly endure contradiction; or if not meekly, they yet endure. Even their opponents, in pious moods, must hope that the discipline of being tolerated is good for their souls and tempers.

The Scotch Presbyterians were indignant because of the new legislation; but worse was in store. Secular patronage of church livings had always been obnoxious to them. Of that there can be no doubt. From the days of Knox they hated it. At the Reformation it was said two-thirds of the parishes were in the hands of patrons. After many struggles against it, patronage was abolished in 1649. It returned, of course, with the Stewarts, and though again made illegal in the reign of William III., it was, as has been seen,

against his policy and judgment. On May 22nd, 1712, a Bill restoring patronage received the royal assent, after having been carried through Parliament with a haste that has been called indecent, and an insulting disregard of the authorities of the Scotch Church. The value and wisdom of the Act may be judged from its becoming the fruitful cause of worldliness, strife, and secession in the Church down to modern times. It is impossible to credit legislators who were responsible for the Bill with common sense, leaving out all thought of statesmanship. The protest of the Assembly's Commission was almost disregarded. The Government seemed to be oblivious of the historic hate the Kirk had for patronage. And in all the after history, that has so much to do with the same question, it is a necessary qualification for judgment that it should not be forgotten that, whenever they had opportunity, the Presbyterians resolutely returned to the attack, and strove for the destruction of the gross system of secular patronage in church affairs. Never had it any favour from them, and their objection that the evil Act of 1712 was a breach of faith on the part of the Government, with respect to the Act of Union, was never adequately answered. It is certain that their consent to the Union of England and Scotland would never have been won, if Presbyterians had suspected that the Parliament would pass such a law as that contained in the Patronage Act. A native Scotch Parliament would never have dared to propose it for the Church of Scotland. The year 1712 was altogether unhappy for the Presbyterian Church. The 28th of October in that year was the last day on which ministers could take the Abjura-

tion Oath. When it thus came to a push, some took it under protest and explanation, while others refused it on any condition. This wrought another division in the church into Jurants and Non-Jurants, which was not ended for some years, and was only hurtful while it lasted.

The favour that was shown by Queen Anne and the Government to patrons and to the Episcopalians, had the natural effect of encouraging them and also the Romanists. Though patrons of livings had not the daring to take advantage of the new Act immediately. It was one thing to legislate in London, and quite another thing to act on the new law in Scotland. And even when action was taken by patrons against the judgment and preference of congregations, or the decisions of presbyteries, evidence is ample that the Church held its spiritual powers of ordination, &c., to be untouched by the Patrons' Act ; and that the civil courts limited legal right, on the side of the patron, to the stipend or emoluments of the benefice, which could be used only for sacred purposes in the parish.\*

\* *Vide* Buchanan : "Ten Years' Conflict," Vol. I., pp. 156-168.

## CHAPTER XXI

Rising under the Pretender—Heresy Cases : Professor Simson : “Marrow Controversy”—John Glass—Lowered Tone of the Church—Growth of the Patronage Trouble—“The Moderate Party”—Ebenezer Erskine—First Secession, 1733—Deposition of the Associate Synod—George Whitfield in Scotland.

THE death of Queen Anne and the accession of George I. gave strength to the Presbyterians of Scotland, who gladly welcomed the change of government that the coming of the House of Hanover brought. Their position in general was further strengthened by the folly of the Episcopalians ; many of whom took part in the rising under the Pretender in 1715. The failure of that rising brought a more severe insistence on taking the Oaths of Allegiance and Abjuration, under the pressure of which the Episcopal ministers were more and more detached from the growing life of the country ; while, at the same time, they were not led to wise judgments in the arrangement of their own ecclesiastical affairs. With almost incredible superstition, “most of the prelates, and a considerable number of the clergy, believed that their sovereign, though in exile and holding a different religious (Papist) belief, was as much entitled to their allegiance as subjects and as ecclesiastics, as if he sat

on the throne of his fathers, and professed the creed of King Charles 'the Martyr.'"\* And they even went so far in their infatuation as to receive nominations to bishoprics from "their master," when vacancies occurred. But this began to try the common sense, faith, and even adhesion of some of the Episcopalians, whose nobler thoughts of church life made them dread the Erastianism that had the Papist Pretender for its "Master." A division among the Episcopalians was the result: the Collegers, who were Erastian, and the Usagers, who were high church and held the Church above the Pretender, dividing and striving against each other, by means of the consecration of bishops on each side, in order to get a numerical majority in the counsels of their community. In 1727 the miserable struggle was at its height; but in the end, the Usagers were left the stronger, and their victory was marked by the wise decision, that all the bishops henceforth should have the assignment of diocesan limits and titles. The result was better than might have been hoped. This strife was no more pitiful, in one way, than was the attempt of some of the Scotch Episcopalians, along with some English prelates, to enter into communion with the Eastern church. Negotiations for this were carried on through the years from 1716 to 1723. Such a project was suitable for ecclesiastics who owned the Pretender as their "master" and head of their church, to make to other ecclesiastics who, at every turn of the correspondence, had to consult the Czar Peter! For he, after "the extinction of the patriarchate of Moscow, was the virtual head of the

\* Grub, Vol. III., pp. 382, &c.

Russian church." The Pretender, Head of the Church in the West, and the Czar of Russia, Head of the Church in the East, make a strange picture ; but the wish of some of the British prelates is something more than strange. The negotiations in connection with this absurdity, during which the Western prelates were deservedly humiliated, were ended by the death of the Czar.

While the Episcopalians were passing through their troubles and difficulties, the Established Church, for the first time since the Reformation, was involved in doctrinal controversies and charges of unsoundness in the faith. In 1714 the notice of the Assembly was called to the charge against Simson, Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, of teaching Arminianism. In 1717 the Assembly determined that he had used language loosely ; and for the time the case was ended. But the taint of Simson's reputed opinions was charged, by the Presbytery of Auchterarder, against a probationer named Craig ; and his licence was refused, till he had suffered a satisfactory inquisition on points of doctrine. The Assembly censured the Presbytery for introducing tests that had not been authorized by the chief court of the Church. In the zeal for neutralizing the effects of beliefs that were deemed alien from the true faith, Boston, the author of "The Fourfold State," recommended and indirectly brought about the republication of Fisher's "Marrow of Modern Divinity" in 1718. This brought on the "Marrow Controversy," the issue of which was that in 1720 the Assembly condemned the book for its Antinomian character. An

\* Grub, Vol. III., p. 402.

attempt of some of the Assembly, among whom were the two Erskines—Ebenezer and Ralph, to get the decision repealed, only increased the soreness that is the inevitable accompaniment of theological strife. The Assembly in 1722 ratified the previous decision, and censured the conduct of the champions of the book. Echoes of this strife were heard so late as 1727; after which quiet came.

The second accusation and trial of Professor Simson for heresy cannot be entirely separated from the feeling begotten by "The Marrow Controversy." Simson was this time charged with Arianism, in connection with the doctrine of Dr. S. Clarke, in his recently published work on "The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity." The dispute and trial ran on with vigour till 1729, when, after retracting the words that gave ground for the charge against him, Simson was suspended. Some wished him deposed, but kinder and perhaps wiser counsels prevailed. The decision was certainly kind to the Professor, but some have doubted whether it was wise for the Church. A less worthy, but, perhaps, inevitable Church prosecution about this time was that of John Glass, the minister of Tealing. He had maintained the spirituality of the New Testament Church in a way that was an objection to the Establishment as such. He anticipated the later "voluntary" controversy, taking up a position nearly that of the Congregationalists in church polity. He was deposed by the Commission in 1730. No other result could have been expected from the church courts at that time. To deny the authority of the Covenants and declare that they were rather Jewish than Christian in spirit; to deny also the right of the civil



magistrate in church affairs, and to maintain the unlawfulness of carnal weapons in upholding Christianity and defending religion—these things could meet with little sympathy from any party in the Scotch Church. Consequently the deposition of Mr. Glass caused very little trouble.

It is in connection with the controversy that gathered round Professor Simson's name that some have found signs of the beginning of laxity and want of precision in doctrine and church life, that later on bodied themselves in the formation and growth of the "Moderate Party," and in the patronage troubles, that have been of such vast importance to the Scotch Church. Without going so far as that, it yet may be safely noted that the rise of the "Moderate Party" was coincident with, if not associated with, a lamentable loss of earnestness in holding the faith; and an equal and as deleterious subservience to the degrading law of secular patronage in the Church of Christ. The cause of this lowered tone of thought and life has been overcharged to the influx of the Episcopalian "curates," who took advantage of the opportunity to enter the Established Church that came after the revolution. Their convictions were of loose fibre, and their consciences were very elastic, without doubt: but the area that they tainted with their influence was comparatively small. Wherever they had influence, the result of their conformity was, most likely, a strengthening, if not a begetting of that Vicar of Bray spirit which will have the benefice, no matter who may be patron or king. There was some reason to fear the influence of such: and the Earl of Crawford, writing at the time, was

wiser in forecast than many thought. His words are, "can it be thought that we shall have presbytery established, or that government continued, when the management is in the hands of men of different, if not opposite principles, who being three to one for number, would certainly in a short time cast out of the Church such as were not altogether of a piece with them?" And in another letter he wisely noted that unless patronage were removed, "many would present to churches such as were not of our party."\* The law of 1690 seemed to provide against this by the abolition of patronage: but the shameful act of 1712 made the realization of Crawford's ominous forecast possible. The policy of many of the Jacobite patrons was exactly along the line of the earl's conjecture: and necessitated the passing of an act in 1719, by means of which the trick of presenting a man to a living who, it was known, would not accept it, and so keeping the living vacant and in the patron's hands, was made impossible. For it was enacted, that at the end of six months, the presentation, if still uncompleted, was to pass from the patron to the Presbytery.

Though as yet no case of intrusive patronage had risen on which the courts of law had been called to decide, (for that at this stage would have seemed to be an outrage,) the drift of the patronage party, as it may be now called, was very clearly away from the recognition of the rights of congregations, and the sanctity of the "call" to a minister. The lessening zeal of some of the chief of the Assembly in this matter was very evident. For while,

\* Quoted in Buchanan's "Ten Years' Conflict," Vol. I., p. 171.

for several years after the Act of 1719, no one dared to use a presentation, and later, licentiates were degraded for accepting a patron's gift, a petition to the Assembly in 1732 complains, that the Commission of the Assembly, instead of helping, had condemned those who had protested against ministers and probationers accepting presentations to churches without calls from the congregations. And the petition further asks that "none be licensed or ordained who favour this cause."\* And "Wodrow mentions the case of a presentee to Foulis, who was stripped of his license for the same crime (of accepting presentation), by the Presbytery of Auchterarder, which thus early began to acquire its anti-patronage celebrity." The same Presbytery had already rejected a Mr. Blaikie, as presentee of Viscount Dupplin to the parish of Madderty. The "call" of the congregation was not questioned: it was deemed to be of at least as much importance as the patron's presentation: and this continued for some time after the restoration of patronage. The Crown presentation to Lochmaben in 1724; the presentation to Twynholm in 1726; and notably the presentation of Mr. Chalmers to Aberdeen, which was carried up to the Assembly in the same year, all maintain the sense of the importance, and even necessity of the call from the congregation, as being of greater value than the patron's act.

The patronage question, which was already so great, and was to be a greater cause of trouble to the Scotch Church, was now nearing its first crisis; and, like the last great conflict of principle over this question, the first was

\* Cunningham, Vol. II., p. 420, *note*.

to be marked by a secession. At this time the divergence was only on the point as to from whom the call should come : whether from the heritors and elders only, or from all the heads of families in the congregation. This, though not strictly a "patronage" matter, was closely bound with the common limitation of the word. They who were the more lax in doctrine and thought, would have the call only from the heritors. They who were more "evangelical," would have it from the whole congregation. "The Moderate Party," if it be correct so to speak of it at this stage, laid an overture before the Assembly in 1731, proposing that the call should come from heritors and elders. The overture came back from the Presbyteries in 1732, and their judgment was certainly against the overture. In the debate that followed, Ebenezer Erskine lifted the question to a height that some of the "Moderates" were spiritually incapable of reaching. "What difference," said he, "does a piece of land make between man and man in the affairs of Christ's kingdom? We are told that 'God hath chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith.' It is not said that He hath chosen the heritors of this world, as we have done : but the poor of this world. And if they be heirs of the kingdom, I wish to know, by what warrant they are stripped of the privileges of the kingdom?" But the Assembly's decision was in accordance with the overture : which limited the call to heritors and elders, or town council and elders, with appeal for the congregation to the Presbytery ; and this was to be, till "it should please God in His providence to relieve the Church of the grievance of patronage."

From the Assembly Erskine went home and preached against the attempt "to jostle Christ out of His government." And again, as moderator of the Synod of Perth and Stirling, he preached, maintaining that "the call of the Church lies in the free choice and election of the Christian people. The promise of conduct and counsel in the choice of men that are to build, is not made to patrons, heritors, or any other set of men, but to the Church, the body of Christ, to whom apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, are given. Christ is rejected in His poor members, and the rich of the world are put in His room." The principles implied in such words are the elementary truths of all ecclesiastical polity that is based on the New Testament. The Synod, however, by a small majority, judged its Moderator to be deserving of censure: from which Erskine appealed to the Assembly of 1733. The previous Assembly unhappily had intruded a Mr. Stark, against the wish of the congregation and Presbytery, on the parish of Kinross, and had rebuked the Presbytery of Dunfermline, of which Ralph Erskine, the brother of Ebenezer, was a member. The Assembly's judgment of Ebenezer was a foregone conclusion, if he stood firm. He did, and with three followers, Wilson, Moncrieff, and Fisher, gave in a protest, maintaining his opinions and refusing to cease utterance of them. The Assembly unfortunately put the matter in the hands of the Commission, who insisted on retractation, and sorrow as if for sin. Failing to get this, the four ministers were suspended. When the Commission met again they found the four ministers still unyielding, and in consequence

ejected them from their churches. Again the four ministers protested, with manifest sympathy from some of the listeners, refusing the separation from their congregations, and speaking against "the prevailing party in the Church," as against men who had fallen away from the true principles of the Church of Scotland. . This first secession from the Kirk was in November 1733. The Seceders at once formed themselves into a presbytery, and soon found that their friends were in every district, and that the people looked to them as the champions of the rights of Christ and His people : as in truth they were, notwithstanding their narrowness of judgment in some things, and mistakes in many things.

The next Assembly (of May 1734) tried to undo the mistakes of its predecessors. It both tried to call back the Seceders, and sent to London to work for the abolition of patronage. The members had found, in the interval between the meetings of the Assembly, that the popular feeling against them was stronger than they had thought. The Synod of Perth and Stirling not only objected to the tyranny of the Commission, but also petitioned against the "harangues of mere moral virtues," that had taken the place in preaching "of the great and substantive doctrines of Christianity, which method of preaching," they say, "has created so general a disgust among the hearers of the gospel."\* The Assemblies of 1735-6 showed sympathy with the spirit that was working against patronage and in favour of a return to purer doctrine. But all this was vain, so far as the Seceders were concerned ; they would not return. The

\* *Vide* Cunningham, Vol. II., p. 240, note.

“Judicial Testimony.” that they published at the end of 1736, reads almost like an attempt to shut the door from the outside on themselves. Had they shown a more conciliatory spirit at this time, it seems more than probable that the things they protested against, such as patronage, might have been ended and buried without hope of a resurrection. As it was, they made it a point of honour with even some of their friends in the Assembly, to insist on church discipline, and on an end being put to the scandal of a house divided against itself, that the Church of Scotland was rapidly becoming. And, which was worse, they put power and opportunity into the hands of the friends of the patronage system ; for they made the very earnestness, that all granted was theirs, to appear troublesome and even hurtful to the good cause. This was much to be deplored. The chill of the second half of the eighteenth century was near enough, and its possibility was evident enough, without any need of making the zeal and fervour of the past seem objectionable and “bad form.”

The members of the “Associate Synod” were deposed by the Assembly of May 1740, and they ceased to be members of the Established Church. But they separated only to keep a life and light in the well-being of Scotch religion, for which even the Establishment must be thankful. Before the deposition, the Assembly completed the disciplinary case of Mr. Glass, who had been deposed, as already told, by the Commission in 1730. He was saintlier than his judges ; and on the memorial of the Synod of Angus and Mearns in his favour, the Assembly restored him to the position of a minister of the Gospel, but

refused him the status of a minister of the Scotch Establishment. This strange decision could not have troubled a man who had judged the Scotch and all Establishments of religion by the standard of the New Testament only; and he, therefore, never renounced his connection with the Kirk. His followers were called Glassites in Scotland, and Sandemanians (from Glass's son-in-law) in England. They were few in number, but they had a life in England that drew to itself the lofty intellect and saintly spirit of Michael Faraday.

The Seceders took with them a spirit of intolerance and hardness that was almost as hurtful to true church life as the disposition that, under the name of "moderation," was beginning to have rule in the Assembly of the Church of Scotland. When the Erskines and their friends invited Whitfield to preach in Scotland, they would have made the condition that he should preach only to them, "because we are the Lord's people." To which Whitfield's natural and common-sense answer was: "Are there no other Lord's people but you? And supposing all others are the Devil's people, they have the more need to be preached to." It was not long after this that the Seceders were denouncing Whitfield as "an abjured prelatie hireling, of as lax toleration principles as any that ever set up for the advancing of the kingdom of Satan." This spirit could only beget reaction, and incline the Assembly to move more quickly in the direction that would keep them free from the risks of such angry and intolerant zeal. Soon the Assembly showed that it was altogether too ready to go far in such a direction, now that it was free from the



counterweight of the over-zealous. A strong and wiser Evangelical party would have been of incalculable blessing to the Church during the next generation. They who were of that party in the Assembly did good service, though they were not very influential. It was an Evangelical, Dr. Webster, who must be credited with originating the "Ministers' Widows' Fund," that came into working by Act of Parliament in 1744, and was of such great service to the widows of ministers. A very different sign that the Evangelicals were not without power in the presbyteries and the Assembly is given in the prosecutions for heresy that they initiated against Professor Campbell, Dr. Wishart, and Dr. Leechman : all of whom were, however, freed from the charges brought against them.

## CHAPTER XXII

Rebellion of 1745—Division among the Seceders—Augmentation Scheme—Popular and Moderate Parties—Patronage Troubles—Deposition of Thomas Gillespie—Dr. Robertson.

THE strain put on the country by the rebellion of 1745 hushed theological strife for a time, if it did not unite differing theologians. The Presbyterians were as one in their resistance to the Pretender; even the aged Ebenezer Erskine appearing armed and ready for battle in the defence of Stirling, when it was threatened by the rebels. Many of the Episcopalians were as prominently in favour of the Pretender, and their community suffered in consequence. When the Duke of Cumberland had burned as many of their churches as he could, Parliament made consistent Episcopalianism almost impossible in Scotland. Once more it was insisted on that, whether it would do them any good or not, the royal family were to be prayed for by name in the Episcopalian churches. The penalty for not praying was to be six months' imprisonment for the first offence; and for leaving the reigning house a second time without devotional and liturgical compliments, the offender was to be transported for life. Not long after even worse

came, for another Act of Parliament nearly blotted the Episcopal Church out of Scotland by declaring that no Episcopal orders should be recognized in Scotland, but those that were granted by English or Irish bishops. Even the subservient English bishops were against this legal impertinence, though they had consented to other enactments that pressed heavily on their brethren across the Border.

After their display of loyalty or royalty, the Seceders were able to arrange another division among themselves. Looking at it from the present time, it may seem trivial and frivolous to some, but the hypersensitiveness of the Burgher and Antiburgher split is better than the deadness or lukewarmness, to which all differences are as nothing ; and that, because it believes nothing, will not make a trouble of any others' unbelief. The Burgess Oath required a burgess to swear "that he professed and allowed within his heart the true religion presently professed within the realm, and authorized by the laws thereof." The Erskine section would have taken the oath. Others would not, because they understood the religion meant to be that of the Establishment. Thereon, in 1747, the Burghers and Antiburghers went apart, with as much acrimony as marked their original secession from the Assembly.

By the middle of the century it was becoming clear that the patronage question would have to be taken up and decided ; or such precedents made as would relieve pressure, while the settlement of the difficulty was postponed. The spirit and inclination of the titled lay patrons were not difficult to discover. Their unhallowed possession of the

Church's property made many of them remorseless in their treatment of the claims of the churches and the need of the ministers. The effort in 1749 to get an augmentation of ministers' stipends brought out the intolerable greed and insolent resistance of such as the Earl of Marchmont and the Earl of Leven. The report of the Committee appointed by the Assembly, in favour of application to Parliament for an act that would make it possible to increase the minimum stipend of ministers, immediately ranked the elders against the ministers. "The whole landed proprietary were instantly in arms. The spirit which had withstood 'The First Book of Discipline,' and provoked John Knox's terrible wrath,—which had grasped the revenues of religious houses under the guise of commendatorships, and the rich revenues of bishoprics under a tulchan Episcopacy,—which had made men lukewarm as to religion and scarcely respectable as to morals, flaming supporters of the Covenant, simply because Presbytery was a cheaper commodity than Prelacy, was still as strong as ever. County meetings were held, and resolutions passed condemnatory of the Augmentation Scheme. Nobles joined hands with lairds to keep their minister poor. Heritors who rolled to church in chariots built with ecclesiastical plunder grudged the pastors who preached the Gospel to them £50 a year."\* The appeal to Government came to nothing. The ministers had to be content with their poverty, and with seeing the secular patrons rich far beyond their deserts on the spoil of the Church. While this was not directly linked with the patronage troubles,

\* Cunningham, Vol. II., pp. 482-3.

it showed the disposition of those who had such a selfish interest in church livings. And, coming with the rise of the Moderate party to power in the Assembly, it justified the division into Popular and Moderate of the opponent sections, that from this time marked the Assembly down to the middle of the present century.

Three things pointed the differences between the two groups : a difference in kind and style of preaching ; a difference of judgment as to the rights of patrons of church livings ; and a difference with regard to the authority of the Assembly over the consciences of church members. Whatever minor marks can be delineated in either party, no other word will show the watershed of their separation from one another so well as the word *spiritual*. Their conceptions of the church, of the preacher's message and obligation, of the authority of conscience and church courts, can be easily determined by that word. No soul athirst, no spiritual man could be expected to turn to Blair's Sermons for the refreshing of his heart, or for guidance on the way to the vision of God. As well might a castaway sailor try to end his thirst by drinking of the sea. It is "water, water everywhere, and not a drop to drink." As with the preaching, so with other things. The Church and its courts, in the sight of the Moderates, seemed to have lost anything they had possessed of divine character. To take to the hills for a Covenant, or go to the Grassmarket for "The Crown Rights of Jesus," would have been to them things inconceivable. Sir R. Hill's words are almost bitter, but there is truth in them :—"A moderate divine is

one who has a very moderate share of zeal for God. Consequently, a moderate divine contents himself with a moderate degree of labour in his Master's vineyard. A moderate divine is too polite and rational to give any credit to the antiquated divinity of our articles, homilies, and liturgy. Nevertheless, a moderate divine is ready enough to subscribe to them, if by so doing he can get an immoderate share of church preferment. A moderate divine is usually an advocate for card-parties, and for all assemblies except religious ones, but thinks no name too hard for those who assemble to spend an hour or two in prayer, and hearing God's word."\*

The patronage difficulty now came rapidly forward, in the form it ever had in its later stages, viz., of a conflict between the call of the people and the legal power of the secular patron. It is alleged that between 1740 and 1750 more than fifty cases of disputed settlement of ministers had come before the ecclesiastical courts: many of them being decided by the appointment of a "riding committee": *i.e.*, one sent by the Assembly to "intrude" an obnoxious minister, when the local presbytery would not recognize him. Such procedure, especially when, as in some cases, the "riding committee" was helped by soldiery, must have left great soreness behind, and a broader line of cleavage between the two parties.

It was in the Assembly of 1751 that the two parties had a real trial of each other's strength. A presentation had been made to the living of Torpichen; but the "Call" had

\* *Vide* "Ten Years' Conflict," Vol. I., p. 176; and Lord Cockburn's "Journal," Vol. II., p. 289, &c.

only about six out of a possible thousand names in its favour. The Linlithgow Presbytery twice refused, therefore, to further the settlement. When the case came before the final court, the Moderates appear to have thought that the only important matter was to secure obedience to the decision of the Assembly. The old cry of "authority," against which Rutherford had made complaint, was once more vigorously raised. In the debate, two young ministers moved and seconded that the disobedient Presbytery should be suspended. These two eager and plain-speaking young men were Home, the author of "Douglas: a Tragedy"; and Robertson, who became the most prominent member of the Assembly, and is well known still as the leader of the Moderates, the historian of Charles V., and the author of other works. Though they lost their motion, they had taken a step that was easily imitated: and when a "riding committee" inducted the minister of Torpichen in spite of the congregation's objection, the chief names on the committee were those of Blair, Home, and Robertson. But the Moderates went beyond a "riding committee" in 1752, when the case of Inverkeithing came before the Assembly. After a presumptuous address from the Commissioner, the Earl of Leven, it was determined that the disobedient Presbytery should be compelled to induct the obnoxious nominee, and to give in an account of their conduct to the Assembly. As if to make matters more difficult for the Presbytery, the number of the quorum was enlarged to five. When they appeared at the bar of the Assembly, six of them refused to have a hand in "scattering the flock of Christ."

But the Assembly condemned them, and determined to mark their displeasure by deposing one member of the Presbytery. The next day brought the scapegoat in the person of Thomas Gillespie, minister of Carnock, who was summarily deposed. He accepted his sentence in a spirit that might have taught the champions of authority a lesson; and immediately gave up the position and payment of a minister of the Established Church. In the summer time he preached in the fields; and in the following winter he opened a church in Dunfermline. Notwithstanding many petitions for his restoration, the Assembly refused: whereupon Gillespie formed a kirk-session; and so began what led to the "Presbytery of Relief" in 1761. The Moderates had their way, but at the cost of a secession. It is stating the case mildly to say, that throughout the course of this sad business, neglect of the rights of the congregation, and excessive care for the legal rights of the patron and for the mere authority of the Assembly, marked the conduct of the successful majority. Their words and actions never rose above the level of the discussions and divisions of a political club or a mutual benefit society. The future historian, the author of "Douglas," and the preacher of the chaff-cutting sermons that were so popular for a time in that degenerate age, show no sense of the existence of Christ as Head of the Church, no consciousness of a spirit devoted to Christ supremely. "New presbyter" was once more "old priest writ large": only, "new presbyter" had a colder hand and heart than the priesthood that had built Melrose and Holyrood.

The long step toward intolerance, and even persecution,



that was made in the case of Inverkeithing, is one of the notable things in the history of the patronage controversy : and for it to have been taken in the interest of secular patrons is less to be wondered at than regretted. The after career of Robertson and his party was consistent with this. His friendly biographer, Dugald Stewart, places first among the marks of the Robertsonian policy, "a steady and uniform support of the law of patronage."\* It almost induces the feeling, that Robertson's volunteering to act on the "riding committee" that, with the help of soldiers, forced his own brother-in-law, Syme, on the church of Alloa, in 1751, represents the man in church matters as well as anything could. Noble as his place in Scotch literature is, the level on which he chose to move as a churchman, and on which he for so long kept the judgment and procedure of the Assembly, forbids assigning him any elevated place in religion. The final verdict on any ecclesiastic cannot be determined by the power he gained for himself over the counsels of his contemporaries ; but by the answer to the question,—whether, having power, he left the spiritual life, the church life, the relation of his church to the world, purer and diviner than he found them? or whether he lowered that church's spirituality, dimmed her vision of divine things, and made her less the Bride of Christ than a waiter on the changes of political parties and the judgments of lawyers? Robertson and his party did not do the first, nor is it an open question as to whether they did the second. But while this is so, to Dr. Robertson and the noble company of men who, in his day,

\* *Vide* "Ten Years' Conflict," Vol. I., p. 187.

raised the literature of Scotland to a peerless position, from which it has so greatly influenced subsequent thought, all Britain owes a debt. Hume, Reid, Campbell, and Stewart are names that carry their own honour. The position of some of these to the Scotch Church, especially in the controversy about miracles, cannot here be told. They were all men of whom any church, for one reason or another, might be proud.

## CHAPTER XXIII

“Presbytery of Relief”—More Patronage Difficulties—Growth of Dissent—Supremacy of the Moderate Party—Romanist Relief—Principal Hill, Leader of the Moderates—“Chapel of Ease” Question—Foreign Mission Debate—Relief of Episcopalians and Romanists.

THROUGH all the controversies that gathered about the writings of Hume and others, the patronage trouble lost none of its intensity and importance. While the Moderates kept up some of the time-honoured forms, the “Call” of the congregation in the settlement of a minister was being persistently degraded. The Assembly systematically supported the patron, without regard to the feeling and judgment of the people. Thus the people of Jedburgh were forced to receive a man they would not have as minister. Therefore they left their old church, and built a new one for Mr. Boston, the minister they wanted. This was in 1757. So was it in 1759, with the presentation to the church of Kilconquhar. Rather than accept the patron’s nominee, the people built a new church in the village of Colinsburgh, to which they called a Mr. Colier. These two men, Boston and Colier, joined the outcast Gillespie,

and in October 1761 they formed "The Presbytery of Relief"; which was intended to be a refuge for all who felt the increasing burden of patronage, and the almost tyranny of the Assembly.

From the beginning of the trouble about patronage, the people had naturally been on one side. Hence the contrast of the "Popular" with the "Moderate" party. Strong as their feeling all along had been, it must have been intensified when, during the leadership of Dr. Robertson, a proposal was made to do away with the call of the people entirely, as not being recognized by *any act of parliament*. The reason was worse than the proposal. So high did the thought of the Moderates rise, concerning what was necessary to give authority and power to church questions and actions. And when to this was added another proposal, to limit objections against a presentee to his life and doctrine; because, as members of a State Church, they must rule their conduct by statute law, it was natural that the people should become restless at the persistent degradation of their Church, if they had any conscientious judgment about Church life. The shame and disgrace of public rioting were produced by the feeling that these proposals excited. The obtrusion of a minister at Kilmarnock in 1764 led to sad uproar; for which the backs of some of the people had to suffer afterward, though all the responsibility did not rest with those who were whipped. Rioting was bad enough, but the steady growth of organized separation from the Establishment was still more ominous. Not rudely, but with more devoutness than the Robertsonians could claim, or cared to claim, men were gathering

together and to Christ for worship in large numbers. In an overture of 1765, the Assembly was told that there were 120 meeting-houses in the country, with 100,000 persons in attendance who had been members of the Established Church. The committee that reported on this to the Assembly of 1766, charged the abuse of patronage with being a great cause of the evil of dissent. To which the Moderates, in the debate that followed, among other things argued that dissent was not an evil ; or, if an evil, yet a necessary evil, &c.\*

It is interesting here to note that the Moderates' position to dissent was, strangely enough, not unlike that taken up by Dr. Chalmers at one time, and charged against him in controversy by Dr. Lee, who, in his "Refutation of the Charges in reference to Church Extension and University Education," says,—“if the Dissenters of various denominations are to be united in doctrine with the Church, it must be admitted that one of Dr. Chalmers' announced principles must fall to the ground. I do not know how often he has expressed himself in words like these, but I have read such words in more than one publication bearing his name : ‘my idea of the perfection of an ecclesiastical system lies in this, that in the first instance there should be an Establishment, but that Establishment constantly operated upon, stimulated and kept on the alert by the zeal and activity of an energetic, active and unconstrained Dissenterism.’ ‘It is well that sectarianism should prevail, even to the degree of alarming the dignitaries of our land for the safety of

\* See a good summary of this debate in Cunningham, Vol. II., pp. 527, &c.

its ecclesiastical institutions.' "\* The voting after the Assembly's debate gave a victory to the Moderates. It may be that they felt their position strengthened by this ; and, therefore, were encouraged to mark off the line between the Establishment and the dissenting Presbyterian Churches more rigidly than ever. Ministerial communion was forbidden with the clergy of the Relief Presbytery, which had always avoided an actual breach with the Establishment ; and the State Church was made more exclusive in its claims. In the several opposed presentations that occurred about this time, also, the Assembly was more determined and insistant on the patron's right in law being accepted without question. At last it was unresisted. Before the great excitement about the repeal of the penal laws against Romanists in 1778, the Moderate Party could call itself master of the Assembly ; and the chief court of the Church of Scotland was, at length, undisturbed by the demands of congregations, that thought their rights were violated and Christ dishonoured by the intrusion in the church of obnoxious clerics.

The Moderate Party took the right side in the widespread opposition that was excited by the proposals of the Government to relax the penal laws against Romanists. These laws were as bad as the laws that now have force in some Romish countries against other Christians. They were legalized outrages on almost every relationship in human life. The rebellion of 1745 had made the pressure of the penal statutes even more heavy and acute. That

\* Dr. Lee's "Refutation": 1837: p. 81. See also Dr. Chalmers' Sermon at Bristol, 1830.

was to be expected; but thirty years' endurance of more trying penalty, might have warranted some relaxation in applying the code, if not the alteration of the laws themselves. In 1777 relief had been given to the Irish Romanists, and in 1778 to the English; but the expectation that Scotland was to be included in a similar relief, raised alarm and fanaticism to the pitch of excitement. The Romanists had strengthened their position in the country under the vicariate of Bishop Hay, who had been appointed coadjutor to Bishop Grant in 1769. At Edinburgh, where Bishop Hay made his headquarters, a new Roman Catholic church had been built, and the Romanist colony had been enlarged, partly, as a report to Propaganda in 1777 declares, by conversions, and partly by the coming of Roman Catholics to live in the capital.\* The proposal of 1778 to relieve Romanists from penal sufferings was met by wild indignation throughout the country, which at last broke out into mob rioting. The new Romanist church was fired, Bishop Hay's library was robbed, and other dishonours perpetrated. Glasgow saw similar atrocities. Dr. Robertson, who with his party was in favour of repeal, represented to the Government that the offence to the country would be greater than "the relief of a handful of Roman Catholics." The question of right was thus thrown to the wolves of expediency and popular clamour: the bill was dropped, and the Romanists had to wait another fourteen years before they were relieved of the shame and suffering that the law put upon them.

After 1780 Dr. Robertson sat no longer in the Assembly.

\* Bellesheim, Vol. IV., p. 232, note.

He said that he wanted to give himself more to his historical studies. Of his "administration," for such it was, it has been said—"Robertson was resolved to be independent of the Government, though he was resolved to support the existing order of things. He set two great objects before him—to strengthen patronage, and to improve the criminal procedure of the Church. He succeeded in both. He found the call competing with the presentation : he left it stripped of its ancient power. He found presbyteries mutinous : and he left them thoroughly subdued. He found the Assembly guided by no precedents, and bound by no rule, in the prosecution of offenders : he insisted on the same strictness as was observed in the other Courts of Justice, and left behind him a series of decisions, which were long venerated as a kind of Common Law in the Church."\* The spirit of this commendation ranges no higher than the compliments of an old sea captain, who might praise another captain of the old school, for having brought into working order a crew that had been furnished by the pressgang from the slums of a seaport. If that be all or the best that can be said of Dr. Robertson's influence on the Scotch Church and Assembly, they who can fill in details will not count his work great. They will prefer to think of Robertson the historian rather than of the ecclesiastic. In remembrance of all the jarring of the time, it may be well, perhaps, to remember him as Sir W. Scott speaks of him indirectly, when he makes Mr. Pleydell say to Guy Mannering of Dr. Erskine, the colleague and opponent of Dr. Robertson,—“his colleague and he differ,

\* Principal Hill, reported by Cunningham.



and head different parties in the Kirk, about particular points of church discipline, but without for a moment losing personal regard or respect for each other, or suffering malignity to interfere in an opposition steady, constant, and apparently conscientious on both sides.”\*

The Moderates did not lose ground under the leadership of Principal Hill of St. Andrews, Dr. Robertson's successor. Though it is clear that discontent with the policy of the dominant party was not entirely subdued; because several protests were made at that time against the appointments by patrons. Complaints were even made that ministers had been inducted without the appearance of a “Call.” For the desultory fight still ranged round “the Call,” in opposition to the nomination of the patron: the faint strife was still to champion the rights of the congregation, against the gift of the secular owner of the benefice. In 1782 the Assembly affirmed that “the moderation of a call in settling ministers is agreeable to the immemorial practice of the Church, and ought to be continued.” But how little this meant is to be seen from the answer that was given in 1784, to the petition for the removal of patronage, that was presented by the Synods of Perth and Glasgow. The overture was rejected: and more, the annual form of instruction to the Assembly's Commission to strive against patronage, which had been followed for forty years, was removed from the Assembly's orders. The controversy soon after became quiet; but in 1787 the advertisement for sale of the living of St. Ninian's, stirred both parties with abhorrence and shame, to a degree that would make

\* “Guy Mannering,” Chap. xxxvii.

members of the English Establishment stare. But no definite act of remedy came out of the disgrace and humiliation.

The principle of the subordination of church courts, that some maintain to be a necessary condition of Presbyterian Church life, had been worked by the Robertsonians till the power of the Assembly had become an almost irresponsible authority. This at length occasioned a contest as to whether the Presbytery or the Assembly was the root institution of the Church ; and the question came up in the Assemblies of 1795 and 1796 on the "Chapel of Ease" discussion. The Popular party, led by Dr. Erskine and Sir H. Moncrieff, strenuously opposed the committee recommendation, that presbyteries should consider and report on local needs without giving judgment, till authorized by the Assembly. It was now Presbytery against Assembly. When the question came back from the churches in 1797, a majority of presbyteries gave voice on the Popular side ; but the Assembly altogether unjustly returned it, and in 1798 got a majority, by which the power of the Assembly was made absolute in the matter of church extension.

It was in the Assembly of 1796 that the notable discussion on foreign mission work took place. It is certain that the Moderates had no zeal for such work, and that the Evangelicals were caught and stirred with renewed zeal, when the rekindled light of hope for the world reached Scotland. But in this the Moderates were only too much like the vast majority of British Christians at that time. Only a few years before, Carey, the Baptist, the " father of

modern missions," had been answered by one of the Baptist leaders, when he was pleading for support of foreign missions,—“Young man, sit down! When God pleases to convert the heathen He will do it without your help or mine.” And Carey's project formed a congenial subject for the jocular profanity of Sydney Smith. Likewise, in the Scotch Assembly, there were godlessly inane speeches against missions to the heathen, by such as Hamilton, Hill and Boyle; and the voting went against undertaking such work. In similar fashion the Antiburgher Synod in 1796 resolved against missionary societies; and the Cameronians excommunicated a member for attending a missionary service.\* The arguments used against mission work in these discussions are now thought despicable; and such resolutions would be held to disfranchise any community that professed to be of the Kingdom of heaven. But this was the low-water mark of the Scotch churches. The indignant “Rax me that Bible!” of the aged Dr. Erskine, as he rose to answer Hamilton of Gladsmuir out of “that Bible”; and the speech in support of foreign mission work, that the Evangelicals so warmly backed up, showed where the Spirit of God was moving. It was the foregleam of a new day. The morning had not broken, but the morning star had risen. The century did not end without signs, both in England and Scotland, that the chilly worldliness that had marked all the churches was passing away; and that the claim of Christ as Head of the Church, and ever present with it, was being more readily and sympathetically

\* *Vide* Cunningham, Vol. II., p. 570, note.

acknowledged. At the same time, in Scotland, sectarian differences had been a little accentuated, by the result of a visit of Rowland Hill to Scotland, and by the work of the two brothers Haldane, who gave impetus toward the formation of the Baptist and Congregational churches in Scotland not long after. Also, there were internal differences at work in some of the minor Presbyterian sects that still further divided them. Thus, in 1799, the "Old Light Burghers" were formed from the Burghers, by a difference of judgment about the Covenants and the Westminster Confession. And a few years later the Anti-burghers were subdivided, and a secession formed "the Constitutional Associate Presbytery."

The story of the Episcopal Church in Scotland during the latter half of the eighteenth century is not one of growth. The penal laws that had been made to press heavily on them after the Young Pretender's venture of folly made the struggle for existence hard, and the Scotch Episcopalians had little countenance from their English brethren. When, in 1789, a deputation of Scotch bishops went to London to claim relief from Parliament (the Young Pretender having died in 1788), they found only cold welcome where they might have expected warmth. Though the House of Commons passed a relief bill, the House of Lords rejected it; Lord Chancellor Thurlow moving its rejection, and declaring, as one of his reasons, that there could be no bishops without the King's authority. This almost took the breath away from the Scotch prelates, who could not realize that what Thurlow said was

\* Grub, Vol. IV., p. 104.

as the breath of life to the Anglican bishops. The remonstrance of the Scotch delegates to the Bishop of Bangor, who was a friend of Lord Thurlow, brought back only a very cold reply. But in 1792 a bill was again introduced into Parliament; and though this, too, was ignorantly opposed by Thurlow, who this time was well answered by Bishop Horsley, it passed both Houses, and conferred great advantages on the Episcopalians. In the following year, 1793, a relief bill for the Scotch Roman Catholics was passed; which, though it stopped far short of justice, gave to the Romanists great encouragement. At the close of the century their reports to Propaganda are bright and thankful, and their historian records that "in 1800 there were three bishops, forty priests, twelve churches, and some thirty thousand of the faithful."\* Bishop Hay was their venerated leader. He died in 1805.

\* Bellesheim, Vol. IV., p. 262 and note.

## CHAPTER XXIV

Nineteenth Century—Leslie Dispute—Pluralist Controversy—Strengthening of the Evangelical Party—Rapid Development of the Patronage Controversy—Preparation for “The Ten Years’ Conflict.”

THE first half of the nineteenth century was to prove a time of momentous importance to the Scotch Church, though no one could have foreseen it at the beginning of the century. When, in 1831, Dr. Chalmers preached the funeral sermon for Dr. Andrew Thomson, he could speak of “the next war” in the Church, and of its being, in all probability, “a war of principles.” But when the preacher was licensed in 1799, and Thomson in 1802, they could not have anticipated that questions which appeared to be settled, controversies that seemed to be dead and buried, with an autocratic Assembly triumphing over their graves, would have a mighty resurrection; and in their resumption of vitality would convert the triumph into humiliation. But to this the Scotch Church began to move fast from the beginning of the century; and the very earnestness of such as Chalmers and Thomson, served to prevent the life of the Church becoming hidebound through the Assembly’s self-content. The success, also, of the various Dissenting

Churches, Protestant and Romanist, was a continual object lesson, that, it may be unconsciously, fixed itself on the vision of earnest men in the Establishment ; and if it did not tempt imitation in due time, yet made church liberty appear to be a real, honourable and successful thing.

The two parties of the Moderates and the Evangelicals still faced each other in the Assembly ; the former and dominant party being led by Dr. Hill, while Sir H. Moncrieff led the latter. The Leslie dispute in 1805 renewed the strife between the parties, though it strangely reversed their position. The Moderates supported the candidature of Mr. Macknight, an Edinburgh minister, for the chair of Mathematics in the University, while the Popular party backed Mr. Leslie, against whom a cry of infidelity had been raised. The difficulty went up to the Assembly, and the voting gave a victory to the Evangelicals, who became honoured for having championed Science. The sense of victory gave them new power ; while the Moderates, by their defeat and subsequent lack of agreement among themselves, were correspondingly weakened.

Although there were now no burning questions before the Assembly, the distinctive marks of the two parties were ever preserved, and their members were always ready to fall into line. When the pluralist difficulty again came up in 1813, the two sections naturally took opponent ranks ; and Thomas Chalmers, who had previously written anonymously in favour of pluralities, opposed the union of the pastoral and professional offices as wrong in common law. On this it was that the Synod of Angus and Mearns brought the question before the Assembly in 1814, by

which court it was declared to be illegal in the Church, for any minister to hold an office that involved him in absence from his parish. A controversy rose on this that had to be sent down to the presbyteries, and was not settled till 1817, when it was enacted by the Assembly, "that no professor in a university can hold a parish, unless it be close by the university seat." The Evangelicals returned to the attack on pluralities in 1823, when Principal Macfarlan was presented to the High-church of Glasgow. Dr. McGill, Divinity professor in the University, and Dr. Chalmers, who was then working out his experiment with the low parish of St. John's, opposed the giving of such a parish as St. Mungo's to one who had enough to do in other work. The Presbytery of Glasgow and the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr refused to go on with the presentation; upon which the Assembly of 1824 tried the case, and gave the victory to the pluralists. And when, the next year, a number of overtures to the Assembly reopened the subject, the Assembly refused to work the provisions of the Barrier Act, and threw out the overtures.

The Evangelical party, notwithstanding its defeat on the pluralities question, was gradually gaining strength. By means of *The Edinburgh Christian Instructor*, which Dr. Thomson began to edit in 1810, and by the works of Dr. McCrie, specially his "Life of John Knox," which was published in 1811, the interest in the early Reformers and admiration for their work, which had been flagging, received a new stimulus. The coldness and narrowness of thought and feeling with which the last century had closed, began to pass away, so that, when foreign missions were brought before



the Assembly in 1824, 1825, and 1826, it was one of the chief of the Moderates, Dr. Inglis, who introduced the question, and it was his address to the churches that was read, calling for prayer and money. The result was that in 1829, Dr. Duff, whose name will ever have honour in connection with foreign missions, was sent as a missionary to India, the first representative of the Church of Scotland in such work. The spirit that had impelled the old Keltic missionaries was once more abroad, but now in the wider world of the nineteenth century. But in the midst of such signs of a better day for the churches, ominous tokens had been given of the great struggle that was coming. For in the pluralities debate of 1826, one of the Moderates—Hope, the Lord President of the Court of Session, had maintained that the Church had not the power to abolish pluralities, because of her relation to the State. “The presbyterian religion and the presbyterian form of government are in this country the creatures of statute. Both derive their existence and their doctrines, as well as their powers, from Parliament; and it is impossible that they could derive it from any other source.” This contention was met by the indignant speech of Professor McGill, who in ending his speech said—“I maintain that the constitution and privileges of the Church of Scotland are fundamental principles, which cannot be destroyed but by the breaking up of the general frame of our government, or by an act of despotic and lawless oppression.” Others followed in similarly indignant protest, and even Dr. Cook, a Moderate and a leader of the party, moved a resolution that implied the full power of the Church to legislate on

such questions, and to destroy such abuses as pluralities. Though it may have had little direct influence on the condition of the Established Church, or in preparing for the impending conflict, yet the now organized life of the Independents and Baptists in Scotland, was a continual reminder that there were those who so exalted the headship of Christ in His Church, as to consider that alliance with the State carried with it the infringement of His prerogatives, and an inevitable violation of His claims and dignity. With such principles the Congregational Union of Scotland met for its first session in 1813.

It was well that the Scotch Church committed itself to foreign mission work in 1829; that is, before the crush of the real battle about patronage was felt. The Anti-Patronage Society, that had been formed in 1822, was increasingly strenuous in its efforts, both locally and in parliament, to rid the Church of the hurtful influence of the patronage system. Now the question was coming very assertively to the front. The Commission that Parliament appointed to consider the matter, did nothing but pay compliments to the Church for her spiritual work, which no one with adequate warrant had questioned. The Popular party were strengthening their force. The sudden death of their leader, Dr. Thomson, in 1831, seemed at first to be an irreparable loss; but the pressure of the time forced others to the front who were equally, if not more fit for leadership. Then, the fuller relief of Romanists in 1829 had still more familiarized the public mind with the sense of justice, and of the folly of enforcing, by the power of the civil governor, penalties for differences in religion, whether

directly or indirectly. The passing of the Reform Bill made popular claims and rights seem more real ; broadened the area for future conflicts ; and brightened the horizon of popular progress. Many things that had been in solution were rapidly crystallizing in the third decade of the century. Altogether, it is not a mere convenient arrangement, but facts of history warrant the calling the last stage of the troubles that led to the disruption of the Church of Scotland, a "Ten Years' Conflict."

## CHAPTER XXV

Scotch and English Establishments and Patronage—The Veto Act—The  
Chapels of Ease Act—Beginning of the Auchterarder Case—Decision  
of the Court of Session in 1838.

It cannot be too emphatically repeated, that in order to understand the last part of the history of the Church of Scotland before the Disruption, it must be known and remembered that from the days of Knox, the people, the congregations, the members of the churches, had detested and opposed secular patronage in the filling up of church offices. Without remembering this, many who read the story of the final conflict, will be in no better position than Lord Brougham was when the Auchterarder case was brought before the House of Lords. "He could not understand the difficulty." All the same, it was clear as the simplest word of Christ, to the lowliest Scotch peasant who cared for the honour of his Divine Lord. There are some who even yet cannot see or appreciate "the difficulty." Especially among many English Episcopalians is this the case. Nor is it to be wondered at. They who are accustomed to forms of worship and ecclesiastical administration only according to the arrangements of a

secular government, and to praying by Privy Council orders ; they who are used to seeing and consenting to sacred offices being filled by the decision and act of men, to whom the Churches of Christ are only so much patronage that can be bought or sold—mere appendages of property and social position ; they to whom the changing of political power means for a Church the prominence or the depreciation of ecclesiastical parties ; cannot be expected to sympathize with or even understand the passion of indignation with which the Scotch churches, for the greater part, resented the obtrusion of ministers by patrons. In such minds judgment is, of necessity, vitiated by familiarity with the anti-Christian way in which English Episcopal churches are at the disposal of private and other patrons, who are not required to be even decent as a condition of exercising their sacrilegious power. Scotch Church difficulties would have been lighter and more easily dealt with, but for the presence and active working in England of a system of Church patronage, of which it is possible to write in this way, fifty years after the Scotch Disruption :—

“ The law puts Roman Catholic patrons under disability. But it has none for persons who are only known to the public through disgraceful disclosures in the Divorce Court, It has none for non-Christians. Maharajah Dhuleep Singh who several years ago announced his lapse into Paganism, is, nevertheless, entered in the current ‘ Clergy List ’ as the patron of at least one benefice. It has none even for ex-convicts, gamblers, drunkards, and evil-living persons generally. It has none for Jews, Agnostics, or Moham-medans, and of course it has none for Protestant Dis-

senters. Even a baby in arms has been solemnly decided by the law to be competent to choose a spiritual teacher for any parish of which it happens to have inherited the advowson."\* It is quite true that the Scotch system might not have come to such a terrible condition as that of the English Establishment, but in the healthy judgment of the larger part of the Scotch Church, the whole system of patronage was a dishonour to Christ, an irreverent interference with the sanctities of His redeemed Church ; and was working to the injury of religion and the weakening of the National Establishment. It was a domination of the spiritual by the secular ; the permission of an authority in Church affairs of which there is no mention or hint in the New Testament, and that had power in the Church only according to the extent of the Church's lapse from the truth as it is in Jesus. But if there had been no question of sacred principle involved, yet the violent enforcement of ministers on unwilling churches had caused much angry feeling and bitter alienation.

It may be well here to notice the theory and custom of the Scotch Church with respect to church vacancies. The theory was and is, that a candidate is ordained or appointed to be minister of a certain charge and people. In filling a parochial vacancy, two things were needed—the patron's presentation, and the call of the church or congregation. When the preliminary conditions of the call and presentation had been met, the ordination was completed by a service, the simplicity of which, as in the case of the ordination of Elders, tended to convey to the candidate and the

\* Mr. Dibdin, *Contemporary Review*, February, 1893.

onlookers the spirituality of the office to which he was admitted ; and that it was literally the *charge of the Lord*.\* Had the two things been equally worked, much difficulty might have been avoided or postponed. But the Moderates had degraded the call into nothingness, and had quite as much exalted the presentation. The Popular party were under obligation to reverse this ; or to bring the call up to its proper level, whatever they did with the presentation. Accordingly, in 1832, they, in response to many overtures, tried to persuade the Assembly to restore the call to its old value. The proposal was lost by 42 votes. But the next year 42 overtures came up to the Assembly, with the same prayer as that made by 11 in the previous year. This brought the matter to an issue ; and in the Assembly of 1833, Dr. Chalmers and Lord Moncrieff proposed the Veto Law, for which they had the countenance of the Government of the day.† This proposal was “that the dissent of the majority of heads of families, with or without the assignment of reasons, should be of conclusive effect in setting aside the nomination of the patron, save when it was clearly established that this dissent was grounded on corrupt and malicious combination.” This was lost in 1833, but when brought up again by Lord Moncrieff in 1834, it was carried by a majority of

\* For an admirable representation of the simplicity and spirituality of an ordination service in the Scottish Church attention is drawn to Mr. Lorimer's picture of an “Ordination of Scottish Elders,” which is reproduced in Plate II., facing.

† See Lord Jeffrey's Letter to Dr. Chalmers of May 13, 1833, in “Life of Dr. Chalmers.”



Photo by A. K. Fox

Photo by Electric Engraving Co.





46. The form of veto was adopted as being the wiser and less disturbing course to take ; the wish, as yet, being more to honour and exalt the call of the congregation than to degrade the act of patronage.

In the debate on this resolution the Moderates, under the leadership of Dr. Cook, practically conceded many things that were vital to the position of the Evangelicals : such as, granting that the people, in trying the fitness of a presentee, had right to judge more than his "life, doctrine, and literature." The reference in this was especially to the suitability of a nominee for a particular congregation, in respect to which much of the trouble that had lasted for generations had been endured. This being granted, it gave a power to the congregation, on which the patron's right would have to wait ; and without which his nomination would have no value. When the question came to the vote, 95 clerical members of the Assembly were for the motion and 86 against it ; 42 presbytery elders were for it and 38 against it ; 43 burgh elders were in its favour and 7 against it : giving the well-divided majority of 46. It was afterwards further moved, that the Veto resolution should be an interim act for a year ; and meanwhile, under the provisions of the Barrier Act, should be sent to the presbyteries for their judgment and answer. But in agreeing to this, the supporters of the Veto Act were very careful to have it known by the preamble of the motion, that it was not sent to the presbyteries as a new law of the Church, or as one that needed to be strengthened ; but because of the doubts of some, and as an act of expediency and courtesy. Mr. Hope, the Dean of Faculty, gave in

over his lonely signature fourteen reasons for dissenting from the resolution. He specially contended that the Assembly was incompetent to pass such a measure as the Veto Law : and “ that, in point of law, a presentee, though rejected by the majority of heads of families, yet there being no judgment of the Church Courts on his qualifications, will nevertheless be legally, validly and effectually presented to the *benefice*, and will have a clear right to the stipend, and to all other rights appertaining thereto.” On the whole debate and its result, Lord Cockburn’s clear-sighted judgment was,—“ it will be strongly resisted in the Civil Courts and otherwise, by patrons and presentees. If the Courts of Law should overrule what the Assembly has done, Parliament must interfere, otherwise there will be an indecent collision between the civil and the ecclesiastical power, in which the Churchmen will probably stick to their point, even though the spiritual cure should go to one presentee, and the temporal benefice to another.”\*

The Veto Act passed, another question came up for decision, in which the same parties of Moderates and Evangelicals were arrayed against each other as before. This was, whether ministers of Chapels of Ease should have the same full ecclesiastical position and powers as those of the ministers of parochial and endowed churches. As it was, the Chapel ministers were not regarded as beneficed clergy, and were permitted only to teach, not to rule. They were not allowed to sit in any of the Church Courts. After several ministers of Chapels of Ease had been heard at the bar of the Assembly, Professor Brown

\* Lord Cockburn’s Journal, Vol. I., p. 60.

moved that the disabilities of Chapel ministers should be ended. The Moderates opposed this ; on the ground that it was against law and an unwarranted assumption of power on the part of the Assembly. The division on the vote gave to Dr. Brown's motion a majority of 49 ; 152 to 103. " These proceedings extinguished the old Moderate party. The fabric which it was Robertson's great glory as a Churchman to have reared, and the great object of all his successors in the management of our ecclesiastical affairs to preserve, and which seemed, like Toryism, to be deeply and immoveably founded, has disappeared. The working of the new system I do not guarantee. It is full of danger certainly. I am only confident that it must be better than the old one."\*

The forecasts of evil consequences, in which many indulged, as likely to come from the Veto Law, were not realized. Neither were troubles in churches begotten ; nor was there any degradation of the type of ministers ; nor any appearance of lowered motive in assumption of the ministry, by those to whom the judgment of the congregation was now more important than ever. The facts were all to the contrary. And the Moderate party themselves sealed the Chapel ministers enactment with their approval, by the appointment of Dr. McLeod to the Moderatorship of the Assembly in 1836 ; who previously had been only the minister of a Gaelic chapel in Glasgow.

In the year in which the Veto Law and the Chapels of Ease Act were passed—1834, the first step was taken in the series of events that led directly to the Disruption of

\* Lord Cockburn's Journal, Vol. I., p. 61.

the Church of Scotland. In the month of August the parish of Auchterarder in Perthshire fell vacant. This church had once before in Scottish Church history been known for its antagonism to patronage. The living was in the gift of the Earl of Kinnoull as patron; and in October he presented Mr. Robert Young, a licentiate. This was brought up in ordinary course to the Presbytery, who, in the terms of the presentation, were required to admit the presentee on "having found him fit and qualified for the function of the ministry at *the said church of Auchterarder.*" The Presbytery determined to act according to the regulations of the Veto Law, with which the patron's agent, then present, agreed. Thereupon Mr. Young conducted Divine worship for two Sundays; and when, afterwards, the service was held at which it was to be seen whether he had the suffrages of the people, "the call" was signed by only two parishioners in a parish of three thousand. Then the exercise of the veto was tried: on which nearly the whole congregation rose to their feet in dissent. There were 330 heads of families that had the privilege of the veto; and of those 287 signed the veto on Mr. Young's presentation. After further delay, to avoid hurry the Presbytery allowed an appeal to the Synod of Perth and Stirling; whence the appeal was dismissed, and the Presbytery enjoined to proceed according to the Veto Law. On a further appeal to the General Assembly it was resolved, on May 30th, 1835, that the Presbytery should act as the Veto provided. No one but a bondslave of patronage, to whom the rights of the Church of God were as nothing, could have objected to this result as either

unwise or unjust. Against the Presbytery's consequent rejection of Mr. Young, his agent appealed: but the appeal was never brought to the Synod. So far the Church Courts had done with it.

"The Auchterarder Case" now began to take larger importance: for patron and presentee took it into the Civil Courts, by an action in Court of Session against the Presbytery. In this they claimed from the heritors and others the stipend of the living. But before the plea was tried the suit was amended by the patron and Mr. Young; and the Court was now asked to decide that the Presbytery were under legal obligation to take the patron's nominee, and that their rejection of him, on a veto of the parishioners, "was illegal and injurious to the patrimonial right of the pursuer, and contrary to the provisions of the statutes and laws libelled." This gave an entirely new character to the suit; and in consequence it began to excite interest in every direction. For if the pleadings now urged were sustained by the Civil Courts, it needed no great foresight to see that a strain would come on the Evangelical part of the Scotch Church, such as it had never previously borne. The cause was taken before the full Court in November, 1837; but it was not till March 8th, 1838, that the decision was given. That was, by a majority of eight judges to five, to the effect that the act of the Presbytery in rejecting the patron's nominee, under the provisions of the Veto Act, was illegal. The minority of the judges were of opinion that the Veto Law was legal; and, if it were not, that the Court of Session had no power or right of interference with the spiritual pro-

ceedings of the Church Courts. The decision went too far for the peace of the Church, and not far enough for its help in the inevitable trouble that the judgment caused. That it was against the current of the life of the Church of Scotland from the time of the Reformation, no one can doubt. The two "Books of Discipline"; the Acts of 1567, 1581, and 1592; the events and decisions of Assembly in 1638, 1649, and 1736, are all in clear evidence as to the spirit of the Scotch Church on the question in dispute. Even the Robertsonian ascendancy meant the domination of a party in the Assembly, and not a change in the judgment of the churches about patronage. "If the Auchterarder case had occurred in 1638, or at any time for a century afterwards, the patron would have been set in a white sheet at the church door, the presentee deposed, and the Court of Session excommunicated."\*

\* Lord Cockburn's Journal, Vol. I., p. 216.

## CHAPTER XXVI

Assembly of 1838—The Lethendy and Marnoch Cases—Auchterarder Case before the Court of Final Appeal—Action of the Assembly—Assembly's Committee in negotiation with the Government—Refusal of Government Help—Development of the Marnoch Case.

AT the time when the decision of the Court of Session was given, the meeting of the General Assembly was not far off; and for that meeting many presbyteries and synods sent up overtures, calling for action against the attack on the Church's independence. Mr. Young, in his turn, then threatened the Auchterarder Presbytery with an action for damages, for not taking him on trials immediately. The Assembly, by 183 to 142, resolved,—“that the General Assembly of this Church, while they unqualifiedly acknowledge the exclusive jurisdiction of the Civil Courts, in regard to the civil rights and emoluments secured by law to the Church, and the ministers thereof, and will ever give and inculcate obedience to their decisions thereanent, do resolve, that, as it is declared in the Confession of Faith of this National Established Church, that ‘The Lord Jesus Christ is King and Head of the Church, and hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church officers distinct from the civil magistrate, and that in all



matters touching the doctrine, government and discipline of the Church, her judicatories possess an exclusive jurisdiction, founded on the Word of God, which power ecclesiastical (in the words of the Second Book of Discipline) flows from God, and the Mediator, Jesus Christ, and is spiritual, not having a temporal head on earth but only Christ, the only spiritual King and Governor of His Kirk'; and they do further resolve, that this spiritual jurisdiction and supremacy and sole headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, on which it depends, they will assert, and at all hazards defend, by the help and blessing of that great God who, in the days of old, enabled their fathers, amid manifold persecutions, to maintain a testimony, even unto the death, for Christ's kingdom and crown: and finally, that they will firmly enforce obedience to the same upon all office bearers and members of this Church, by the execution of her laws in the exercise of the ecclesiastical authority wherewith they are invested." This was equivalent to a manifesto of what may be fittingly called the High Church Evangelical party.

In the year 1838 the Assembly had more than the Auchterarder case to make them careful of the liberties of the Church of Scotland. For in that year two other appeals came to them, that led to conflict with the Civil Courts, and had important bearing on the feelings and judgments that made the Disruption possible in a few years. These were about the cases of Lethendy, in the Presbytery of Dunkeld; and of Marnoch, in the Presbytery of Strathbogie. The trouble of the Lethendy case came about in this way:—the Crown, as patron, had appointed in 1835 a

Mr. Clark to be assistant and successor to the aged incumbent of the parish. This man, Clark, after the Disruption, had to be deprived of his license for drunkenness. His appointment was rejected by the congregation, and, therefore, by the Presbytery. His appeal to the Assembly of 1836 was also defeated. But in 1837, like Mr. Young of Auchterarder, he appealed to the Civil Courts. But the aged holder of the benefice dying about the time that the case came up for trial, the Crown held the appointment of Clark to be void, according to Church custom, as not having taken effect during the lifetime of the previous incumbent. A presentation was, therefore, made to Mr. Kessen; whom the Presbytery proceeded to ordain and induct into the benefice. But Mr. Clark appeared with an interdict from the Court of Session, stopping the ordination. Upon this the Presbytery appealed to the Assembly of 1838, asking to be told what they were to do. With only two dissentients, the Commission of Assembly in May enjoined the Presbytery of Dunkeld to complete Mr. Kessen's presentation, and to report to the Commission in August. But Mr. Clark got another interdict against this; and on further appeal by the Presbytery to the Commission in August, they were instructed to proceed with the ordination of Mr. Kessen without delay. On the day of ordination they were met by an agent of Mr. Clark, who asked leave to read the judgment of Mr. Hope, Dean of Faculty, who was always to the front against the Assembly in these things. His opinion was that all the proceedings were invalid; and it was accompanied with threats of possible penal conse-

quences. Mr. Kessen, however, was ordained ; and the Presbytery were summoned to appear before the Court of Session on June 14th, 1839. When they appeared, they were rebuked, with a warning of imprisonment to any presbytery that repeated the offence of performing a spiritual act against the will of the Civil Courts. Lord Cockburn was one of the judges ; and his comment on the decision of the majority was ominous yet accurate :—"this judgment is the second deep cut into the nervous system of the Church : for if we can order a presbytery not to induct, I don't see how we have not power to bid it induct, and after this, where is the peculiar power of the Church ?"

The Marnoch case had similar features, with differences. In 1837 the trustees of the patron, the Earl of Fife, presented Mr. Edwards, who had been assistant to the previous minister. But the only name that appeared on "the call" was that of a tavern keeper in the parish. The majority of the Presbytery, however, were against the vast majority of the parishioners, and would have inducted Mr. Edwards. The Assembly of 1838 had this case also before them : and laid it on the Presbytery to reject Mr. Edwards. This they did. In all likelihood, the case would have ended at this point ; but for the result of the appeal to the House of Lords in the Auchterarder difficulty in 1839.

The Assembly of May 1838 had resolved to take the Auchterarder case up to the Court of Final Appeal ; and in May 1839 Lord Brougham and Lord Cottenham gave judgment against the Assembly on all points. In this

judgment it was that, among other notable things, Lord Brougham acknowledged an "inability to discover wherein the very great difficulty consists." Perhaps this approach to modesty, on the part of one whose weakness was said to be omniscience, was owing to his giving his judgment extemporaneously. To value the difficulty needed at least a degree of spiritual discernment : and there is no trace of this in Lord Brougham's address. Nor would he have been troubled if any one had charged him with the omission or non-possession of such an elementary qualification. Fourteen days after the judgment was given the Assembly met ; and it was immediately seen that the question of the right of the Civil Courts to have supreme authority in spiritual things and Church controversies, would dwarf all other business. Dr. Cook, for the Moderates, moved, that as the Veto Law had been abrogated, the Assembly should legislate as though it had never been passed. Dr. Chalmers, who for six years had not been a member of the Assembly, moved a resolution with three paragraphs ; to the effect, that the Assembly accept the decision "in regard to the civil rights and emoluments secured by law to the Church" ; and that the principle of non-intrusion of undesired ministers be strenuously reaffirmed ; and that a Committee be appointed to consider "in what way the privileges of the National Establishment and the harmony between Church and State may remain unimpaired, with instructions to confer with the Government of the country, if they see cause." Dr. Muir moved another resolution, that Lord Cockburn and others thought "would require a cunning head to distinguish from Cook's" ; which was lost

on the first vote. After a session of fourteen hours, at two o'clock in the morning, Dr. Chalmers's resolution was carried. On the nomination of the Committee to carry out this resolution, Dr. Cook consistently refused to act: but the Earl of Dalhousie, the youngest and least experienced member of the Assembly, childishly and pettishly withdrew from the Assembly; though, only a few days before, he had given Dr. Chalmers permission to nominate him, in case the resolution were carried. The Moderates thought that this "great example" of a young lord "would awe the majority into reason." A much more instructive "example," that might have taught the Moderates to trust the local congregations more generously, was to be found in the fact that meanwhile the Veto Act was working very well. For in the year between May 1838 and May 1839 no patronage dispute rose that was not quietly settled in its own district.

The prospect of the Committee that was appointed to confer with the Government was not so bright as its friends wished. The air was dense and the road difficult. When a previous deputation to Government had been appointed, "Lord Melbourne expressed a hope or wish that 'that damned fellow Chalmers was not among them.'" The forecast of Lord Cockburn was anything but cheery. He wrote,—"they will fail. They have appointed a Committee to confer with Government, with a view to legalize the Veto Act. If it be a Whig Government, the answer must be—'you boast of your hatred to us, and wish us to renew the persecution of Dissenters: we won't run our heads against an English and Irish post to please you.'

If it be a Tory one, the answer will be,—‘you are against patronage and the law; get you gone!’ If it be a Radical,—‘we hate the Church: your ruin rejoices us.’ Thus left to itself and patronage confirmed, the Evangelical party will be always appealing to the people and railing at the law. The opposite party will be sneering at the people and hardening the law; and the result will be that in the next generation the Dissenters will be in the majority.”\* This was not prophecy, but there was shrewdness in the conjecture. When the Committee went to London, they had interviews with Lord Melbourne and Lord John Russell. It was found politic that Dr. Chalmers should be in the background. Dr. Gordon was, therefore, spokesman. Dr. Chalmers was not a *persona grata* to Lord Melbourne: nor is it conceivable that any earnest Christian man could be. Chalmers had to remember, as he said in his diary, that “a courtier’s curses are exalted praise”: and he was “thrown back on his independence.” But the Committee returned with hope of a settlement: for both in Lord Belhaven, the Commissioner’s words, and in those of the formal report to the Commission of Assembly, it was said that the Government were expected to bring in a bill on the lines of the Veto Law; and meanwhile they promised to administer Crown patronage “in accordance with the existing law of the Church.”

It may be well to finish the account of the negotiations with the Whig Government, that, at this stage, promised so well. In the Commission the report of the Committee had

\* Lord Cockburn’s Journal, Vol. I., p. 231.

been violently spoken against by Dr. Cook ; who charged the Government with opposing the law of the land, and declared that the Veto Law had been swept away by the decision of the Courts. Mr. Hope, the Dean of Faculty, also issued a pamphlet in the form of a letter to the Lord Chancellor, that has been credited with a great effect on the judgments of the half-hearted Whig Government, and with the Tories, who were strong in the House of Commons, and all-powerful in the House of Lords. The Dean of Faculty was always to the front against the liberty of the Church. "Thoroughly self-confident, and possessing that influence which a strong narrow mind of a positive overbearing type often exerts over a mind of much higher quality,"\* his influence was always hurtful and even irritating.

When the Assembly's non-intrusion delegates went again to London in February, 1840, they had interviews with Lord Melbourne and Lord John Russell. The latter went so far as to promise a definite answer by the middle of March. They had to wait till the 26th of the month; and then Lord Russell told them that "there was so much division on the subject in the Church itself, in the country, and in Parliament, that they despaired of being able to obtain, at present, the necessary support for such a measure as they would be disposed to introduce." And then the Church delegates were referred to an uncertain "by-and-by," in which there might be a greater unanimity on the subject, and "then it might be in their power to effect what could not be attempted now." The intervention of

\* Sir A. Gordon, "Life of the Earl of Aberdeen," p. 134.







the Scotch members of the House of Commons, however, led to the resuming of negotiation with the Government, and a third interview with Lord John Russell, Sir G. Grey, and the Lord Advocate. Lord Russell promised to bring the question once more before the Government, and give a final decision on the 30th of the month. This he did : but only to tell the deputies that the Government could not move in the matter. Thus the Committee had only lost time and disappointment to show for trusting a Whig Government. But though the deferred hopes of the Evangelicals were thus disappointed, the Assembly, in the midst of the weariness of waiting on Government, had the cheer of receiving back the Original Burgher Synod, on the understanding of a common agreement as to supporting an Established Church and the principles maintained in 1638.

Meanwhile the "Marnoch case" had been developing ; doubtless in consequence of the decision of the House of Lords in the Auchterarder intrusion. Mr. Edwards, the presentee at Marnoch, had been rejected by the Assembly of 1838, in agreement with the Veto Law ; and the Presbytery of Strathbogie had been forbidden to induct him. When the trustees of the Earl of Fife presented another candidate, Mr. Edwards obtained an interdict from the Court of Session, forbidding the induction of the new presentee. To this the Presbytery agreed, and delayed procedure. Acting on this, the Assembly determined that the Presbytery were to stop action till the next General Assembly. But in June 1839 Mr. Edwards got a decision from the Court of Session, that declared that the Presby-

tery were bound to induct him, notwithstanding the veto of the people. The majority of the Presbytery of Strathbogie were in favour of obeying this mandate of the Court of Session, rather than that of the Assembly. Accordingly, they tried to evade the injunction of the Commission, and to intrude Mr. Edwards on the parish. When their attempt was defeated by the Moderator, they broke up the meeting of Presbytery. The Moderator reported the conflict to the Commission, who summoned the Presbytery before them on December 11th, 1839. This Commission is said to have been the largest ever summoned; and the various parties in the conflict were represented by counsel: viz.—the rebellious majority of the Presbytery of Strathbogie; the minority who were against the intrusion of Mr. Edwards; and the parishioners. After debate, Mr. Candlish's motion against the admission of Mr. Edwards, and to suspend the seven refractory members of Presbytery, was carried by 121 to 14. To this the seven replied by legal protest, and by application to the Court of Session to nullify the sentence of the Church Court, and to forbid any other ministers from conducting divine worship in their parishes. This acknowledgment of the headship of the Court of Session over the duly appointed Church Courts must have been flattering to the lawyers who constituted the Court; but it was utterly derogatory to the Church of Scotland. The Court of Session granted an interdict in December 1839, forbidding the minority of the Presbytery and any others from using the church, churchyard, church-bell, and schoolhouse, in carrying out the sentence of the Commission. But though this was granted, and the ministers

appointed by the Assembly were shut from cover in the performance of the duty laid upon them, they carried on the worship of God in the open air in the depth of winter, with the evident sympathy and support of the inhabitants of the seven parishes. The Commission further appointed a committee to confer with the seven suspended ministers in a friendly way. This committee sought an interview with them on January 16th, 1840; but on going to Aberdeen for the meeting, they found only a lawyer, who gave a written refusal from the seven to meet in conference.

The suspended ministers again appealed to the Court of Session against the work of the Assembly's ministers in their parishes. They obtained a second interdict in the terms of their petition. But though it was granted, with threats of what would happen if any disobeyed the order of the Court, the Assembly's services in the parishes of Strathbogie found ministers to carry them on, who were eager, by running the risk of the penalties, to show their sense of the wrong done to the Church, both by its sometime ministers, and by the Civil Court. The Commission of Assembly in March, 1840, after protest against the action of the Court of Session, resolved, by 107 to 9, to petition Parliament for "protection of the Church from such unconstitutional interference of the Court of Session with the government, discipline, rights, and privileges thereof."

## CHAPTER XXVII

Earl of Aberdeen's Proposals—Uselessness of his Bill—Assembly against it—Strathbogie Presbytery Troubles—Antagonistic Associations formed by the Moderates and Evangelicals—Interference of the Court of Session with the Spiritual Province of the Church—Intrusion of Mr. Edwards at Marnoch.

EARLY in the year 1840 the Earl of Aberdeen had an interview with the Assembly's Non-intrusion Committee; and it is certain that to him they looked for a time, in hope of his being able to introduce legislation that would go far to settle the Church's troubles. But from the first of the negotiations with Lord Aberdeen there was, though he seemed to be unconscious of it, a radical difference of purpose and aim between him and the Non-intrusion Committee. The difference was really on the one side for a Presbyterial veto, and on the other for a Popular veto. A letter of January 27th from Dr. Chalmers made it clearly known that the dissent of the congregation was to be considered enough in itself to warrant the rejection of the presentee by the Presbytery. And about the time that the Whig Government finally ended negotiation with the Assembly's delegates, Lord Aberdeen had declared his growing inclination to have the question of the settlement

of ministers determined by the old plan of the "positive call," as represented by the majority of the congregation. But early in April he wrote to Dr. Chalmers that "further examination and reflection have convinced me that it would be quite impracticable, and I have, therefore, abandoned it altogether."

On March 31st, 1840, Lord Aberdeen gave notice in the House of Lords that he would bring in a bill to meet the emergency of the Scotch Church; but, in connection with it, he declined any intercourse with the Non-intrusion Committee. He saw two members of it, as private persons, and read the draft of the bill to them. They gave him a written answer, in which they said that the bill "would infallibly be rejected by the Church, and by the large majority of the coming General Assembly." Nor could this have surprised any one: for the bill accepted the act of the Court of Session in the Auchterarder case as decisive, and gave to the Court of Session the power that it asserted over the Church. The bill permitted statement of objection to a presentee on the part of a congregation; but insisted on the giving in of reasons. It would not allow a presentee to be disqualified by mere unacceptableness to the congregation. The presbytery was to be permitted to judge objections, but to give them effect only when they were personal to the candidate, legally substantiated, and enough in their judgment to warrant rejection. The law of patronage was untouched. Intrusion would have been as easy under the bill as without it. It was more a patron's than a people's bill. It was as different in spirit as it was distant in time from the "First Book of Discipline," in which it was dis-

tinctly affirmed, for the guidance of all who should come after, "that it appertaineth to the people and to every several congregation to elect their own minister." The contemporaneous judgment of a shrewd and quick observer was that the bill required "the Church to give up *in toto* the only principle for which the contest was carried on, and settled *everything* in opposition to her desires. Of this I am sure, that if there be one position regarding any point in the whole controversy capable of an easy and complete establishment, it is this,—that the acceptance of Lord Aberdeen's Bill by the General Assembly of 1840 would have been—not the adoption of a middle course—not the concession of a part—but the abandonment of the whole of the principle of Non-Intrusion."\*

The reception of the bill in Scotland showed its character. It is easily possible to understand the rising of difficulty between Dr. Chalmers and Lord Aberdeen as to the meaning and purpose of the proposal; from the fact that Lord Cockburn could write of it that, "its tendency was made clear enough by the rapture with which it was received by patrons and all enemies of everything popular in the Church"; and that "if the bill was intended to mislead it was well drawn, for no two even of its friends agreed in what was meant on one vital point."† On the 27th of May the General Assembly took up the matter of Lord Aberdeen's bill. Dr. Chalmers proposed four resolutions, declaring the Church's decision to assert and maintain its exclusive jurisdiction in things spiritual; affirming "the

\* Marquis of Lorne. Letter to Dr. Chalmers, pp. 7 and 9. 1842.

† "Journal," Vol. I., pp. 259 and 260.

great and fundamental principle of non-intrusion"; condemning Lord Aberdeen's bill as not in accordance with such principles; and approving the conduct of the Non-intrusion Committee. After long and vigorous debate, the bill was condemned by 221 to 134. Notwithstanding this, Lord Aberdeen moved the second reading of his bill on June 16th, and it was carried. Thereupon a deputation from the Non-intrusion Committee presented a petition through Lord Breadalbane against it, as destructive of the liberty of congregations, offensive to the consciences of ministers, and as involving an enforcement of the rights of patronage beyond anything attempted since the Revolution; and asked to be heard by counsel against the bill at the bar of the House. But on July 10th Lord Aberdeen announced that he would not press the third reading of the bill during that session of Parliament. The session was notable, not only for this abortive attempt, but also for the presentation of petitions against the principle of the bill from 265,000 persons, while only 4,000 had petitioned in its favour. Something must be allowed for annoyance: but Lord Aberdeen was very needlessly at pains to express his agreement with the seven suspended ministers of Strathbogie; and to give harsh objection to the ministers whom the Assembly had sent to preach in their place. For them he thought imprisonment would be fitting.

When the Assembly had decided against Lord Aberdeen's proposals, it was free to resume judgment of the miserable case of the Strathbogie Presbytery. This it did on May 26th. After hearing counsel for the seven delinquents at the bar, it was contended, on the side of the



Moderates, that the Commission, in suspending the seven ministers, had gone beyond their province. On that contention it was moved that the Assembly should rescind all that the Commission had done. But by 227 to 143 the Assembly determined that the Commission had not exceeded its powers; and found that the seven ministers had been duly suspended. When, in consequence of this, the seven appeared again before the bar of the Assembly, it was moved, on the side of the Evangelicals, that a Committee of the House should be appointed to deal with them and report to the Assembly. This was carried, after opposition, by 211 to 129. Dr. Cook, the leader of the minority, then put in "reasons of dissent"; and because of the importance of the issues involved, it was moved that a Committee of the Assembly should prepare "a Declaration of the principles of the constitution of the Church," in opposition to Dr. Cook's "reasons for dissent." The Committee that had been appointed to hold a conference with the suspended ministers reported on June 1st: from which it was seen, that, while showing Christian spirit in their intercourse with the Committee, the suspended ministers refused to give expression of regret for their conduct, or of willingness to submit to the authority of the Church. It was, therefore, moved that the suspension be continued, and that the ministers be cited before the Commission of August; and that, if then still recusant, they should be served with a libel, and the case stand for the next Assembly. The counter proposition of Dr. Cook was—to remove the sentence of suspension: but this was lost by a minority of 64. No one could say that the act of

the Assembly was precipitate, intolerant, or inconsiderate. Nor was any complaint made by the implicated ministers.

Before the Commission of August 1840 could meet two important things happened. A letter, bearing date July 1st, 1840, was issued by Dr. Cook and other Moderates, convening a meeting in Edinburgh for August 12th, to form an association that should have for its purpose, the neutralizing of the principles involved in the act of the last Assembly against the seven members of the Strathbogie Presbytery. To meet this move of the Moderates, another association was projected by the Evangelicals ; for which an "Engagement" was drawn up, having as its design the maintenance of the two great principles, that were now being once more raised, as the standard of all that was spiritual and vital in the Church. These were :— "that the Lord Jesus, as King and Head of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church officers distinct from the civil magistrate." And 2nd, "That no minister shall be intruded into any parish contrary to the will of the congregation." These principles were expounded in detail ; with special application to the circumstances of the time, with emphatic claim for non-interference of the State with the spiritual duties of the Church ; and with a declaration "that we will consent to no plan for adjusting the present difficulties of the Church which does not afford the means of effectually securing, to the members of every congregation, a decisive vote in the forming of the pastoral tie."

At the same time they "held sacred the principle of civil establishments of religion, as sanctioned both by reason and the Word of God." They admitted "that the civil

magistrate has always command over the temporalities bestowed upon the Church, and has power to withdraw them." In which case, "the Church must be prepared to submit to their being withdrawn, rather than allow him to encroach upon that province which the Lord Jesus has marked out as sacred from his interference." They protested against the system of secular patronage ; declaring, quite accurately, that the Church had never approved it. They maintained, truly enough, that "the restoration of that system in 1712 was a breach of the Revolutionary Settlement and the Treaty of Union, contrary to the faith of nations." Recent legal decisions had made it clear that patronage was a burden more grievous than had ever before been believed. They held "that the Church ought to be wholly delivered from the interference of any secular or worldly right at all, with her deliberations relative to the settlement of ministers. We declare, therefore, our determination to seek the removal of this yoke, which neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear : believing that it was imposed in violation of a sacred national engagement, and that its removal will, more effectively than any other measure, clear the way for the satisfactory and permanent adjustment of all the questions and controversies in which we are now involved." They, therefore, called for the support of the members of the Church of Scotland, and especially "invited them to raise a united and solemn protest against the system of patronage, which the decisions of the Civil Courts are now riveting more firmly than ever upon the reclaiming Church of their fathers." The meeting that was held on August 11th, 1840,

in support of this appeal, was enormous, and answered the call with enthusiasm.

The other important event noted was, that on July 11th the Court of Session "interdicted the Commission of Assembly, the Presbytery of Strathbogie and all concerned, from executing the order by the last General Assembly."\* There can be no doubt that this was a distinct interference of the Civil Court with the spiritual and disciplinary acts of the Church. And it was all the worse because it was prohibiting an *anticipated* act: viz., the libelling of the seven suspended ministers, who had refused to "appear at this meeting of the Commission, or at any of its other meetings to be held under the authority of the last Assembly's resolution and sentence relative to them." The meeting of Commission was on August 12th, with full authority from the Assembly to act, even to extremity, in the case of the disloyal presbyters. It met and was opposed, with the threat of legal penalties against it, if it acted as the Commission had ever had power to act; and with the daring opposition of seven presbyters, who said that the authority and verdict of the secular Court of Session was of more importance to them, than the decision and acts of the Courts of the Church, which, they had professed, took authority directly from Christ. How Christian ministers could so judge, even on Dr. Cook's contention, that the spirituals and temporals were mingled, and that, therefore, the verdict of the secular court must be bowed

\* The opposition of the Assembly to the Court of Session was afterwards made the subject of the celebrated pictorial satire called "The Reel of Bogie," for a copy of which see Plate III., facing page 266.

down to, will be inconceivable to those who have learned their ecclesiastical polity from the New Testament. In communities where alliance with the State and submission to corrupt secular patronage have produced their inevitable warping of judgment concerning things spiritual, a Privy Council or a Court of Session may be regarded as the lord of the Church. Given submission to the presentation to church rights and privileges by a godless patron, and no trouble can be made over the Church's subordination to a court of lawyers, to whom all religions may be equally true or false, useful or useless. Perhaps it is unwise, if not unjust, for men who have learned to think of Christ as Judge, Lawgiver, and King in His Church; to expect that adherents of a gross system of secular patronage in church possessions, should acknowledge the voice of the Church as the voice to which they must give heed. A man who can accept a presentation from a notoriety of the Divorce Court, and a church or congregation that can allow such creatures as patrons and presentees to have power and place in and over the "Household of Faith," ought not to be expected to be very sensitive as to the rights of the glorified Head of the Church, or to be very anxious for the guidance of the Spirit of Truth. None the less ought the duty of true followers and obedient disciples of Christ to be plain. It was seen to be plain in 1840, and it is none the less now to those who "see the Kingdom of Heaven."

The Commission that met on August 12th, 1840, had immediately to deal with the Strathbogie case. Their decision, by 180 to 66, was to serve the libel on the seven

disobedient ministers and Mr. Edwards, the patron's presentee. The debate was very earnest. In the course of it Dr. Chalmers' increasing tendency to resist patronage showed itself in a vigorous and enthusiastic speech. The interdict of the Court of Session was thus challenged and defied, and the determination was reasserted, in Dr. Chalmers' words, to maintain "the Headship of Christ; the authority of the Bible as our great spiritual statute book, not to be lorded over by any power on earth; a deference to our own standards in matters ecclesiastical; and a submission unqualified and entire to the civil power, in all matters civil."

This resolve of the Commission had, however, little effect. When, at their next meeting, it was announced that the libel had been delivered, the counsel who represented the condemned ministers put in a defence, in which they denied the jurisdiction of the Commission and the legality of the sentence of suspension, and declared that the libel itself was a breach of law. Mr. Edwards also denied the validity of the sentence against him; but the Commission ratified the previous sentence in each case, and referred both parties to the session of March, 1841. This gave ample time for the eight men who were under censure of suspension, to take the step that led to one of the most disgraceful and humiliating events in Scotch Church history. Mr. Edwards brought an action in the Court of Session against the Strathbogie Presbytery, which was friendly to his friends, but bitterly inimical to his opponents, in which he prayed the Court to compel the Presbytery "forthwith to admit and receive him as minister

of the Church and Parish of Marnoch; or pay him £10,000 as damages and solace." To this the seven then followed suit, announcing that they were willing to obey the decree of the Court. The decree was given in the form of Mr. Edwards' petition.

Naturally, this missive to ordain, proceeding from a Civil Court, met by readiness to obey, in spite of the Church to the contrary, by the presbyters involved, stirred deep and painful feelings. No religious community in which there is any spirit of religion, whether it be heathen or Christian, could receive such a charge to admit into their sacred ranks, with other than indignation and sorrow. But the seven suspended ministers proceeded to act, and on January 21st, 1841, they met at Marnoch, to "ordain" the suspended presentee, against the will of the people and the sentence of the Church Courts, at the command of a tribunal of lawyers. Their right to be there at all was challenged by the parishioners, who spoke their protest; and against the "call" from the solitary keeper of the tavern, handed in a written objection signed by 450 communicants beside elders. Then their agent ended by saying for the parishioners,—“they can have no further business here, and will, I believe, all now accompany me from the church, and leave you to force a minister on the parish, against the people's will, but with scarcely one of the parishioners to witness the deed.” “The people of Marnoch immediately rose from their seats in the body of the church; old men with heads white as the snow that lay deep on their native hills, the middle-aged, and the young. Gathering up their Bibles and Psalm books, which

in country churches often remain there for half a century, they left the church once free to them and theirs but now given up to the spoiler. They went out, many in tears, all in grief. No word of disrespect or reproach escaped their lips. They all left, never to return."\* Leaving the church, they met in a hollow in the snow, and there determined to retire quietly to their houses. As soon as the parishioners left the church, a rabble of strangers filled their places, and, it is said, with groans and hisses, and even the throwing of snowballs, tried to drive out the intruders. Only one parishioner was in the church, and he left when a magistrate came. By the presence of the magistrate quiet was secured, and then a blasphemous farce was enacted, and Mr. Edwards was "ordained and inducted." The indignant parishioners built another church for themselves, and left the parish church to the "Rev. Mr. Edwards" and the publican who had given him "the call." "Seven suspended ministers have, at the command of the civil tribunal, ordained a presentee who is not only suspended, but under a libel. This may be law, and it may be useful law ; but if it be, what jurisdiction, exclusive of the control of the Civil Court, has the Church?"† Before the end of the year it was to be seen how much, or rather, how little, the law courts would leave the Church in the government of its own affairs.

\* Life of Chalmers : taken from the *Aberdeen Banner*.

† Cockburn's "Journal," Vol. I., p. 274.



## CHAPTER XXVIII

Duke of Argyll's Bill of 1841—Deposition of Seven Ministers of Strathbogie—Resolve of the Evangelicals to appeal to the Country—Cul-salmond Case—Decision of the Court of Session against the Assembly.

IN May, 1841, the Duke of Argyll, notwithstanding the deterring efforts of the Earl of Aberdeen, brought a Veto bill into the House of Lords, in hope of therewith settling the difficulties that were harassing the Church of Scotland. The bill proposed that the right of Veto should be given to all male communicants above twenty-one years of age, and that the veto should be set aside whenever the opposition was proved to be due to causeless prejudice. After opposition from Lord Aberdeen, who seems to have been mortified at having his own bill rejected, the Duke's bill was read a first time, and waited further judgment of the forthcoming Assembly.

The Assembly met in Edinburgh on May 20th, 1841. The seven Strathbogie ministers maintained their claim of right to sit by representatives, but this, as a matter of course, was refused. When the many overtures for the abolition of the law of patronage had been read, Mr. Cunningham moved a resolution declaring the evil and grievance of patronage, and calling for its removal. But

this was lost, by three votes, in favour of an amendment by Dr. Cook, "that the overtures against patronage should be dismissed." When the Duke of Argyll's bill came up for discussion, it was found that the Moderates were against it, and that the Evangelicals were equally in favour of it. On Mr. Candlish's resolutions affirming the non-intrusion principle and approving the new bill, there was a very earnest debate. The resolutions were met by an amendment proposed by Dr. Hill, depreciating the utility of the bill, and affirming that the Church's difficulties would be met by rescinding the Veto Act of 1834. Mr. Candlish's resolution was very significantly carried by 230 to 105.

The Strathbogie Presbytery case was resumed on May 29th. All the suspended ministers but one appeared to the summons, and on their still holding out against the Assembly, Dr. Chalmers moved that they should be found guilty as libelled. To this, Dr. Cook proposed an amendment, to dismiss the libel and "declare that the ministers named in it are in the same situation in all respects as to their ministerial state and privileges, as if such libel had never been served, and such proceedings had never taken place." The lines of the debate showed, as all discussion between the two parties had made clear, that the conception of the Church and State, and of the union between the two, was radically different in the two sections. The Popular party were truly High Church Evangelicals; the Moderates were Erastian to a degree. Dr. Cook maintained "that no man or body of men can, without violation of duty, resist the

just command of magistrates—that is, the Civil power.” Of course, the fight might all be gone over again round the word “just,” and what it was to mean. Mr. Cunningham charged the suspended ministers with having “broken the laws of the Church, violated their ordination vows, and been guilty of sin against the Lord Jesus Christ.” Dr. Chalmers’ motion was carried by 222 to 125. Upon this he further moved that “the seven ministers be deposed from their office of the Holy Ministry.” To this there was no amendment, but a protest was put in by the Moderates in a very unruly fashion. After this, prayer having been offered up, the Moderator rose, and “in the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, the alone King and Head of the Church, deposed the seven ministers from the office of the Holy Ministry, and discharged them from exercising the same, or any part thereof, under pain of the highest censure of the Church.” Their churches were declared to be vacant. Mr. Edwards, the occasion of all this trouble, was deprived of his license, by the judgment of the Assembly, without a division, and the Assembly further allowed a call to be moderated in to Mr. Henry, at the prayer of the parishioners of Marnoch.

The now deposed ministers lost nothing of their courage and persistence. Two days after the sentence of deposition, while the Assembly was discussing the report of a committee on eldership, the agent of the Strathbogie ministers appeared at the door with a messenger-at-arms, bearing an interdict from the Lord Ordinary, prohibiting the Assembly from carrying out the sentence on the deposed clergymen. This they had obtained from the Court on

the morning of the day in which it was served. There was not overmuch of dignity in the way in which the Assembly received the attempt to serve the interdict. One side contended that it had not been served ; while the other insisted that it had been received. On the following Monday strong resolutions were carried by more than two to one, in protest against this "intrusion of the secular arm into the ecclesiastical province," which were to be sent to the Queen in Council, because in the person of her Commissioner, she was presumed to be affronted by the service of the interdict on the Assembly.

Ecclesiastical matters were now reaching such a point of troublesomeness, and taking such a form, as would compel the interference of the legislature, if an appeal to the Government were not previously extorted. As things were, the Church was declared by the Law Courts to have no free and irresponsible power in those departments of her life and administration, in which she had thought herself supreme. Judging the qualification of ministers, liberty to refuse trial, induction and ordination to presentees, had been taken from her ; with the assumption that the Law Courts could compel the Church to give or refuse ordination to a candidate. Lordship over the temporalities had been often conceded as the possession of the Civil power: but now the power to recognize any one as the holder of the spiritual office was claimed and asserted by the Courts. Some of the Moderates must have been startled by this, if they thought of what the position of the Church was thus declared to be. They who were contending for spiritual life, and the supremacy of the will of

Christ in the Church, had few friends in high place to help their side of the controversy. The Earl of Aberdeen gladly presented a petition from the seven of Strathbogie to the House of Lords: and in doing it he said that "the presumption of the General Assembly was never equalled by the Church of Rome." To which Lord Melbourne sneeringly replied, "that they knew the Church of Scotland was equal in presumption to the Church of Rome any day." But the Premier would not do as Lord Aberdeen wished; viz., instruct the Lord Advocate to proceed against the General Assembly. Perhaps the General Election was too near.

The Commission of Assembly that met in August, 1841, had immediately to deal with an additional trouble and very irritating difficulty. A deputation from the sympathizers with the deposed ministers of Strathbogie had gone to London, to put before the Government an appeal against the Assembly's recent decision. In this appeal they asked the Government "to prosecute their opponents for breach of interdict," declaring that in such case they and their friends "will have much reason to be satisfied." At the least, coming from ministers of religion, this was cold-blooded. In addition to this, some of the Moderates had disobeyed the Assembly's monition by holding ministerial communion with the deposed, and helping them to administer the Lord's Supper. On consideration of these things by the Commission, it was determined to refer the conduct of the incriminated ministers to their presbyteries, and to give them "a solemn remonstrance and warning." The "reason of dissent" from this that

Dr. Cook gave in, really brought the long, fluent controversy into fixed form. It was the touch that crystallized the solution. Dr. Cook declared that he and his friends intended "to take such steps as may appear most effectual, for ascertaining whether they or those who continue to set at nought the law of the land and the decisions of the Supreme Civil Court, in what we esteem a civil right, are to be held by the legislature of the country as constituting the Established Church, and as entitled to the privileges and endowments conferred by statute on the ministers of that Church."

This resolve was almost like the beginning of the end in the long, weary conflict. The tone of the after debates shows that the members of the Commission felt it to be. The special meeting of Commission that was convened upon this resolve of the Moderates was crowded to excess; and, save for two voices, was unanimous in determining to propose a friendly conference with the Moderates. With forethought of the sharper fight that was seen to be thickening round, it was also decided to appoint a committee, who should bring the principles, privileges, and risks of the Church "before the Government, the legislature, and the country at large, by deputations, public statements, meetings and such other means as may appear expedient." As an earnest of the work they would do, that very evening a public meeting of unusual size was held with great enthusiasm, in which the issue was clearly put before the minds and consciences of those present. This was to the effect that the impending strife was, on their side, against the compulsory intrusion of ministers

“without even the shadow of a call from the Christian congregation over whom they were to be placed: and against the demand to renounce the spirituality and power of Christ's kingdom, as distinct and apart from the civil magistrate,” or renounce the privileges of the Church of Scotland. The Evangelicals were now steadily facing the possibility of the worst. They saw clearly enough how the Scotch Law Courts would go; and that they themselves could have little hope from the Government in England, who were identified with a church system in which there was no recognition, either of the elementary principles of the liberty of the Church of Christ from the domination of the State, or of the rights of the believing people of Christ in any locality. The Evangelicals were wise in looking on to what did come to pass; as they said, “confident in the smile of an approving Heaven; and that confidence not abated, when we look around on the goodly spectacle of our friends and fellow-Christians—the best and worthiest of Scotland's sons—in readiness to hail and to harbour the men who are willing to give up all for the sake of conscience and of Christian liberty. The God whom they serve will not leave them without help, or without a home.”\*

As if to clear the minds of all concerned of any thought that the Evangelicals were to have a loophole of escape from the decision of Law Courts, in their interpretation of the Church's bounds of claim over its ministers and officers, the Culsalmond case came up in the autumn of 1841. When the Presbytery of Garioch met on October 28th to

\* Dr. Chalmers' speech at the Commission, August 25, 1841.

moderate in the call of Mr. Middleton, who had been presented to the Church by the patron, a majority of the communicants dissented. But the majority of the Presbytery were intrusionists, and opposed to the legality and working of the Veto Law. They, therefore, passed by the protest of the Church and the appeal of the protesters to the superior Church Courts, and on November 11th met to complete the induction of Mr. Middleton. The whole neighbourhood was roused against them; and it is said that two thousand angry people waited in the sleet and rain for the opening of the church. When the doors were loosed, they filled the building, and made it impossible for the Presbytery to proceed with the ordination. The acting members of the Presbytery then went back to the manse, and with locked doors completed, after intrusionist fashion, the settlement of Mr. Middleton. The people thereupon appealed to the Commission of the Assembly, which met on November 17th; and the Commission, by 54 to 3, prohibited Mr. Middleton from officiating in Culsalmond, and instructed the minority of the Presbytery to provide for the spiritual needs of the parish. On this followed, as a matter of course, the Moderates' appeal to the secular courts; but the Lord Ordinary refused to give the interdict asked, on the ground that no question of civil or patrimonial right entered into the case. But this was reversed by the First Division of the Court on May, 1842.

No one after this could doubt what the position of the Church of Scotland was to be, viz., a hanger-on of the Law Courts, with no right of judgment in all the piety and learning of its Assembly, but what might pass the review



of one or two judges of the law. Moderatism, Erastianism had brought the Church to this condition. An onlooker wrote,—“It is vain to attempt to disguise that the principle of this judgment does emphatically and directly subject the Church, in every sentence it can pronounce, to the review of the Civil Court. If the Court of Session had interfered in the same way with the proceedings of *Moderate* General Assemblies, there would not have been one Moderate member who would not have been in arms under Robertson and Hill in the defence of the Church. The uses, indeed, to which this ecclesiastical supremacy of the Civil Court may hereafter be turned, make some of the most sensible among them by no means comfortable under their present victories.”\* The immediate result of this decision of the Law Courts in the Culsalmond case is seen in what is stated in the “Life of Dr. Chalmers,”—that interdicts, stopping trial by Presbytery, were obtained from the Court of Session, by three ministers who were being tried by the Church Courts for fraud, theft, and drunkenness.

\* Cockburn's “Journal,” Vol. I., 314, 315.

## CHAPTER XXIX

Change of Government in 1841—Negotiations by Sir G. Sinclair—Refusal of Legislation by the Government—Assembly of 1842—Cases of Discipline—"The Claim of Rights"—Resolution against Patronage—Second Auchterarder Case—Convention of 1842.

WITH the change in parliamentary power that came in the summer of 1841, both parties in the Church of Scotland hastened to approach the Government. The Evangelicals had an interview with Sir R. Peel, the Premier, when they presented their memorial. From the Prime Minister, however, they had little but silence. The Moderate party presented their memorial in turn. In it they clearly, but very strangely, said that "to the principle of non-intrusion, as synonymous with a right of arbitrary dissent or rejection by congregations or presbyteries, they had the strongest objection; but especially when effect was given to the principle by the amount and character of the popular feeling existing against a presentee. Such a measure appears to the Memorialists to be dangerous alike to civil and religious liberty. The spiritual independence which has been claimed on the part of the Church is essentially inconsistent with the first principles of social order." And again they spoke of "a

new, fanciful, anomalous principle, which the Church has chosen to dignify with the name of spiritual independence." It is difficult to understand how any minister of the Church of Scotland could endorse such words, without forgetting the history of his Church ; or else, without being content to hand over everything that made it a Church, and gave warrant for its claim to be regarded as the Church of Scotland, to the haphazard majorities of law judges. These bare majorities were taken as representing the judgment of the Court of Session : while the Court refused to the ample majorities of the Church, in all its orders and courts, the right to be deemed the expression of the voice of the Church. To have satisfied the contention of the *Moderates'* memorial would have required a new vocabulary for Church practices and documents, and an entire rearrangement of ecclesiastical institutions. The old time-honoured words could no longer have the same meaning ; and the dignified rights and privileges of the Church, many of which had been won at sore cost from kings and governments, would now be suspended or nullified by a legal machine, that could be set working by hands that were rightly judged to be unworthy to handle the mysteries of the Church. Each memorial, however, was an appeal to Cæsar ; and Cæsar's judgment was not far away.

The autumn of 1841 was worse than wasted in a well-meant but harmful attempt, on the part of Sir G. Sinclair, to bring agreement between the opposed parties, by conference and correspondence between Dr. Candlish, the Dean of Faculty, and the Earl of Aberdeen. The end and

aim of the conference were to be the preparation of a bill that, it was hoped, would satisfy all parties. But this was a sheer impossibility, as both sides found, when they came close together in judgment. Lord Aberdeen's son and biographer says that "bills were prepared, different in form, but containing the essential principle of Lord Aberdeen's bill" (withdrawn the year before); and he also says that "there was every prospect that the preliminary agreement on the questions at issue would be crowned with complete success; and it probably would have been so, but for an unlucky accident."\* But no one who knows the spirit and purpose of the Non-Intrusionists could for a moment believe that any bill that had in it the "essential principle" of Lord Aberdeen's bill of 1840 could depend on lucky or unlucky accident for its acceptance or rejection. No more certainly would Lord Aberdeen have rejected the proposal to give the veto of the congregation imperative power, than the Non-Intrusionists would have rejected any settlement that did not practically come to that. The attempt at negotiation was a mistake from the outset, and came to nothing.

It will be remembered that the Culsalmond case was decided against the Assembly in March, 1842. In the same month the Scotch Church Question was discussed in the House of Commons. During the debate Sir J. Graham, the Home Secretary, was defied by Mr. Campbell, of Monzie, to carry out his foolish threat of "enforcing the law against the Church of Scotland." Soon after, when Mr. Campbell moved for a select committee to consider and report on the

\* Sir A. Gordon's "Earl of Aberdeen," p. 147.

troubles of the Scotch Church, he was defeated by a large majority. But in April Mr. Campbell obtained leave to bring in a bill that had been introduced to the House of Lords the year before by the Duke of Argyll. When the night for the second reading came, Mr. Campbell was persuaded by the Government to agree to the postponing of the bill for six weeks, because the Government proposed to introduce a measure of their own. When the 15th of June came, to which date the second reading had been put back, the Speaker announced that as the bill had to do with the law of patronage, and the Crown held the patronage of a number of the churches involved in the bill, the bill could not be introduced till the consent of the Crown had been obtained. This ought to have been discovered when the bill was first introduced, and before the promise of the Government. But it was found out at a convenient time, and a knowledge of this might have kept Lord Aberdeen's biographer from saying, that, acting on Lord Aberdeen's advice, "no measure was introduced by Government with a view to altering the law."\* This resolve not to act was little to their credit for straightforwardness. Perhaps they expected the Non-Intrusionists would not carry out their half-threatened secession; or, if they did, that the numbers would not be large enough to give trouble. A small split in the party had been made by "The Forty" of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, who were understood to be favourable to the amended bill of Lord Aberdeen. This, joined with the well-known belief of the Dean of Faculty, that any possible secession

\* Sir A. Gordon's "Earl of Aberdeen," p. 149.

could not be of great magnitude, may have had something to do with the steady refusal of the Government to keep their engagement.

It was in the anxiety caused by these events, or by what led up to them, that the Assembly of 1842 met. To this Assembly the deposed members of the Presbytery of Strathbogie had the hardihood to send three of their number as their representatives. Even Dr. Cook did not propose that their commission should be received. He moved that both theirs and the commission from the accepted Presbytery of Strathbogie should be refused; but by a majority of 130 the Assembly rejected his proposal. The next day, in spite of an interdict from the Court of Session, they received into their number the representatives of the accredited minority of the Strathbogie Presbytery. In welcoming these interdicted ministers, the Assembly formally protested against the attempt to "interfere with the constitution of the Supreme Court of the Church." In the same spirit, and with an even more vigorously protesting attitude, the Assembly dealt with the men whose names were notorious for having appealed to the Court of Session against the Church. With respect to them, the Assembly reasserted its authority most emphatically and dignifiedly. They deposed the ministers of Cambusnethan and Stranraer. The licence of Mr. Clark was taken from him. They annulled the induction of Mr. Middleton as minister of Culsalmond, and they suspended till the March Commission, all the ministers who had held Church communion with the deposed clergy of Strathbogie.

All this was preparatory to more momentous action. Two other great decisions of this Assembly followed quickly. These were the resolution against patronage, and "The Claim of Rights." The resolution was, that the Assembly do "resolve and declare that patronage is a grievance, has been attended with much injury to the cause of true religion in this Church and Kingdom; is the main cause of the difficulties in which the Church is at present involved; and that it ought to be abolished." This was carried by a large majority. "The Claim of Rights," is one of the most notable documents belonging to the Church of Scotland. It is noble, looked at from any point of view. Even the most antagonistic to its purpose must honour it. Any church might be proud of it as a manifesto. It ought to be read by every one who would clearly see and judge the movement that led so soon to the Disruption. Its "Claim, Declaration, and Protest" are made on behalf of the "Sole Headship of Christ over the Church," and the Church's spiritual government independent of the Civil power. It specially concerns the settlement and deprivation of ministers as secured to the Church; the laws concerning which had been violated by the Auchterarder decision. And, following a statement of the encroachments of the Civil Courts, the claim is made for all the Church's lost liberties and guardianship in the use of the same; and a declaration is given, that even if it should lead to the loss of all secular benefits from the State, the Assembly cannot "intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations, or carry on the government of Christ's Church, subject to the coercion attempted by the Court of

Session." Then it is protested that whatever "Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain passed without the consent of this Church and Nation, in alteration of, or derogative of the government, discipline, rights and privileges of this Church, which were not allowed to be treated of by the Commissioners for settling the terms of the union between the two kingdoms;" and whatever sentences of courts against the rights, shall be void and null; and they will submit only as far as concerns civil matters, and look on to the time when they may repossess the temporal benefits that they may now be compelled to yield. And they call on all the churches that hold the doctrine of the sole Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ over His Church, and the officers and members of the Church of Scotland, to stand by the Church, and to call on the help of God, for endurance of loss, if it may be needed, and for the restoration of lost rights and possessions. The document bore the signatures of 160 members of the Assembly, and was supposed to have been written by Mr. Dunlop. The counter motion to that of Dr. Chalmers, who moved the adoption of "The Claim," was made by Dr. Cook, whose warmest friends could scarcely have said that either his speech or resolutions touched the great questions that were brought to an issue by "The Claim." "The Claim of Rights" was adopted by the Assembly by a majority of 131.

It was inevitable that the friction between the Church and Law Courts should become intense about this time. From a return made to the House of Commons, and other evidence, it was seen that in the summer of 1842 there were about 50 law suits against the Church, in which



those most competent to judge had no expectation that the Church would be successful. One of the most notable, if not the greatest, was the second Auchterarder case. The patron, Lord Kinnoull, and his rejected nominee, Mr. Young, had sued for a decree to compel the Presbytery of Auchterarder to take Mr. Young "on trial," under penalty of heavy damages. On August 9th the House of Lords gave final judgment against the Church, and in the case of the Presbytery's continued refusal, the damages claimed were £10,000. The point of the Assembly's indignant contention against this judgment was, that it was unquestionably an interference with the spiritual functions of the Church, and an attempt to coerce it in spiritual duties. It went beyond all other final decisions.

The immediate consequence was, that 32 of the most honoured ministers of the Church of Scotland convened a meeting of the Evangelical ministers for November 17th, 1842. Though the time of year was bad for those who had to come from a distance, nearly 500 clergymen attended; among them, as was noted at the time, being "the whole chivalry of the Church." Two series of five resolutions each were debated, concerning the wrongs and the remedies of the Church's position. The first resolutions briefly recapitulated the wrongs done to the Church by the Civil Courts, and in them 423 ministers agreed. The second group disclaimed any power of the Church in antagonism to the State save protest; held that a refusal of redress on the part of the Government, implied agreement with the wrongly-assumed power of the Courts, in the province of the Church, which was distinct from that of

the State ; held also, that it was the duty of the ministers of the Church not to retain their endowments, &c., if the State subjected them to civil control in spiritual things, and intruded ministers on unwilling congregations ; and finally, affirmed it to be the duty of those present, to represent to the Government and Parliament, the peril in which the Established Church stood ; intimating, that if measures of relief were not granted, their determination was to give up connection with the State, though they still held the principle of a right Scriptural connection between Church and State. In consequence of some of the ministers being compelled to return home before the final decision, only 354 agreed with the second set of resolutions. The actual publishing of these resolves was made at a large public meeting, from which a memorial was sent to the Government, in agreement with the determination of the gathering of ministers.

## CHAPTER XXX

Events in January, 1843—The Stewarton Case—Mr. Fox Maule's Motion—Lord Campbell's Resolutions—Anticipations of Secession—Final Decision of the Court of Session in the Strathbogie and Auchterarder Cases—The Sustentation Fund.

THE year 1843 opened with the Evangelicals anxiously waiting the answer of the Government to their memorial. They had not long suspense. They could not have expected a favourable response. The very proposal of Dr. Chalmers in the convocation of ministers at Edinburgh, and the ready consent given to the proposal, that they should hear his exposition of a financial scheme, which was intended to provide for a possible separation from the adherents of State supremacy in the Church, showed what they anticipated. January was the decisive month. On the 4th of the month the answer of the Government came; on the 20th the decision of the Court of Session, in what was the test case of Stewarton, was given against the Church; or, as Lord Cockburn put it, "the Court again maimed the Church by another most effective slash;" and on the 31st the Special Commission was sitting to determine the last stage of the long controversy. The Stewarton case was briefly this: In 1834 the Assembly determined that all

ministers of "Chapels of Ease" should be considered members of Church Courts, with districts and kirk sessions of their own. In 1839 these decisions were extended to any secession chapels that might be returned to the Church. But all this was done "with reservation of all civil rights and interests." When the Associate Synod rejoined the establishment in 1839, Mr. Clelland, a Synod minister in Stewarton, was received into the Presbytery of Irvine. But when an endeavour was made to give him a district, some of the heritors of Stewarton opposed it, and obtained an *ad interim* interdict from the Court of Session prohibiting the formation of a parish for Mr. Clelland. The Presbytery determined to proceed with what was a purely religious act, returning an answer to the Court, "that nothing now done by them shall in any way or manner affect the civil rights of the parties at whose instance the interdict was obtained." When the case came finally before the Court it was decided against the Church by eight judges against five. The effect was to tell the Church that she could not break new ground for spiritual work without leave of the Court of Session. The judgment was given, as told, on January 20th, 1843.

The answer of the Home Secretary, Sir J. Graham, left no doubt of the Government's decision. They held that the Church's claims were unreasonable, and that to yield to them would lead directly to despotic power. They would not advise the Queen to grant the requests of the Assembly's petition. When this answer was followed by the Stewarton decision, it seemed to the majority of the Assembly that the Church of Scotland was handed over bodily, to the super-

vision and constraint of the Court of Session. The Special Commission that met on January 31st found the Moderates eager to take advantage of the Stewarton judgment, for on the basis of it Dr. Cook moved, that all the names of "chapel ministers" should be removed from the roll of the Commission; and when this was thrown out, by 125 to 23, he produced a written protest, in which he and his friends declared the Commission to be illegally constituted, and to have no title or authority to act for or in the name of the Church of Scotland. Having made their protest they schismatically withdrew.

The chief action of the Commission, after the withdrawal of the Moderates, was their resolve to make a final appeal by petition to the Houses of Parliament; praying for redress of grievances and protection according to the "Claim of Rights." This petition was brought before the House of Commons, on March 7th, by Mr. Fox Maule, who moved for a committee of the whole House to consider the grievances complained of by the Church of Scotland. The debate lasted over two evenings, with the result of the rejection of the motion by a majority of 135. Out of 37 Scotch members 25 voted for Mr. Maule's proposal. Thus it was the English vote that denied the petition of the Scotch Church. On the 31st of March the House of Lords gave its "judgment" on the Church of Scotland, in a debate on "five inane resolutions" that were brought forward by Lord Campbell. They were rejected, "in ignorant hostility to the Scotch Church," without a division, on the ground that they committed the House "to abstract propositions, which were either vague or prema-

ture.”\* A sample of the debate may be given from Lord Brougham’s speech. Lord Aberdeen had professed to be a Non-Intrusionist—of a sort. To which Lord Brougham vigorously, but scarcely religiously, replied: “Would he have that principle not only established in Scotland, but carried South of the Tweed? Would he have it eat into our English system? Would he seek, by means of it, to destroy our Erastianism?”† What could the Church of Scotland look for from men, “lords,” who could talk like that? They could not “see the kingdom of God.” However, the debates in the two Houses of Parliament had this advantage—they showed the Church of Scotland that its claims were rejected and its rights ignored; and that there was no more ground of hope from appeal.

There was now but a little time left before the next meeting of Assembly, and much had to be done if the demands and professions of many years were to be carried to their legitimate and honourable consequences. Either the Evangelicals would be the scorn of the earnest and the laughing-stock of the foolish, or they would rank with the martyrs of all time, and with the most honourable confessors for conscience’ sake, that the world has known. Expectation did not honour them overmuch. Hope, now Lord Justice Clerk, formerly Dean of Faculty, and ever the relentless enemy of the Evangelicals, “up to the last moment thought that the number of seceders would be small.” So writes Sir A. Gordon, adding, “it is curious to observe how often the acutest lawyers are deceived by their over-

\* Lord Cockburn’s “Journal,” Vol. II., p. 14.

† Ibid. Vol. II., p. 17.

estimate of the power of the written law."\* "Dr. Cumming, of London," prophesied with as much skill and knowledge as he brought to the interpretation of other men's prophecies. He said: "I am not satisfied that any will secede." He was all the more fitted for the disappointing revelation that was soon to be given him. "Mark my words, not forty of them will go out," said "one of the best-informed and sagacious citizens of Edinburgh." Even Lord Cockburn could write: "A secession is certain; more respectable, probably, in character than in number."

There was, however, no lack of trust and confidence in one another, or in their cause, among the Evangelicals. Their duty was clear before them, and there was only too little time to get ready for it. If anything had been needed at the last moment to weld the Church party thoroughly together, (for in the noblest meaning of the words they were the High Church section of the Establishment,) they had it in the final decision of the Court of Session in the Strathbogie and Auchterarder cases, on March 10th. The General Assembly had deposed the seven Strathbogie presbyters, and now the Court of Session was asked to set aside the sentence of deposition—a purely spiritual act. This it professed it was competent to do, and it was ready to do it. In the case of Auchterarder, where the majority of the Presbytery had refused to induct the obnoxious presentee, authority was given by the Court of Session to the minority to act without their colleagues, or with them, if they did what the Court enjoined. Five of the judges were against

\* "Life of Lord Aberdeen," page 150.

these decisions, but they were out-voted. One of the minority declared, "We must now, as judges, hold that the Church has no exclusive jurisdiction whatever. The Star Chamber never made greater encroachments on the common law of England than the Court of Session has made on the Ecclesiastical law of Scotland."\*

The sharp pressure of the coming need compelled Dr. Chalmers and the leaders of the true Church of Scotland to press on the preparation that they had begun in November, 1842, when Dr. Chalmers' "Sustentation Fund" scheme was started, the principle of which had been announced by Dr. Candlish in 1841. Between that date and May, 1843, 647 associations were formed, with contributions that enabled Dr. Chalmers to say, at a meeting on February 16th, that money "has come in upon us like a set rain at the rate of £1,000 a day." A letter from him, on April 19th, is very bright and full of hope. "The great bulk and body of the common people, with a goodly proportion of the middle class, are upon our side; though it bodes ill for the country that the higher classes are almost universally against us." With this feeling, a letter that he received soon after from the then Marquis of Lorne, now Duke of Argyll, must have been a cheer to him and his friends. The Marquis wrote that if, after recent events, Dr. Chalmers and the Evangelicals stayed in the Establishment, "they would give their consent to the undoing of what the Reformers did, to the abandonment of a principle of no ordinary moment, not only with reference to your Church, but with reference to the world at large; and, finally, to as clear and

† Lord Cockburn's "Journal," Vol. II., pp. 8 and 9.



indisputable a breach of national engagement as has been presented to the world." Notwithstanding this very true judgment, when the real crisis came, Dr. Chalmers and his colleagues had to do without the support of their somewhat hortatory young friend.

## CHAPTER XXXI

Prospect of Disruption—Real Nature of the Controversy—May 18, 1843  
—The Disruption.

As the time for the meeting of Assembly drew near (May 18th, 1843), the wisdom of the preparation that had been made, and the longing that more could have been done, must have strongly affected many minds. Of the Non-Intrusionists, the true Church of Scotland, few could have gone to the Assembly without either great anxiety or deep peace. According to the domination of conscience would they feel assurance: for it should be remembered all through the last scenes of this struggle how serious the crisis was, especially to the ministers. While to be consistent would be a tax in many ways on every elder and Church member that was Non-Intrusionist, it must have been peculiarly a strain and sorrow that faced the ministers in having to give up church, manse, stipend, status, with all the associations that had made life bright, real, and sacred in the various parishes. It was a question of bread for wives and children, as well as of antagonism to the usurping Law Courts. "The Church was the unchallenged National Church of Scotland; Dissent was comparatively weak and divided; and the Scottish Episcopal Church supported itself

with difficulty. The stipends of the parish ministers, though never on a liberal scale, were sufficient for comfort, and were much better, both absolutely and in proportion to the general run of men's incomes, than those of their successors in the same parishes now. More dear to them were their homes, their quiet, well-appointed manses, and gardens and glebes, beautified often by their own tasteful labour, consecrated by the events of their domestic lives; where children had been born, and where, perhaps, they had died; homes which a great enthusiasm might enable brave men to abandon for themselves, but the surrender of which was to inflict all manner of loss and suffering on their families. All these things, and much more, were to be deliberately and unhesitatingly surrendered by nearly one-half of the ministers of the Scottish Church."\*

What was to be set over against the possibility of such painful loss? Nothing but what many of their brethren in the Church thought a mere unpractical sentiment, not to be entertained in an Established Church; and one that, in the greater Establishment across the border, had been ignored, contemned, or burlesqued for centuries. That sentiment or principle, or, as the Covenanters and the true High Churchmen of the Scotch Church in 1843 ever maintained, that spiritual fact was "the alone Headship of Jesus Christ" over His Church; and their sense of outrage was caused by the wrong done to Him and His people by the usurpation of the Civil power and the Courts of Law. "The Crown Rights of Jesus," cant expression though it seemed and seems to those who know not His power and supremacy;

\* Mr. McCandlish, "Why are We Free Churchmen?" p. 12.

loose exaggeration though it appears, to those who know not the Divine regeneration that is the absolute condition of being able to see Christ and His kingdom,—this it was that acted as a rallying cry to the Evangelicals of 1843 in the Church of Scotland. It was the truth that is set forth in the old Hebrew words, “The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King,” that drove the men of the old time to the hills, and brought them to piteous tortures; and was now, in days when the thumb-screw was out of fashion, to bring their spiritual descendants face to face with the loss of all things. For to that it came.

The great point of the controversy was not the question of the establishment of a church, nor even the patronage of church livings, in itself. But it was, what the existence of the Establishment had made a bitter necessity, and what the exercise of patronage had driven to the forefront and key position of a battle that had been fought, with intervals, for generations, *viz*, the protection of spiritual authority, from interference and domination of a majority of lawyers, and of a nondescript House of Commons, and a very unreligious House of Lords. It is often said, the Free-Church leaders said, that they did not go out on the question of Establishment and Voluntaryism. It might equally accurately be also maintained that they did not go out on the question of patronage and congregationalism. Their historian has been careful to say, that they “adhered to the great principle that it is the right and duty of the civil magistrate to support and maintain an establishment of religion, constituted according to God’s Word.” But

they had to learn, and they learned at bitter cost, that "an establishment of religion, constituted according to God's Word," was, ever has been, and probably ever will be, in the present state of things, an impossibility. No establishment of religion anywhere shows an approach to realizing what the High-Church Evangelicals of Scotland wanted. Dr. Chalmers' attachment to establishments, however, may have been over-stated; for it ought to be noted that he declared to the Royal Commissioners in St. Andrews, before the Voluntary agitation, or the last stages of the Non-Intrusion controversy had risen, "I have no veneration for the Church of Scotland *quasi* an establishment, but I have the utmost veneration for it *quasi* an instrument of Christian good."\* While, then, it is true that neither establishment nor patronage was the actual and only cause of the Disruption, both were involved in it. For they had been the unhappy occasions and instruments of a tyranny over the Church and a dishonour to the Lordship of Christ, that made them at last to be intolerable. Something greater than either the union between Church and State, or secular power in the Church, yet inseparable from both, was the "impulsive force" to the exodus from the State Church; and that was, loyalty to the Lordship of Jesus. Consequently, with perfect consistence (for this had been fought for ever since the Reformation), the leaders of the Free Church of Scotland were able to declare, without fear of challenge, that they represented the Church of Scotland—Free; and that the men whose chief credentials were—obedience to law courts and law lords, the tenure of State property, and the

\* *Vide* "Encyclopædia Britannica," 9th edition, article "Chalmers."

presence of a Royal Commissioner in their annual meeting—were, in no sense, the Church of Scotland, bond or free. They represented the Church of the Law Courts. The union of motive, the identity of impulse in the men who left the State Church, is remarkable. It was clear to every one. The motives were religious, spiritual, divine.\*

Thursday, May 18th, 1843, was the day fixed for the meeting of the Assembly. But on the evening of the 15th a meeting was held, that had to be continued on the 16th and 17th, to receive and consider a protest that had been drawn up for presentation to the Assembly. By Wednesday evening the protest had been signed by about 400 ministers, and was ready for the next day. At the Commissioner's *levée* at Holyrood, before the session of the Assembly, the Evangelicals were present, as usual, in large numbers. In the midst of the presentations to the Commissioner, the voice of Mr. Craufurd of Craufurdland was heard calling,—“There goes the Revolution Settlement!” It was found that the crowd had so pressed against a portrait of William III. that was opposite the Commissioner as to force it from the wall, and it fell to the ground. To some it seemed almost an omen of the approaching end of the condition of things that was largely due to the settlement of 1690. No wonder; the tension of most minds was very tight, and it quickly responded to the least touch.

The service in St. Giles' followed, with a sermon by the outgoing Moderator, Dr. Welsh, from—“Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.” With evident

\* *Vide* “Annals of the Disruption,” New Edition, p. 144, &c.

reference to what was soon to come, Dr. Welsh strenuously insisted on the truth that "each man must answer for himself in the great day of accounts, and not on the example and authority of men, but only on what he truly believes to be the mind and will of God, can he venture to appear before the Righteous Judge of all." From St. Giles' the procession passed to St. Andrew's Church, where the Assembly was to hold its session. Street and church were packed with a strained and excited multitude, whose very excitement made them quiet. Dr. Welsh as Moderator offered prayer, and after that made his own protest against any further proceedings, because of the violation of the terms of the union between Church and State. Then he read, on behalf of himself and 203 members of the Assembly, the Protest that had been decided on at the meetings earlier in the week. The Protest recited the wrongs of the coercion that had been attempted over the Church Courts, and by the interference of the Civil Courts in spiritual things, and by the authoritative declaration that the secular power was to be supreme over the ecclesiastical, even in its own province. This was incompatible with the standards of the Church; and, more, submission to such a condition involved "betrayal of allegiance to the Church's only King and Head, and a casting away of that precious birthright of spiritual liberty with which He had made her free." They also protested that any Assembly meeting under the conditions declared by law, "is not, and shall not, be deemed a free and lawful Assembly of the Church of Scotland." And then he said, "We protest that in the circumstances in which we are placed, it is, and shall be

lawful for us to withdraw to a separate place of meeting for the purpose of taking steps, along with all who adhere to us, maintaining with us the Confession of Faith, and standards of the Church of Scotland, for separating in an orderly way from the Establishment, and thereupon adopting such measures as may be competent to us, in humble dependence upon God's grace, and the aid of the Holy Spirit for the advancement of His glory, the extension of the Gospel of Our Lord and Saviour, and the administration of the affairs of Christ's house, according to His Holy Word, and we now withdraw accordingly, humbly and solemnly acknowledging the hand of the Lord in the things that have come upon us, because of our manifold sins, and the sins of the Church and Nation ; but at the same time with the assured conviction that we are not responsible for any consequences that may follow from this our enforced separation from an Establishment which we loved and prized through interference with conscience, the dishonour done to Christ's Crown, and the rejection of His sole and supreme authority as King in His Church."

Having read the Protest, Dr. Welsh bowed to the Commissioner, and then walked from the chair to the door of the church, followed by the men who were the very glory of the Church of Scotland, and by row after row of the presbyters, till the whole of one side of the church and all the cross benches were left empty. The only sound beside the tread of the departing confessors, was that of the tears of men and women to whom the sight was beyond belief, though it had been expected. Hope, the Lord Justice Clerk, looked down from beside the Commissioner's seat ;



and it must have been with bitter astonishment and disappointment that he saw how his malignant forecasts were being falsified. Outside the church, as the Moderator was seen coming followed by his friends, the words, "They come!" gave place to a shout of admiration; and the crowd parted to give them room to move along,\* as they fell unconsciously into procession of three abreast, and went to Canonmills, in the north of the city, where a large hall had been hired and fitted up for the great gathering of 3,000, that soon filled it. The withdrawal from the Assembly was a glorious act. When some one ran in to Lord Jeffrey, who was quietly reading, and said, "More than four hundred of them are actually out," the book dropped, and, with natural enthusiasm, Jeffrey said, "I'm proud of my country; there's not another country upon earth where such a deed could have been done." That was true in 1843. But a similar confession had been made by 2,000 ministers in England in 1662.


When the new Assembly had been constituted by prayer, Dr. Welsh proposed that Dr. Chalmers should be appointed first Moderator. At the mention of the name the vast assembly rose in applause to ratify the nomination. Here, too, many saw a *bright* omen. For when Dr. Chalmers gave out the Psalm to be sung, he read the verse with which they were to begin; and as he read, and

\* Here, too, as in the Strathbogie case, pictorial satire was brought into play, and the procession to Tanfield was burlesqued, as may be seen in Plate IV, facing.



THE DISRUPTION !!  
MAY 1843

PLATE IV



three thousand voices sang the sweet, quaint setting of the forty-third Psalm :—

“O, send Thy light forth and Thy truth,  
Let them be guides to me,  
And bring me to Thine holy hill,  
Even where Thy dwellings be ;”

the sun struck through a heavy thundercloud that had been overhanging for some time, and the light filled the hall, cheering every one, and reminding some of Dr. Chalmers' text six months before: “Unto the upright there ariseth light in the darkness.” It was as men who walked in light; as men who had looked unto God and were enlightened, and whose faces were not ashamed, that the Assembly of the Church of Scotland Free began its great and most difficult task. They appointed Assembly officials, having, happily, the best blood of the Church of Scotland to choose from; and as almost their earliest act, did what must have been a great help to the remnant left in bondage. For, on the Tuesday following the day of departure, the Act of Disruption was legally completed by the voluntary subscription of the “Act of Separation and Deed of Demission,” by which 470 ministers “separated from and abandoned the present subsisting Ecclesiastical Establishment in Scotland, and renounced all rights and emoluments pertaining to them in virtue thereof.” “A revenue of more than £100,000 a year was thus voluntarily relinquished for the keeping of a good conscience, and on behalf of the liberties of the Church.”\*

\* Dr. Hanna.

And this, with all the sadness that it implied, was borne bravely and even brightly. "The only regret expressed to me by the minister of a small Highland parish, a good, simple, innocent man, who had to quit the favourite manse garden, was implied in the question,—‘But, ma Lord, can ye tell me, are thae Moderates entitled to *eat ma rizzards this summer?*’”\* And Dr. Guthrie bore witness in later years that "he never met a minister who regretted his sacrifice in giving up all, though he found many to whom leaving the manse was the bitterest of all the Disruption experiences." With curious Scotch practicalness, and in the midst of all the intense emotion that was stirred by the great Exodus, the arrangements in the new Hall of Assembly provided for the exhibition, in front of the table on which the Act of Demission was signed, of a set of sacramental plate, "to inform the 500 congregations where, and at what cost, they could be supplied." †

After the great secession on May 18th, a few sympathizers with the Free Churchmen stayed in St. Andrew's church in the hope that the "Queen's Letter" might contain a promise of better things. But they wasted their time: and after hearing the almost insulting and "ill-timed nothings" that were put into the letter, they made haste to join their brethren in the Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland. The State Church Assembly then proceeded briskly with their work. They annulled the Veto; replaced the seven deposed ministers of Strathbogie; excluded from the Church Courts all the Chapel of Ease ministers;

\* Lord Cockburn's "Journal," Vol. II., p. 32.

† Vide "Description of Hill's Picture of the Disruption," p. 17.

removed all sentences pronounced by Evangelicals ; determined to reply to the Government, accepting legislation in the shape of Lord Aberdeen's useless bill ; and resolved to close the State Church pulpits to Dissenters. When Lord Aberdeen's bill was brought before the House of Lords, Lord Brougham declared that "if the present bill were to be considered as truly declaring the law, their lordships should not have decided the Auchterarder case as they did." And Lord Cottenham similarly contended that "if the judgment in the Auchterarder case was the right one, the present bill was not in accordance with what he conceived to be the existing law of Scotland." Thus "the Veto Law of the Church was in 1839 pronounced to be illegal by the House of Lords, upon a view of the law which the same House of Lords in 1843 declared to have been erroneous."\*

On the 24th of May the State Church Assembly considered the Protest of the Free Churchmen. It was resolved to appoint a committee, who were to judge it and prepare a minute answer to the Protest. Three answers were tried : but the Assembly dared not commit itself to any. Then the committee was reappointed to consider the Protest and report to the August Commission. When the Commission met, it could not be constituted, because there was not a quorum. From that time the answer to the Free Church Protest has never been heard of : upon which Free Churchmen have been warranted in commenting, to the effect that "it was the virtual admission of the Establishment itself that it is not the true Church of Scotland." And that

\* *Vide* "Ten Years' Conflict," Vol. II., p. 622.

others, who had the calmness of onlookers and earnest men, judged similarly, is clear from the note with which that keen and judicial writer—the Rev. A. Sydow, chaplain to the King of Prussia, ends his book on the “Scottish Church Question.” He says:—“The deputations from the Presbyterian bodies of America, Ireland, Holland and England, together with those from the bodies of the earlier Scottish seceders, that were deputed to the then undivided General Assembly, had, at the disruption of the Assembly, to decide where they should find the representatives of the Church of Scotland. But all of them, without a moment’s hesitation, passed St. Andrew’s Church, and went to Cannonmill Hall, to address what they deemed the true General Assembly of the Kirk.” This the writer witnessed himself.\* Their decision was accurate. They went to the Assembly of the Scotch Church: for such it was, if religious and spiritual continuity is more than the retaining of State endowments, and a more sacred thing than the assigning of territorial limits by a law court.

Not less notable than the great withdrawal of the ministers and their piteous losses, was the act of the 200 probationers who, as with one heart, joined the Free Church of Scotland. The fact of 450 church vacancies must have appealed to many of these, as giving opportunity for immediate success and advancement, in a way almost inconceivable at this time. But without hesitation they cast in their lot with those who for conscience’ sake had taken the loss of all things, and were glorifying God in the tribulation. Similarly and most notably, not one

\* Sydow: “Scotch Church Question,” p. 201.

foreign missionary hesitated as to the direction in which his allegiance to Christ led. They all went with the Free Church: though it involved the giving up of all the property and working material that the missionaries had gathered round them. Dr. Duff gave up "everything down to the minutest atom that by the most microscopic ingenuity could be claimed by our friends of the Establishment." At Bombay "the house Dr. Wilson had built was taken possession of, and a *German agent* appeared, demanding of the missionaries the library and scientific apparatus, the fruit of their own and their friends' generosity, property to the value of £8,000.\*

Notwithstanding the emphatic words of Dr. Chalmers as Moderator,—“the Voluntaries mistake us, if they conceive us to be Voluntaries; we are not Voluntaries,”—there came from all the Evangelical unestablished churches loving and admiring words of sympathy; and in due time help for the time of great necessity that was upon the Free Church. This help was only a return for a great spiritual blessing. The English-speaking Christian world, and other parts also, were the better and nobler for the great act of the Free Church. Christ and His supremacy were made more real to them all by the great self-sacrifice in Scotland. The paramount claim of Christ's Rulership shone out more brightly than ever before them. And this gain has lasted to the present time. It was better than well, that while in England another revival, that was to move chiefly along the lines of visible ritual, was making progress without worldly loss to the actors therein, there should be

\* Blaikie's "Fifty Years After," p. 50.



such a maintenance of Christ's great honour and supremacy over earthly advantages and governments, as the Free Church of Scotland made with deep loss. No country can afford to undervalue the quality of such an act, or the gain of such a loss.

The real pain of the suffering was not felt till the Free Church Assembly scattered, and the ministers went back to their old homes. The almost excited crowds of 3,000 at a time that attended the sessions and services of the Assembly so long as it met, must have kept the hearts of the confessors buoyant and hopeful. Dr. Chalmers notes their light-heartedness when the untraceable step was taken, in a letter to his sister, on June 16th, 1843. Another member of Assembly "expected to have nothing like it on this side heaven." But when the Edinburgh meetings ended, and each minister had to go his own way alone; no longer to his old church, for the State Church Assembly had without delay closed the doors to them; and only once more to the old manse, to arrange for the removal of the furniture and plenishing that love had put there in many years; then their hearts must have been wrung as they never could have anticipated. Then their troubles began: and very real they were, especially when the summer waned and winter grew. The hardships inflicted on them by many "noble" owners of the land might well make Dr. Guthrie, in his speech at the Assembly of Inverness in 1845, congratulate some of the dead on having gone with a clean conscience; "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest." The accounts of the wrongs and sufferings that had to be

endured are sad reading, and move deep indignation : but they ought to be very generally read. So long lasting were the wrongs, and so painful, that in 1847 a Committee of Inquiry was appointed by Parliament. Things must have been bad for that to have been granted. The evidence given before the committee was only too ample, as showing the meanness and pertinacity of the enemies of the Free Church.

One of the greatest difficulties of the Free Church, especially in country districts, was to obtain sites for churches, schools, and manses. In their difficulty the opportunity of their opponents was often found ready to hand. The Free Churchmen were driven into the open air to worship God, tinkers and tramps being allowed camping ground where Christians were made outcast and refused tenting space : or they were compelled to hold their services between high and low watermark of the tide : or even to build a floating church for their worship, the shore being denied them. No wonder that it was noted by Mr. Fox Maule that "in the country almost all the congregations were at first compelled to resort to the open air, to carry on their religious ordinances ; and it was a remarkable fact that on seventeen successive Sundays not a single drop of rain fell in Scotland." Similar statements, some with remarkable particularity, are found from many districts during the same time. But as winter came on the trial of faith and the flesh must have been very hard. What sacrifice and nobility of endurance and even pathos are in the words of one minister, that may be given as only one of many similar cases :—"Monday, June 12th, we kept our prayer-meeting


in the open air, and on the 15th we observed the fast appointed by our Free Assembly : and henceforward, *until December following, we met for worship in the field, taking the most sheltered spots we could find.*" After December they were "allowed, unmolested, to fit up a gravel-pit, where we had our canvas tent for a year." In October one congregation that had to meet on the loch shore in the open air, had no protection against the spray that was flung over them by the storms as they worshipped God. Rich lords and landlords, such as the Duke of Sutherland, Lord Panmure, the Duke of Buccleuch, and others, were the great enemies of the Free Church settlements. The detail of their refusals of sites, &c., is, on one side, the saddest, and on the other the most heart-stirring reading that any one could have.

Even at this distance of time from the events now noted bitter indignation will be felt, and justly, as the story is read. But it is too long to be told here. Happily in "The Annals of the Disruption" the whole story is admirably told. To read the book would be to enervated religion, like Alpine air to a jaded city toiler.\* Too often in many districts the old time hill experience was repeated:—

"The storm was out, the wind was up,  
 God's Israel sat in mire and clay;  
 Rain-drenched they took the sacred cup,  
 Shivering with cold they turned to pray."

An instance in which this was literally true is found in the case of the congregation of Auchnacroish, of which a

\* A new and cheap edition of this good book has just been issued.





ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENT  
IN THE GRAVEL-PIT NEAR AUCHNACROSH MULL  
20TH OCTOBER 1845

contemporary pictorial record (*See* Plate V.) has been preserved. In this case the congregation had to meet in a gravel-pit within high-water mark, under the shelter of a canvas tent, which, however, was soon rent in pieces by the storm. They then met in a barn or cow-shed, the part they occupied being divided from the other part used for cattle by a canvas partition made of the remains of the tent. But they held on through all their difficulties, and wrought out the will of God in the noble fashion, of which the later pages of this volume will tell. The word of one who, while he was not a lowly sufferer for the Free Church, yet did not gain, as men judge, by his noble championship of the honour of Christ, might have been adopted later on by every one of the many hardly-trying believers who suffered for conscience in the Disruption. The Marquis of Breadalbane, one of the few titled men who stood by the Free Church, said :—“ Let them say what they will, it is we who have succeeded. We have lost the aliment of the State, and pain and privation have been the consequence ; but at this moment here we stand, safe through the trials of the conflict, pure as in the times of our fathers, the Free and Ancient Church of Scotland. We acknowledge no head but Christ.” That word was the rock on which the lowliest member of the Free Church firmly stood. It was the inspiration through all the weary struggle. It was their consolation in every loss. It is the true principle in the history of the real Church of Scotland from the Reformation :—“ We acknowledge no head but Christ.”

The text on this page is extremely faint and illegible. It appears to be a historical account or a list of events, but the specific details cannot be discerned due to the low contrast and blurriness of the scan.

PROGRESS AND FINANCE

BY

JOHN M · McCANDLISH





## INTRODUCTORY

THERE are few institutions in this world which have not a financial side. Many have no other, but the Christian Church is not one of those ; her aims, indeed, are so lofty, and her methods ought to be, and in the main are, so spiritual, that it seems almost a desecration to lay any stress on her financial arrangements. And yet to underestimate the importance of these would be worse than a mistake. The truth is that the right use of money is one of those things which are necessary to the very existence of a visible branch of Christ's Church ; and Church finance deserves a close attention, whether regarded as an outcome and fruit of principles, or as a means of promoting the service of the Church's Divine Head.

Some interest would probably be found in studying the finance of any church, but the Free Church of Scotland in this department of her activities, as perhaps in some others, presents a unique phenomenon. Just at this time we have mapped out before us a compact history of its finance extending over the not insignificant period of fifty years. Nor did the history begin, as that of many a great institution has done, like one of those feeble streamlets which, after a long course, develops into a mighty river ; it more resembled that full and powerful torrent with

which the waters of the Rhone rush into life out of their icy cavern. And then, both in aim and in methods, Free Church finance in its chief departments has been original and without prototype, and its history opens up questions of universal interest.

It will be convenient to speak of the Free Church as an institution which came into existence in 1843, just fifty years ago ; but it need scarcely be said that in some vital aspects this is not the view which the Church herself takes of her history. The Free Church of Scotland claimed from the first, and still claims, to be the Church of Scotland Free. That connection with the State which is called Establishment can neither make nor unmake a Church. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland, during its history of three centuries, was sometimes established by, and sometimes in conflict with, the State as represented by the Crown and Parliament ; but these changes of relationship did not disturb its own identity ; nor did the Disruption of 1843. New financial arrangements necessarily had their origin then ; but we shall find that they were largely influenced by the conception that it was a National Church that had to be provided for ; that the true Church of Scotland, the rightful inheritor of that title judged by continuity of principle, having renounced the advantages of establishment and endowment, in order to be free, had to rebuild its finance on a national basis. The facts to be now set forth will show how far this has been done.

In May 1843 four hundred and seventy-four ministers of the Church of Scotland voluntarily, and under the

impulse of constraining principle, made an absolute surrender of their whole incomes, of their homes, of the churches in which they had conducted the worship of God, —in fact, of every privilege and advantage which the ministers of an established and endowed church could possess. One hundred and ninety-one probationers surrendered at the same time all their hopes and expectations of succeeding to these advantages. The whole of the missionaries employed by the Church in India and elsewhere in like manner surrendered their means of living, as well as the buildings, libraries, &c., which had been provided chiefly through their own influence and labour. A large number of the people of Scotland hitherto attached to the Established Church, not merely from the congregations of the outgoing ministers, but from every congregation in Scotland, renounced at the same time the prestige and the material advantages of belonging to an established and endowed Church, and deliberately set their faces to the work of sustaining, building up, and extending the institution which they gloried in as the Free Church of Scotland.

Forty-nine years afterwards, in May 1892, the last date up to which we have exact figures, the Free Church of Scotland possessed 1,047 churches, served by about 1,166 ministers, upwards of 900 manses, three theological colleges, three training schools for teachers, fully-equipped missions in many parts of India, in South and Central Africa, in the New Hebrides, in Palestine, Syria and Arabia, with numerous churches and ministers on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere. And in support of all these operations there

was received in the year ending March 31, 1892, an income of £624,107 13s. 7d.; and there had been accumulated capital funds, chiefly invested in mortgages, exceeding £900,000. In the Report of the Finance Committee we find that portion of the income which came under the cognizance of the General Treasurer grouped under the following heads:—

	£	s.	d.
I. Sustentation Fund ... ..	175,642	13	10
II. Local Building Fund ... ..	63,913	2	4
III. Congregational Funds ... ..	220,574	0	9
IV. Missions and Education ... ..	138,214	0	9
V. Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, &c.	25,763	15	11
Total as before ...	<u>£624,107</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>7</u>

But when we include some sources of income not passing through the ordinary church accounts the amount is increased to £676,249 19s. 7d. (*See Appendix No. 1*). In the following pages we will endeavour to trace, so far as finance is concerned, the progress from 1843 to 1893, dealing in the first place separately with each of the greater branches of income and expenditure.

## THE SUPPORT OF THE MINISTRY—THE SUSTENTATION FUND

THE first necessity which arose in 1843 was to provide for the support of the ministers and their families. As the Disruption did not come upon the Church quite unexpectedly there had been some opportunity of considering how this was to be done. Providentially, this work fell chiefly into the hands of a man of the highest intellect, who combined fervent piety, great theological attainments, and a familiar acquaintance with economic science, with a degree of eloquence and of public confidence which secured for any proposals he might make the readiest popular acceptance. There is reason to believe that ideas similar to those of Dr. Chalmers had been passing through other minds, but it was to him they chiefly owed their successful embodiment.

The problem which Dr. Chalmers had to face was a new one. The Free Church, as we have said, claimed to be the true National Church of Scotland, and this involved the duty of providing religious ordinances throughout the whole country. If only the 474 ministers who "came out" had had to be provided for, and possibly a few more, no great difficulty would have been experienced; but a portion, greater or less, of every congregation in Scotland

left the Establishment and cast in their lot with the Free Church ; and in the end the number of congregations and ministers came to equal those of the Established Church prior to the Disruption. It was manifest from the first that a large number of these congregations, in rural districts, in the remote Highlands, among fisher-folk, and miners, and factory workers, &c., would not be able to support their own ministers without external aid, and, as a matter of fact, more than 700 congregations, or nearly three-fourths of the whole, are at the present time in that position. The question then was how such congregations were to be provided for.

In February 1843, three months before the Disruption, a Circular was issued by Dr. Chalmers, "under the authority of the Financial Committee constituted by the United Committees of the Convocation of Ministers and General Meeting of Elders." In this Circular Dr. Chalmers sets forth the general features of his scheme, and he begins his appeal "to the friends of a pure Gospel in Scotland" by stating that the funds to be raised were not so much for the needful support of the ministers and their families as for the continuance of their services. In other words, it was the interests of the people rather than of the ministers that he had in view ; and he goes on to anticipate the "making good a universal provision, by a commensurate supply of churches and schools, for the whole of our Scottish population."

An obvious method by which provision might have been made for assisting poor congregations, and one that has no doubt often been practised in other churches, was to let

each congregation do what it could for itself in the first place, and then to supplement its efforts out of a Central Fund. Dr. Chalmers, in his lectures in defence of Church Establishments, had been accustomed, in opposition to views which seem to have been prevalent among "Voluntaries" at the time, to insist that the religious wants of a community were not to be dealt with under that economic law of demand and supply which may be reckoned on in so many other cases. The sort of wants, he pleaded, which will ensure their own supply are felt wants; whereas religious instruction was one of those wants which was likely to be least felt just where to others it might seem most needful; and accordingly his church extension operations, which had added about 200 congregations to the Church of Scotland, had been largely guided by the consideration that churches were to be planted where they were needed rather than only where there was a local demand for them. Then in the Voluntary controversy a good deal had been made of the idea that ministers who were chiefly or wholly dependent for their means of living on the gifts of their own congregations might not be so free to "reprove, rebuke, exhort," as their duty to God and their people might require. No doubt these views largely influenced him in forming the scheme which he organized for the use of the Free Church, and which, notwithstanding many difficulties, has been, with eminent success, the basis of its Finance during these fifty years.

That scheme was thus introduced in the Circular of February 1843 :—"First, then, we feel ourselves prepared



to announce that there should be a General Fund, supported by contributions from all parts of the Church, and made available for the benefit of all the adhering congregations, by means of an *equal* dividend towards the support of each minister." It was characteristic of Dr. Chalmers that to this Fund he gave the full-sounding title of the "Sustentation Fund," which it has ever since borne ; \* but, indeed, it is difficult to see what better title could have been given to it. We shall refer presently to the second feature of the scheme. "But, *thirdly*, this dividend, this equal dividend, being always one and the same to each minister of the Church, and so increasing with every increase of the General Fund, should not, however, increase to more than a certain amount, even though beyond and, it is to be hoped, greatly beyond this point, the Fund itself should continue to increase. What, then, it may be asked, should be done with the surplus? This surplus, which it is our earnest prayer might be made as large as possible, should not go to the increase of any minister's stipend, but should go to the increase of the number of ministers or missionaries, to the increase not of ministerial income, but of ministerial service."

This Central or Sustentation Fund was therefore to provide an equal minimum income, and, as it was hoped, an increasing income, yearly, to all the ministers of the Church,

\* This name has since been used by many Religious bodies which have sprung into existence since 1843, to denote similar funds, and has lately been suggested for use by the Church of England. The general principles laid down by Dr. Chalmers for the raising and administration of his Sustentation Fund have also been widely copied.

and to an ever-increasing number of such ministers. It became necessary, as we shall presently see, owing to the rapid extension of the Church in poor and thinly-peopled districts, so far to modify the original conditions as that a certain number of new congregations before being admitted to what is known as the equal dividend platform, might have to satisfy themselves with a smaller contribution out of the Fund. But that the original intention has been effectively carried out will be seen from the following figures, which show the amount of the *equal* dividend, and the number of ministers to whom it was paid in full at each quinquennial period since 1843. Up to the year 1865 the amount fluctuated a little from year to year; since then any changes have been towards increase.

Year.	Number of Ministers drawing equal Dividends.				Amount of Dividend.
1843-4	...	...	470	...	£105
1848-9	...	...	623	...	122
1853-4	...	...	696	...	119
1858-9	...	...	713	...	138
1863-4	...	...	715	...	138
1868-9	...	...	740	...	150
1873-4	...	...	770	...	150
1878-9	...	...	776	...	160
1883-4	...	...	815	...	160
1888-9	...	...	828	...	160
1891-2	...	...	836	...	160

The figures here given indicate the number of ministers who in each year received a full year's dividend at the current rate, but they do not show the number who, in one form or another, participated in the Sustentation Fund.

They do not include, for instance, a considerable number of ministers who, owing to death, or to their admission to a benefice in the course of the year, or other causes, have received only a part of the yearly dividend. And they do not include certain cases of "Territorial and Church Extension Charges," and a few others which receive for the present somewhat less than the full dividend. Thus in the last year for which we have the details, the year 1891-92; while 836 ministers received each of them the full dividend of £160, amounting to £133,760, upwards of 320 other ministers shared to a greater or less extent in the Fund, the total amount of which was £176,735 1s. 2d.

Leaving the Sustentation Fund for the present, let us revert to another feature of Dr. Chalmers's proposals in February 1843:—"Second, to maintain, however, not a nominal but a real and substantial equality, something more is necessary than the allocation of the same yearly sum from a General Fund to each minister of the Church. What might nearly suffice for the adequate maintenance of a minister in some parts of the country might fall greatly short of what is necessary in towns, where the habits and expense of living must require a larger income. Now, so far as has yet been ascertained, there seems a general agreement among all the Church's friends that it should not be the function or office of the General Fund to repair this inequality; and that on no account the principle of a rigidly equal distribution from what might be termed this great Central Treasury of the Church ought to be violated. But it seems the clear and confident opinion of all that, besides its dispensations, room should

be left in some way for the supplementary efforts of each congregation on behalf of their own ministers. Any arrangement for this object must be made by the General Assembly of the Church when disestablished ; and such precise regulations as appear advisable may then be made for adjusting the two objects which every congregation will necessarily have in view, viz. : the contributing to the General Fund, out of which every minister is to receive a fixed stipend or allowance, and at the same time applying a portion of their contributions for the particular benefit of their own minister. No positive rule can be laid down on this point at present."

Here, then, we have in full the principle of ministerial support devised by Dr. Chalmers, and adopted by the Free Church of Scotland. Instead of leaving each congregation to support its own minister with such assistance as might be necessary from a Central Fund, each minister was to receive a certain minimum income from the Central Fund irrespective of the contributions of his congregation, but supplemented by such further allowance as they might be able and willing to supply. It will readily be seen how advantageous this was for the ministers of the Church, giving a certain sureness and fixity to the essential part of their income, while placing no restrictions on the liberality and personal attachment of their people. On the other hand, the scheme appealed to all the best motives which could influence men to give in such a cause, and opened up to the Christian people a breadth of view which could not but be educative in a high degree. Every contribution to the Central Fund not only served to benefit their own

minister, but helped to maintain Christian ordinances in every congregation throughout the land, to promote church extension, to support the principles of the Free Church, and to sustain its honour and reputation in the country. At the same time there was ample room for indulging those kindly personal feelings of affection and gratitude which attach a Christian congregation to the individual who ministers to them the bread of life. In the language of the Circular already so often referred to, "Under such an economy the Christian philanthropy which looks not only on its own things but on the things of others also, will have an ample and beneficent range opened up for its best and most generous aspirations."

The Free Church seems to have carried out from the first Dr. Chalmers's suggestions about supplementary payments to its ministers, or Supplements, as they have come to be called; for, though the published accounts of the first two years do not distinguish the sums paid in this way, we find that in the year 1845-46 the sum of £24,863 is set down under the head of Ministers' "Supplements paid out of Congregational Funds." In the following year the amount was £25,187, distributed among 478 ministers. Many of these Supplements are very small indeed, and others merely assist in paying house-rent where there is no manse, and there are only two or three, if so many, that bring up the minister's whole income to anything like £1,000 a year. This sum, indeed, may be taken as the maximum income of any Free Church minister derived from his office. But the total amount paid as Supple-

ments has grown very considerably, as may be seen from the following table :—

In the Year	Number of Ministers receiving Supple- ment.			Total Amount Paid.	
1851-2	...	..	459	...	£24,988
1861-2	...	...	549	...	34,526
1871-2	...	...	618	...	50,592
1881-2	...	...	723	...	71,634
1891-2	...	...	741	...	75,669

The growth of this Supplement Fund has excited a little jealousy in the interests of the Sustentation Fund, and an apprehension that congregations may be tempted unduly to limit their contributions to the great Central Fund for the sake of increasing the incomes of their own ministers. That this may have occasionally happened is not improbable, and the subject is now under consideration by a Special Committee of the General Assembly. We need not speculate on what may be their Report.

It must be sufficiently obvious, however, that it can be no easy work to secure that every one of eleven hundred congregations, rich and poor, town and country, shall each contribute in fair proportion according to its means to a great Central Fund : and here we may consider the mode in which this Fund is raised.

One cardinal idea entertained from the first, and effectively carried out down to the present time, was that every member of the Church, whether rich or poor, would desire to contribute to this fund according to his ability, and that the contributions of all would be required to maintain it at a proper level. Dr. Chalmers, while not

regardless of the larger offerings of the comparatively rich, insisted with a sort of loving pertinacity on the "power of littles," on the great results that might be expected from the ingathering of a multitude of small subscriptions, collected monthly or even weekly. This implied a large machinery of collection, and the most conspicuous step taken with this object was the revival of the order of Deacons. Up to this time the Kirk Session, composed of the minister and lay elders, had managed any small secular business which had to be attended to. But the proper functions of a lay elder being of a spiritual character, it was felt, as in the primitive church, that the accession of a great amount of secular business called for a class of officers who might give their special attention to it. The further advantage was secured of enlisting in the service of the Church, with a defined office, a large number of men very willing and very able to render effective help, who, owing to their youth or other circumstances, might not be suitable yet for the office of elder. There was no thought, however, of excluding minister or elders from their due share in the management of any portion of the congregation's concerns; and accordingly during these fifty years the control of each congregation's finance has lain with the "Deacons' Court," composed of the minister, elders, and deacons. Experience has proved the truth of the apostolic maxim, that "they who have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree."; and there are probably at this time few men in the eldership of the Church who have not first served it as deacons; while in some congregations frequented by students for the

ministry, it is not unusual to accord them the advantage of passing through the diaconate, and so acquiring a useful acquaintance with the business part of congregational life. Thus the same man who yesterday served as a deacon may to-day, like Stephen or Philip, be found a Preacher of the Gospel.

Another arrangement made at the outset was to form Associations in every parish for the promotion of the Sustentation Fund. This sort of machinery was, no doubt, adopted to meet the cases, numerous at the first, of money being raised for this central fund even in localities where there were no organized congregations. In the summer and autumn of 1843 many deputations went forth to organize such Associations in different parts of the country, and the present writer had the privilege, along with a friend, of visiting every parish in one of our southwestern counties on this errand, holding meetings in each, sometimes in a public hall, sometimes in a barn, and once or twice speaking from a cart in the corner of a field. The term Association has been kept up, although there are probably no cases now where the so-called Association is not identical with the Congregation; and in the published accounts of the Church far the larger portion of the Sustentation Fund is described as "Revenue from Associations."

The existing machinery therefore is that in every congregation there is a Deacons' Court, with its treasurer, who attend, amongst other things, to the ingathering of the Sustentation Fund. Where this work is most effectively done every member or adherent of the congregation is



personally visited monthly, and visited by one of the deacons, but it has not yet been found possible to get all congregations to come up to this standard of efficient administration. In many the deacons, instead of visiting personally, as it would be well for them to do, make use of the services of lady collectors, and the Church has been very greatly indebted to the zeal and self-denial of its female members in this as in many other acts of cheerful and gratuitous service. It is doubtful whether the visits paid are always as frequent as they ought to be. To very many willing contributors it must tend to liberal giving when they are allowed an opportunity of breaking down the aggregate of their contributions into small monthly sums. But whether the machinery is in every case as perfect as it might be, the fact remains that in the year 1891-92, from 1,082 congregations and preaching stations, the sum of £157,487 5s. 11d. found its way into the treasury of the Sustentation Fund. To this there came to be added donations and legacies not passing through particular congregations and a small sum of interest, which brought up the available amount of the fund to £176,735 1s. 2d.

We have spoken of the congregational machinery, but our view of the subject would not be complete without some reference to the central administration of the Free Church, with its various enterprises and the large amount of money which it collects and distributes. This administration naturally finds its seat in Edinburgh, and occupies convenient offices, largely the gift of an honoured layman, the late Mr. John Maitland, in one of those lofty and conspicuous tenements at the head of "the Mound," which, connected

behind with the High Street by one of its historic closes, commands in front as wonderful a piece of scenery as any city can boast of. On one side are the grassy slopes, and beyond them the rocky precipices and battlements of the Castle; on the other, the far-off entrance to the Firth of Forth, North Berwick Law, and the Bass Rock where many of our presbyterian forefathers endured a cruel imprisonment, for the sake of those principles which are still dear to our Church. Between these lie below us Princes Street, with its gardens, and the whole New Town of Edinburgh, with the Lomonds, the Ochils; and the Grampians in the background, and the Forth and its islands between. Adjoining these offices are the Free Church College, with its library, and the Assembly Hall, where the supreme court of the Church holds its periodic meetings. In these offices, on a fixed day every month, numerous committees of the General Assembly meet to deal with the various subjects which have been remitted to them: the Sustentation Fund; Missions, Home and Foreign, Continental, Colonial, Jewish, &c.; the Theological Colleges; Finance, and many others, some being standing committees and others special and occasional. Clergy and laity are, of course, fairly represented on each of these committees, and the rules for their election aim at securing that they shall deserve and possess the general confidence of the Church. Their work does not interfere with that government of the Church by Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, and Provincial Synods, which is of the essence of our constitution: they merely act as the means by which the General Assembly deals with details of inquiry or action that so large a body

with only a limited time at its disposal could not otherwise encounter: they have no powers but what have been expressly delegated to them, and have to report to the Assembly and obtain its approval of all their proceedings. Each committee is presided over by a convener appointed by the Assembly, who may be either clerical or lay, and whose services, often laborious enough, are entirely gratuitous.

Many departments of the Church's work demand, of course, the services of competent officers giving their whole time to it, and remunerated accordingly. An obvious example of this is the General Treasurer; but the business of the Sustentation Fund and of Foreign Missions, Colonial and other Missions, &c., also involves the need of paid officials, and there is, of course, a staff of clerks. A very large amount of printing work has to be done, and the very postages and stationery cost many hundreds of pounds yearly. The whole expense of this central administration amounted last year to £9,800. A large part of this expense has no special reference to the amount of the money passing through the Church's hands, but it may be noted that it comes in all to little more than one and a half per cent. of the received and administered income. Persons accustomed to deal with large business arrangements will be surprised at the severe economy indicated by these figures; and it may be permitted to the present writer, who has had opportunities of forming an opinion, to say that the Free Church has all along been singularly fortunate in her paid officials, and that at the present time she enjoys services of an amount and character which no secular

institution could hope to procure for itself except at a greatly higher cost.

Returning to the subject of ministerial support and the Sustentation Fund, we may indicate briefly some of the difficulties which have presented themselves in the working out of the scheme adopted by the Free Church. When a congregation can secure for its minister an equal dividend from the Fund without reference to its own contribution—and this is what happens in the case of a majority of congregations—there is room to apprehend that it may be less zealous for the welfare of the Fund than if it had a more direct interest in its amount. How far the absence of a selfish motive tells on the giving of congregations in general, or of any one in particular, it is impossible to say, but if Congregation A suspects that B, C and D may be withholding their fair share of the burden, A is very apt to retaliate. It is often difficult, too, for people to see why they should make sacrifices and increase their own contributions when the effect will be so trifling, even if it be not neutralized by greater slackness on the part of others. Thus a congregation giving £100 a year to the Fund may argue with itself that even if it could double its contribution, what would cost it so much would only add about two shillings to the income of each minister in the Church. Then, in appealing to congregations, it is scarcely possible to institute comparisons, the circumstances vary so much, and there is no standard of giving to this Fund which can well be applied to congregations generally. It is to be feared also that the large and generous spirit which breathes in the leading principle of this Fund, the recognition of

the fact that there are congregations requiring help, and that the Fund exists for the very purpose of helping them, leads many to accept too readily the position of aid-receiving congregations, and to cling to it too long, when a not excessive exercise of self-denial and liberality might easily make them independent of help.

Undoubtedly, too, the enthusiasm of the period which followed the Disruption has almost inevitably waned. It would be out of place to enter here into the causes of this, or to suggest the needful remedies; but obviously it must be more difficult for this generation than for their fathers to permit in themselves such a degree of sympathy with abstract principles as will entail pecuniary sacrifices, and it is on abstract principles that the Sustentation Fund largely depends for the motives of its support. Even where the grand idea of systematically devoting a certain portion of one's income, be it great or small, to Christian and benevolent objects, has happily laid hold of a man, the daily increasing number and variety of objects which invite his support are apt to thrust aside older claims which do not so strongly appeal to the sentiment of the hour. It is needful to have these considerations in view, because, whether they are generally recognized or not, they furnish an explanation of the action of the Church in dealing from time to time with its great central Fund.

It will be obvious, in the first place, that a watchful regard has to be kept on the manner in which every congregation in the Church performs its duty towards the Fund. This is a work of delicacy, but possibly more might be done by the Church in the way of representation and remon-

strance. The occurrence of a vacancy in the charge is the chief opportunity for a searching review of what any congregation is doing. Even if it were possible at another time to visit the shortcomings of a congregation by withholding assistance, the penalty would fall not on the congregation but on the minister, who might not be to blame. But when a vacancy occurs it is for the Church to say whether the congregation deserves to continue in the receipt of the equal dividend in spite of the inadequacy of its own contributions; and as the withholding of help may interfere with its obtaining the minister of its choice, there is an opportunity of appealing to its own interests. It is called on to indicate what minimum contribution it proposes to send up in future, and if its proposal is unsatisfactory, or if, owing to the membership being very small, and to the nearness of other places of worship, there seems no need for keeping up a separate charge, it may be reduced to the status of a "preaching station," and placed perhaps under the wing of some neighbouring congregation. It may be questioned, however, whether this sort of discipline is always exercised with a sufficiently firm hand.

A more direct method of influencing contributions has been in operation for many years. In 1867 what is known as the Surplus Fund was established. Even at that comparatively early period the complaint came from the more liberal, or at all events the richer, congregations that any increase in their givings yielded no benefit to their own ministers, being absorbed and neutralized by the growing demands or the diminished givings of the poorer and more

numerous class. To meet this it was resolved that when the equal dividend, which was then £144, should come up to £150 (this sum being afterwards raised to £160), all beyond what was required to yield such equal dividend should be divided among those congregations which contributed at the rate of 7s. 6d. or upwards per member; those that gave 10s. per member receiving twice as much as those that gave a rate between 7s. 6d. and 10s. Under this scheme, which is still in force, the equal dividend rose from £144 to £160, notwithstanding that the number of ministers participating in the Sustentation Fund increased by about 250; and last year no fewer than 783 congregations shared in the Surplus Fund, in 600 cases at the yearly rate of £14 10s. each, and in 183 cases of £7 5s. each. The rule at the present time is that not more than £10,000 is to be reckoned as Surplus, so that any increase in the aggregate amount of the Sustentation Fund goes to increase the equal dividend.

Although this Surplus Fund plan has been in operation for twenty-six years, and has in more than half of the congregations of the Church raised the minimum income to £174 10s., and in about one-fifth more to £167 5s.; and although the minimum equal dividend has increased since 1867 from £144 to £160, there are still to be heard occasional complaints about it, and demands that the Surplus Fund shall be divided equally among all ministers without reference to the rate of contribution by the members of their congregations. Apart from the dislike to inequality natural to those who suffer from it, this consideration is urged,—that there are congregations of a



FREE CHURCH DALIBRO SOUTH UIST  
MAY 1851





Home Mission character where the success of a minister in making converts among the very poor may tend to lower the average rate of giving per member, and so to disentitle him to that small increase to his stipend, which, if he had been less zealous and effective, he would have had. On the other hand, if in other congregations the hope of earning a share of this Surplus stimulates minister and people to bring about or keep up a higher standard of giving, the effect may be so to raise the Fund that every minister will benefit by the regulation.

It may be interesting to take notice of a circumstance incidental to this Surplus Scheme. As has been said, the share of Surplus to be enjoyed by any congregation depends on the proportion between its givings and the number of its members. The ordinary rule is that "a member" is a person regularly admitted as such, and with a special view to attending the Lord's Supper. In most parts of the country nearly a uniform proportion subsists between the number of admitted members and the aggregate number of adherents, including children and other non-communicants. But it is not so in the Highlands, where owing to some peculiarities of opinion a far smaller proportion of the people manifest their obedience to our Lord's commands by partaking of His Supper. Membership therefore in the ordinary sense does not furnish an absolute test of the numbers of a Highland congregation, and the Church has been obliged to lay down special regulations with reference to these charges in reckoning their average givings.

As has already been said, it was fully contemplated at

the outset that there would be a large and growing increase in the number of ministerial charges beyond what was represented by the ministers who came out at the Disruption, and as we have seen this has been accomplished to a remarkable extent. But it was not long before questions arose as to whether this was not being too rapidly pushed on, having regard to the interest of existing ministers. A great many of the new congregations were not self-sustaining, and each of these to the extent of the burden it imposed on the Sustentation Fund tended to lessen the equal dividend. Not long after the Disruption it was questioned whether the principle of an equal dividend had not been intended to apply only to the ministers who had abandoned their livings in the Established Church.\* It is to the everlasting honour of these men, and indeed of the ministers of the Free Church generally, that they have been among the foremost promoters of that Church Extension system which, by increasing the demands on the Sustentation Fund and keeping down the equal dividend, has been carried out largely at their expense. But it came to be seen that there were cases of small but possibly growing congregations which might well be content for a time with some help less than the full equal dividend, or where it might even be for their advantage to be left more dependent on their own resources. A great Home Mission and Church Extension Scheme was started. Without going into the history of the movement in detail, it may

\* In the years 1844-48 a different plan was tried, but being found to deal hardly with the poorer congregations the equal dividend plan was reverted to.

be enough to mention that at the close of the year 1891-92 there were in existence 57 Church Extension charges, which received back their own contributions to the Sustainment Fund combined in most cases with a grant from the Home Mission Fund; 80 congregations which received back their own contributions with a special grant from the Sustainment Fund so restricted as that no grant exceeds £100, or raises the whole income beyond £160; and 910 congregations on "the equal dividend platform," of which 74, owing to vacancies and other changes, did not receive a full year's dividend, and 836 did receive a full dividend. This gives the number of organized charges as 1,047, while the number of ministers was 1,166. The Home Mission Scheme contributed about £6,000 to the support of 94 mission stations and new charges, and about the same number of Congregational missions, together with Evangelistic work of other kinds. A separate scheme for the special benefit of the Highlands and Islands expended about £6,800 for similar objects in that part of Scotland.

Thus in the 49 years the number of regular charges organized and provided for has increased from 474 to 1,047, without reckoning mere stations. In the 50 years between 1841 and 1891 the population of Scotland increased from 2,620,184 to 4,033,103, *i.e.*, by about 54 per cent., while the Free Church congregations have increased in number at the rate of 120 per cent. Of these 1,047 congregations, 312 contribute £160 or upwards to the Sustainment Fund, but when a closer investigation is made and the share of the Surplus Fund enjoyed by these self-sustaining congregations is taken into

account, it appears that the number of those which do more than sustain themselves and therefore contribute to the support of the rest is only 228, while at least 735 congregations depend for part of the support of their ministers on these 228. The amount which these 228 congregations contribute beyond what they themselves receive is £37,000, which yields on an average to each of the 735 congregations about £50 a year. The constitution of the Sustentation Fund somewhat obscures this important fact. We do not, of course, claim for these 228 "aid-giving congregations" any special merit. It is quite possible that many of them may not contribute so liberally in proportion to their means as some of the "aid-receiving congregations": and obviously the Fund might be as much benefited by the poorer congregations so increasing their contributions as to need less help from outside as by the richer ones giving a larger amount of help. But while the Church draws no distinction between these two classes it cannot fail to be seen that in appealing to them to keep up and increase their givings quite different motives have to be placed before them. It is one thing for a congregation to entertain the worthy ambition to escape from the condition of requiring external help into that of being self-supporting, and another thing for a congregation that is more than self-supporting to see why it should still further increase the help it gives to others. This last can chiefly be moved by feelings of loyalty towards the Free Church and interest in its principles, a desire to see the Gospel proclaimed under its auspices throughout the whole country, and a kindly sympathy with poorer congregations.

Appeals of every sort have from time to time been addressed to all the congregations of the Church, and at certain epochs, separated by a good many years from each other, there have been special movements intended to stimulate an immediate and considerable increase of the equal dividend. Printed appeals have been circulated and deputations have visited and addressed presbyteries, congregations, and deacons' courts, sometimes with excellent effect. These efforts, if they have not always produced the desired increase of contributions, may have at least served to prevent declension.

One of these movements has been going on lately in view of the Church's approach to its 50th or Jubilee year. An increase has been experienced in the vital element of congregational offerings, but it threatens to be counteracted in some degree by an accidental decrease in donations and legacies. It is beyond doubt, also, that the stirring of questions about disestablishment, and about adherence to the Confession of Faith, has been used as a reason for withholding an increase of subscriptions, while there is not wanting an apprehension that among the richer members of the Church (the classes!), the zeal of some may have been chilled by the somewhat pronounced political sentiment and action of certain Free Church ministers.

We have still to refer to one or two Funds not hitherto mentioned, which contribute to ministerial support in the Free Church. An important step was taken about the year 1848 in the establishment of an "Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund," out of which allowances are granted to ministers obliged to retire wholly or partially from active

work by reason of age or impaired health. For a number of years also there have been additional sums paid to surviving pre-Disruption ministers out of a yearly collection made throughout the Church for the purpose.

We shall here bring together the various sums actually expended in the year 1891-92 for ministerial support.

	£	s.	d.
The Sustentation Fund, excluding Surplus Fund . . . . .	163,980	12	8
The Surplus Fund . . . . .	9,456	4	3
Supplements paid out of Congregational funds	75,669	7	7
Home Mission Fund . . . . .	1,745	0	0
Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund . . . . .	8,703	5	2
Pre-Disruption Ministers' Fund . . . . .	1,275	0	0
In all . . . . .	<u>£260,829</u>	9	8*

To this falls to be added £17,202, representing various sums which go to increase the provision for Ministerial support, such as the amount distributed by the Society for the Benefit of Sons and Daughters to assist in education; several Trust Funds, from which yearly payments of £5 or £10, and sometimes more, go to ministers who require this help, and contributions towards the Widows' and Orphans' Fund.

Then there are about 940 manses, which, at the moderate average of £40 yearly, add £37,600 a year to the aggregate value of Free Church livings. This indicates

\* This does not include the £12,800 mentioned previously as spent on Home Mission Workers (non-ministerial). It differs from the sum stated in Column 5, Appendix No. I, in omitting the cost of administration, and legacies received but not actually expended during the year.

an average provision for each of the 1,047 congregations of £300 yearly, and for each of 1,166 ministers, effective and non-effective, of £270.

The income of every Free Church minister is charged with a payment of £7 yearly to the "Free Church of Scotland's Ministers and Missionaries Widows' and Orphans' Fund," an Institution incorporated under private Acts of Parliament. These yearly payments are supplemented by further payments on marriage, and by legacies and donations. The capital of this Fund amounted at 31st of March, 1892, to £359,214, and during the previous year the payments to widows and orphans were £18,168; widows receiving £48 each, and each child (on certain conditions as to age) £27.

In concluding this review of the provision made by voluntary effort in the Free Church of Scotland for a national ministry, it may be permissible to suggest the question of how far it can be regarded as satisfactory. Every one of the ministers has gone through a regular course of education at a University, and has afterwards devoted four years to professional studies as a theologian in one of the Church's Colleges. In most cases the mere facing and the successful completing of so many years' study afford indication of exceptional mental vigour and of high aspirations; and while no doubt some of these gentlemen have risen from a position which rendered the social status and the modest emoluments of the clerical profession an object of ambition, it is more than probable that the same degree of capacity and an equal measure of labour would have ensured



greater pecuniary rewards in other occupations. It must be acknowledged, then, that the Free Church has nothing to boast of in the scale on which it pays its ministers, and that it ought and without difficulty might rise to a more adequate rate. How far, however, even its present rate compares favourably with what is done by other Churches, established or non-established, in or out of Scotland, is a question we prefer to leave to those who are interested in other Churches to work out for themselves. It may just be added here that the sums raised by the Free Church for the support of the ministry during the fifty years 1843-93 have exceeded nine and a half millions sterling. The progress of these contributions will be seen in an abstract form at page 369.

## CHURCH AND MANSE BUILDING FUND

THE claim which appealed to the Free Church at the Disruption next in urgency to the immediate support of the ousted ministers arose from the need of having churches in which the people might attend the public worship of God. Under any circumstances they were bound to face great inconvenience. Only one congregation, St. George's, Edinburgh, had so far anticipated the event as to build for themselves a temporary church of a substantial character, but wooden structures were very rapidly put up in various localities. Many congregations belonging to other denominations, with great kindness and at some sacrifice to themselves, gave the use of their churches for a portion of each Sunday, and in towns public halls were utilized. In country districts much greater inconvenience was experienced, even when no opposition was made to farmers affording what accommodation they could in barns or otherwise, a graphic illustration of which will be found in Plate vi., p. 336. We need not here recount the painful story of the refusal by many noblemen and other great landlords of any site on which a church or manse might be built, a subject which engaged the attention of a Parliamentary Committee. In the end all these difficulties were got over, and about two thousand buildings were erected, churches and

manses. A severe economy was at first exercised, even by the better-off congregations, who were reluctant to spend on ornament money which was so much wanted by their poorer brethren. The need for this self-restraint passed away, and the Free Church now possesses a large number of handsome and costly churches and commodious manses.

Free St. Andrew's Church, Edinburgh, completed about six years ago, has been suggested as an example (*see* Plate vii., facing) of a modern Free Church. The style of architecture is Italian Renaissance and exhibits some striking features, such as the three great archways with their wrought iron gates, which form the access to the spacious vestibule; and the four buttresses which may some day perhaps be finished with four memorial statues, for which they are well adapted. The cost for the whole work has been upwards of £12,000, and the architect was Mr. Campbell Douglas, of Glasgow, now one of the four Vice-Presidents of the Royal Institute of British Architects.

The scheme for providing manses was greatly indebted to the powerful and sympathetic eloquence of the Rev. Dr. Guthrie, which found a most congenial object in pleading throughout the country the cause of his brethren who for conscience' sake had surrendered their pleasant homes, and were now, with their families, enduring a large amount of discomfort and suffering, not unattended with loss of health, and even in some cases of life.

Although this work of building fell heavily on the first years of the Church, it has been more or less continuous ever since. The early churches, built as we have said as cheaply as possible and as rapidly, have had to be repaired,



FREE ST. ANDREW'S EDINBURGH



enlarged, or rebuilt; and the increase in the number of congregations has kept up the demand for corresponding buildings. Many congregations having been obliged to incur debt, special efforts, both general and local, have been made from time to time to clear it off, and it is believed that by the recent operation of one of these movements the Jubilee Assembly will find the churches and manses throughout the country nearly all free of debt.

There has all along existed a General Building Fund for the supplementing of local effort, but the chief burden has fallen on the congregations of the Church individually, helped no doubt by what they could raise among friends outside their own bounds. It is proper to observe also that, especially at first, valuable contributions were made in the form of material and labour which do not appear in the Church's accounts.

During the six years subsequent to the Disruption, the amount raised and spent for building was £658,608, of which £431,190 was local, and £227,418 came from the General Fund. During the whole forty-nine years to 1892, the sum raised and expended has reached the considerable amount of £3,383,819, of which £2,888,630 was local, and £495,189 was contributed from the General Fund.

## CONGREGATIONAL FUNDS

WE come now to what is known as the "Congregational Fund," the Fund raised by each congregation for its own internal uses. Scottish Christians have for ages been accustomed to observe after a fashion the apostolic rule "concerning the collection" that something is to be done "upon the first day of the week." This has taken the form of an offering at the Church door on Sunday, varied in some cases, though rarely, by the sending round of a plate or bag at the close of divine service. We imagine that with large numbers of people in Scotland the dropping of at least a halfpenny into "the plate" on Sunday is regarded as not less obligatory or less creditable than attendance at church. A certain amount therefore is collected every Sunday by every congregation. These collections may be divided into ordinary and special; with the special we shall deal presently; in the meantime we will confine our attention to the ordinary weekly offertories, which, increased in numerous cases by seat-rents, form a Fund available for a variety of objects. By arrangement in some cases a part of these sums goes to increase the congregation's contribution to the Sustentation Fund, and this portion having already been taken into account in connection with that Fund, may be left out of view here. It is out

of the Congregational Fund that the Supplementary payments to ministers, which have also been already referred to, are taken ; but though we give precedence to this item of expenditure, it does not in fact form a first charge on the Fund, for in many cases what goes to the minister as Supplement is only any balance that may remain after all other claims have been satisfied.

The ordinary church-door collections and seat-rents together, after deducting the payments just spoken of, amounted last year (1891-92) to £106,981, or about £100 per congregation. We take from the records of one representative congregation some of the objects to which this Fund was applied :—Precentor's and church officer's salaries, cleaning, lighting, taxes, insurance, feu duty, repairs, furnishings, Communion expenses, presbytery and synod expenses, local home mission work, aid to poor members, &c. Closely associated with this Fund is another which appears in the General Accounts of the Church, under the title of Miscellaneous. Under this head, as we are informed, are grouped collections made for a variety of objects, which cannot be otherwise classified, but which are all of the nature of external benefactions. We take some examples from the same record as before, but with the observation that not many congregations have the means or opportunity of dealing with such a variety of special calls. Among the objects assisted in this case were the public hospital of the city, a dispensary, Church and Mission work in England and Ireland, on the Continent, and in Syria, Sabbath schools, &c. This Miscellaneous Fund amounted in the aggregate last year to £37,922 19s. 10d.



The following account will show the total amount of the money collected and used during these forty-nine years for the different purposes with which we have just been dealing:—

Ordinary Church-door Collections . . . . .	£3,321,184	4	0
Seat-rents . . . . .	2,028,994	9	3
	<hr/>		
	£5,350,178	13	3
Deduct Supplements paid out of these Funds to Ministers . . . . .	2,277,825	4	0
	<hr/>		
Leaves for Local uses . . . . .	3,072,353	9	3
Add Miscellaneous Fund . . . . .	1,295,786	7	2
	<hr/>		
Together . . . . .	£4,368,139	16	5
	<hr/>		

## EDUCATION—PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SCOTLAND, as every one knows, has possessed a national system of education ever since the Reformation, one of the many boons which she owes to the illustrious Father of her Presbyterian Church, John Knox. If he had had his way, the system would have been still more perfect, as he desired to do what is being done, and that but partially only in our own day, namely, to establish throughout the country secondary as well as primary schools. But, at all events, we had for centuries a primary school in every parish, many of them taught by men, "stickit ministers" and others, who were able and often zealous to impart to their more promising students a sufficient knowledge of classics and mathematics to qualify them for entering the Universities. These parish schools were in close connection with the Established Church. At the Disruption many of their best teachers joined the Free Church, including the masters of the training colleges, and so forfeited their legal right to their appointments. The "Residuary Assembly," as it was called in those days, was so ill advised as to enforce this old law, and to turn the whole of these men out of their schools, an act which

avenged itself on the Established Church by leading ultimately to the loss of all direct connection between it and the educational system of Scotland. The Free Church had, of course, to add the support of the outed schoolmasters to their other burdens, and naturally felt besides that the parish schools, having acquired a sectarian character by the pronounced exclusion of all members of their church from the office of teachers, were scarcely the proper place for the education of their children. Accordingly a separate system of schools was set up throughout Scotland, and three training schools for the preparation of teachers at Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen. There is scarcely any question that the establishment of these Free Church schools did much for education in Scotland, providing in many cases better teaching than that of the parish schools, and in others stirring up the latter to greater vigour by their healthful rivalry. From the first, however, there had been in many minds, both within and outside the Free Church, a strong feeling towards a national system of education unconnected with churches, and this feeling was not lessened by the sight of rival schools everywhere, and a sense of the waste of work and money which could scarcely be avoided. Although in 1861 an Act of Parliament opened the parish schools to teachers unconnected with the Established Church, the governing bodies were unsatisfactory to a large part of the population of Scotland, and ultimately, in 1872, Parliament established the School Board system now in operation, and the Free Church of its own good will handed over to the nation, gratuitously, the whole of its school buildings, which had cost it so large

a sum of money, or as many of them as were desired. A considerable number of the teachers were taken over by the School Boards, so that the Free Church was relieved of their support, but provision had to be made for many others, who, owing to age, or other disqualifications, could not find continued employment.

It was part of the arrangement that the training colleges for teachers, both those of the Free Church and of the Established Church and others should be kept up, as they are at the present time, the greater part of the expense being paid by the fees of the students or out of the school rates.

With these explanations it will be enough to say that the sum spent on education in connection with the Free Church in the year 1891-92 was £22,201 2s. 1d., chiefly on the training and normal schools, and largely provided out of government grants. The total sum expended on education during the forty-nine years since 1843 has been £839,866 7s. 9d., and in fifty years will have amounted to £880,000.

### THE TRAINING OF THE MINISTRY.

The presbyterian churches of Scotland require that candidates for the ministry shall undergo a very complete academical training, first by a course of four years' attendance on the arts and scientific and philosophical classes at some University, and afterwards by devoting a like period of four years to more strictly professional studies in one of their theological halls. Each of the Scottish

Universities has a Faculty of Theology ; but although all their other chairs are now open to competent persons without reference to what church they belong to, the chairs of theology are still strictly attached to the Established Church. At the Disruption, therefore, it became necessary for the Free Church to establish theological halls of her own, and a beginning was made with the "New College," Edinburgh, which at one time occupied premises in George Street, but since 1850 has been in possession of the handsome and commodious building at the head of "the Mound," in close connection with the Assembly Hall, designed by the celebrated architect W. H. Playfair, and erected at a cost of nearly £50,000. Similar institutions were afterwards set up in Glasgow and Aberdeen, partly for the convenience of students who have received their general education at these Universities, and largely promoted by local enthusiasm and liberality. At each of these colleges a full theological education is given. In Edinburgh the subjects taught, each by a separate professor, are Divinity, Systematic Theology, Exegetical Theology, Church History, Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, and Natural Science in its connection with theology ; besides which there are lectureships on Evangelistic Theology and on Elocution. The other colleges are scarcely less fully equipped. Each college has a valuable library and museum. The library of the Edinburgh College consists of upwards of 40,000 volumes.\* The number of students

\* The late Cardinal Newman told on one occasion that, shortly after the Disruption, wishing to purchase a rare and costly theological work, the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum*, which was on sale in some old book shop,

at the three colleges is about 300, of whom about 60 are not aiming at the ministry of the Free Church, but many of them foreigners from France, Italy, Switzerland, Hungary, Bohemia, and other continental countries, as well as from our colonies and the United States.

Large sums have from time to time been received as donations or bequests, both for the endowment of these colleges and for providing bursaries or scholarships for the students, these latter now amounting to about £1,700 a year, some of them available even during the preliminary University course. Lectureships also have been endowed, not dissimilar from such well-known institutions as the Bampton, and with the effect of stimulating the production of some valuable theological works.

The sums raised for these various objects vary a little from year to year, being affected by the incidence of large donations or legacies. In the year 1891-92 the amount was £18,075, in the previous year £27,789, and during the last seven years a little over £20,000 yearly on an average. In the forty-nine years since the Disruption the total amount has been £592,003 1s. 2d., and in the fifty years will have exceeded £600,000.

and which a friend had given him £70 to procure, he found it had already been bought for the Free Church College in Edinburgh. He conceived, he said, a high idea of an institution which at such a crisis had the inclination and the means to possess itself of this literary and theological treasure.

## HOME MISSIONS

AND

## MISSIONARY WORK IN THE HIGHLANDS.

WE have hitherto been dealing with those departments of the Church's work and expenditure which are the necessary result of its circumstances, and directed to its own support as a national institution. These include, of course, a great deal done for persons other than those who provide for the cost of it, and which is therefore to that extent a work of pious charity. But we come now to those operations of the Church which have directly in view the benefit of persons outside her own organization, and although a very secular critic might say that their object was to make proselytes, and therefore to add to the Church's breadth and importance, no honest and intelligent person is likely to refuse it the praise of unselfish benevolence.

Missions, like charity, ought to begin at home. Even in Christian and Protestant countries such as Scotland there are large classes of the population who are nearly as fit objects for missionary enterprise as the heathen of India or Africa. Apart from the "lapsed masses" there are many who are in danger of lapsing, and whose religious needs have not been overtaken by the ordinary operations of the churches. From the first the Free Church addressed itself to Home Mission and Church Extension work, to the employment of suitable agents to proclaim the gospel in remote and thinly-

peopled localities, in the overcrowded districts of large cities, among the inhabitants of mining villages, or the fisher people periodically gathered on certain parts of the coast. Congregations just struggling into existence have been encouraged by grants ; evangelists sent when asked for to assist the regular ministry, and more than one form of agency has been specially employed in the Highlands. Many flourishing congregations, scarcely yet entitled to recognition from the Sustentation Fund, are largely supported by this scheme.

The sums devoted to these objects during the last seven years have been about £15,000 yearly, and during the forty-nine years since 1843 £358,070 8s. 5d. In fifty years they will have exceeded £370,000.



## FOREIGN AND OTHER MISSIONS

### MISSIONS IN INDIA, AFRICA, &c.

THE financial history of these Missions can scarcely be restricted to the fifty years since the Disruption. As has already been mentioned, the whole of the foreign missionaries connected in 1843 with the Church of Scotland joined the Free Church, and it will scarcely be questioned that this was the case also with a large proportion of the persons at home who took an interest in the Missions and had been contributing to their support. Even before the Disruption a beginning had been made of the plan of raising funds by means of Associations connected with each congregation, and by a quarterly gathering of subscriptions by lady collectors, and this system, introduced in 1835 at the instigation of Dr. Duff, probably furnished Dr. Chalmers with a suggestion for his method of raising the Sustentation Fund. For some years both before and after the Disruption a large number of congregations preferred to have church-door collections, and there are still a certain number, chiefly in the Highlands, who adhere to that plan;

but while the congregational collections amounted in the year 1843-44 to £4,193, and the sums raised by Associations to £180, in 1891-92 collections yielded £1,278 and Associations £15,115.

It is well known that the establishing of Missions to the heathen abroad, and even a tolerance of the idea, was, both in England and Scotland, a consequence and an accompaniment of that evangelical revival which took place early in the present century, of which in Scotland the Disruption itself was one of the results, and that it was not brought about without considerable opposition. It would be out of place here, where we are dealing only with Finance, to discuss the duty of obeying our Lord's command, "Go ye and teach all nations"; "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations," or to do more than suggest the advantages which the churches and individual Christians derive from this enlargement of their sympathies and efforts. It will be impossible also to follow the inviting theme of the gradual progress and extension of these Missions; we must content ourselves with a rapid summary.

In 1843 the foreign missions of the Free Church were confined to India, and they included a Ladies' Association for promoting female education there. In 1838, under Dr. Duff's influence, the funds raised had reached £7,600, nearly their highest point prior to the Disruption. In the year 1843-44, £13,432 18s. 9d. were contributed for this object, including £1,387 raised in India itself. At once the Church added to its operations the great Nagpoor Mission in

Central India, and assumed the responsibility of the half of a Mission to the Kafirs of South-East Africa, previously conducted by the Glasgow Missionary Society. When, under the pressure of the financial strain of the Church's operations at home and abroad, a suggestion was made by some persons that the African Missions should be discontinued, the missionaries offered to sacrifice the greater part of their salaries; but a week set apart for collections on behalf of the foreign work nearly doubled for the time the income of the committee, and from that period every decade has seen a great advance. Dr. Duff's first visit to Scotland after the Disruption resulted in so developing the Congregational Associations, that in 1853-4 they yielded £8,066, and in the next year the whole revenue rose to £25,440. On Dr. Duff finally leaving India and becoming Convener of the Committee, in Scotland, the revenue went up—in 1868-69—to £28,494. Five years afterwards, under the influence of David Livingstone, whose work and whose death gave a great impulse to missions in Africa, the Free Church started the Livingstonia Mission in what has now become British Central Africa, and the revenue came to stand at close on £45,000. In 1876 the Reformed Presbyterian Church, which had been conducting a Mission in the New Hebrides, originally suggested by a speech of Dr. Duff's, joined the Free Church, and that Mission has since been maintained by the united Body. Dr. Duff died in February, 1878, and the next year the Committee had to report a small deficit of £1,800 in the funds, but from that time there has been a constant expansion of the foreign mission revenue

of the Church, and consequently of its beneficent operations.

In the year 1891-92 the operations of the Committee embraced missions in India at Calcutta and Hooghly, Madras, Bombay, Poona, Haidarabad, Nagpoor, and Santhalia; in Africa at Lovedale and Blythswold, and in Kafaria, Natal and Livingstonia; in Arabia; in Syria; and in the New Hebrides. They were conducted at 203 branch stations, and engaged the labours of 54 ordained European Missionaries, 20 ordained or licensed Native preachers, 11 unordained Medical Missionaries, and a staff altogether, including these, of 870 Christian agents, with large numbers of unbaptized Native teachers. Besides the direct proclamation of the Gospel and the establishment of Christian congregations, the work included Missions conducted by twenty-six fully qualified medical men and women, and the keeping up of 339 colleges and schools.

The work of the Ladies' Society for female education in India and South Africa through Christian teaching in schools and Zenanas is to a large extent independent of that of the Committee, though it lies very much in the same localities. It employed 308 Christian agents, of whom 53 were Europeans or Eurasians, and it had on its roll 8,000 pupils.\*

\* For many of these facts we have been indebted to Dr. George Smith, C.I.E., the Secretary of the Foreign Missions Committee of the Free Church, who, since he held that office, has done so much for these missions.

The amounts raised in 1891-92 for these various objects were as follows :—

At home, through the General Treasurer of the			
Free Church . . . . .	£52,459	4	2
From Britain otherwise . . . . .	1,094	6	7
In India, Africa, and the New Hebrides . . . . .	36,181	7	1
		<hr/>	
	£89,734	17	10
The Revenue of the Ladies' Society, besides a considerable sum received in India which included school fees and Government grants, was . . . . .	9,471	9	1
		<hr/>	
Total	£99,206	6	11

Since 1843 the sums raised for these objects have amounted to £2,213,720 os. 6d.

#### MISSIONS TO THE JEWS.

This Mission also dates from before the Disruption, a memorable deputation, consisting of the Rev. Dr. Keith, Dr. Black, Mr. Murray McCheyne, and Mr., afterwards Dr., Andrew A. Bonar, having, in preparation for it, visited in 1839 the Holy Land and other Eastern countries, to assist the Church of Scotland to decide on where she could plant missions to Israel. The first Mission was started at Buda-Pesth in Hungary, others followed in Moldavia, Russia, Holland and Turkey. At the present time the seats of these Missions are in Pesth, Constantinople, Breslau, Prague, in Europe, and at Tiberias and Safed in Palestine. The staff in 1891 consisted of six ordained missionaries, one licensed preacher, four medical missionaries with four assistants, and, including teachers, colporteurs and others,

numbered in all fifty-six persons. The sums raised at home in 1891-92 were £7,982 6s. 5d., while there was received through the missionaries, in direct contributions from Britain or elsewhere, and in school fees, &c., £800. The whole sums raised by the Free Church for Jewish Missions in forty-nine years have amounted to upwards of £317,700.

#### THE COLONIAL COMMITTEE.

The objects of this Committee are to assist our Presbyterian countrymen settled in the Colonies to carry on the public worship of God in those countries whither they have betaken themselves, and where, in newly-peopled and remote localities, and often in struggling circumstances, they are unable without help to secure for themselves religious ordinances in connection with the Presbyterian Church.

In Europe, the Committee's work takes in Gibraltar and Malta, and some help has been given to Presbyterians in Madeira, though it is of course not a British Colony. South Africa, New Zealand, Victoria, Western Australia, Canada, and Nova Scotia were in 1891-92 the Colonies assisted by the Committee. The sum collected for these objects in that year was £2,662 8s. 2d., and in the forty-nine years since 1843 the receipts of this Committee have amounted to upwards of £207,700.

#### THE CONTINENTAL COMMITTEE.

The work of this Committee is confined to the Continent of Europe, and has two, or it may be said three, distinct

objects. One of these is to assist and encourage native Protestant Churches and Evangelical Societies in Roman Catholic countries by friendly communications and pecuniary grants. Another is to establish and support fully equipped Presbyterian congregations in various Continental cities, which become for many months in winter and spring the homes of English-speaking residents; and a third object is to provide Presbyterian services in summer in some of the chief resorts of tourists.

Under the first head assistance was given last year to Evangelical Societies in France, Belgium, Switzerland and Hungary, to the Missions in Italy of the Waldensian Church and of the Evangelical Church of Italy, to the Claudian (Protestant) press of Florence, and to Spanish Missions. Large sums were raised and applied for the building, equipment and maintenance of "Bethels" and "Sailors' Rests," and for the support of missionary operations among sailors frequenting the ports of Genoa, Leghorn and Naples.

Regular congregational charges are kept up in the following cities, and, in fact, form a constituent part and a separate Presbytery of the Free Church, from which representatives are sent to its General Assembly; in France at Pau and Biarritz, Nice, Cannes and Mentone; in Italy at Rome, Florence, Naples, Genoa and Leghorn; in Switzerland at Lausanne and Montreux; and at Lisbon and Prague. New churches have recently been built at several of these cities. The congregations of course contribute to the cost of maintenance, but being for the most part composed of temporary residents, the stations are

largely dependent on extraneous help. These churches, and the excellent ministers by whom they are served, not only supply divine ordinances and evangelical preaching to British and American residents and tourists, and religious ministrations, greatly valued, to invalids and alas often to the dying,\* but they have acted as centres of invaluable influence in connection with Native Protestant Churches. The late Dr. Stewart of Leghorn was of the utmost service to the Waldensian Church during the eventful years when a free Italy first offered a field for her evangelistic efforts, and the present Free Church minister at Florence, the Rev. J. R. Macdougall, D.D., has been of eminent use to the rising Evangelical Church of Italy, as well as to the cause of vernacular Christian literature. But, indeed, at each of the important cities we have named, the Free Church minister has worthily represented the sound Protestantism and the missionary zeal of his Church.

Among the summer stations where divine service has been maintained by Free Church ministers have been Aix-les-Bains, Lucerne, Interlaken, Zermatt, the Upper Engadine, Grindelwald and Carlsbad.

In the work of assisting Continental Protestant Churches and Societies the Committee has had a valuable ally in the Ladies' Continental Association of the Free Church, which ever since the Disruption has been collecting and distributing funds for this object.

Irrespective of the contributions of that Society, the sums

\* The late Mr. Spurgeon, during his last illness, was much indebted to the loving attentions of the Rev. J. E. Somerville of the Free Church Mentone, and his funeral service was conducted in that church.



raised for Continental work in 1891-92 were £7,130 7s. 6d., and in the forty-nine years have amounted to £147,973. But very large sums in addition to these have been contributed direct by Free Church people to the McCall and other Missions in Paris, and indeed for Christian objects all over the Continent, and to foreign Pastors and Evangelists, who have visited this country to raise money for their several enterprises.

## SUMMARY

WE have now dealt successively with all the principal objects for which the Free Church of Scotland has raised and expended money during the past fifty years,—the building of churches and manses, the support of the ministry, education, the training of students for the ministry, Home Missions, Foreign Missions, and Missions on the Continent, in the Colonies, and to the Jews. Appendix I. consists of an exact account, showing in thirteen columns the sums received for these various objects in every year since the Disruption. A fourteenth column contains sums received for a variety of miscellaneous objects,\* and a final column gives the total receipts of each year. Even this, however, does not exhibit a complete account, for, as already mentioned, there are local endowments and other contributions, as well as the receipts of several Free Church Societies, which are not usually reported at headquarters, and which it has been found impossible to include. Excluding these, the total amount raised by the Free Church for its various

\* These include the cost of the Assembly Hall, legacies and donations for miscellaneous purposes, for the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, for numerous trusts, such as the Barclay, Hunter, Hamilton, and Webster benefactions and others, and the sums raised (£95,000) by the Society for assisting in the education of the Sons and Daughters of Free Church Ministers.

objects during the fifty years, from 1843 to 1893, including an estimate for the year 1892-93 not yet reported on, will amount to about £23,312,045.

A large part of the sums set forth in the columns to which we have referred pass through the hands of the General Treasurer. From the outset the Church has adopted the practice of printing her accounts at full length every year, both in detail and in abstract, so that all who feel any interest have the means of examining them; and they undergo a monthly audit by professional accountants. The Finance of the Church is under the care of a standing committee appointed by the General Assembly, composed of nine ministers and twenty-eight laymen; the former including some of the most practical and sagacious men of their cloth, and the latter comprising many business men of great experience, as bankers, merchants, lawyers, &c. The chairman and deputy chairman ("convener" and "vice-convener") are laymen. These are the means taken for securing a sound and efficient system of administration.

Not many persons will care to examine very closely the mass of figures exhibited in Appendix I., but these in their detail will prove instructive to the few who take a special interest in such matters, while for those readers who prefer a graphic delineation of facts, Appendix II. gives, in diagram form, the main features of the financial progress of the Free Church. Any one who glances at the tables or the diagram will see that there have been fluctuations from year to year, depending partly on the incidence of legacies often of large amount, and sometimes in one year making a difference of forty or fifty thousand pounds. At

certain epochs, too, some one object has excited exceptional interest, and its funds have manifested a corresponding development. The general progress of the work and of the finances of the Church will be best seen if we take successive periods. The following table will show the progress of some of the principal funds of the Church and of its total income (including other funds) in each of the five decennial periods between 1843 and 1893. As the figures for the last year, 1892-93, are not yet attainable, we have assumed them to be the same as those of the year preceding, which will be so near the truth, that any difference will scarcely tell on the ten years' results.

Sums received by the Free Church in each period of ten years between 1843 and 1893 for the under-noted objects, and as its entire income :—

In ten years.	Support of the Ministry.	Congregational Objects, &c.	Missions : Home, Foreign, Colonial, &c.	Total Income.
1843-53	£1,049,136	£518,474	£368,845	£3,046,809
1853-63	1,470,861	638,119	418,602	3,327,485
1863-73	1,849,825	814,326	609,064	4,243,098
1873-83	2,534,365	1,166,994	932,427	5,989,539
1883-93	2,679,168	1,375,138	1,261,233	6,705,115

There are here very unmistakable signs of progress. The proportion has far more than kept pace with the

increase of population in Scotland (see p. 339). Whether it has kept pace with the increase of wealth also is a further question. It has been estimated that in the fifty years of the Queen's reign, up to her Jubilee year, the average income of each person in Great Britain had increased by about 70 per cent. The difference between the amount raised for the support of the ministry of the Free Church at the outset and the corresponding sum last year, shows a rate of progress equal to what might be expected, taking the general increase both of population and of wealth into account ; and the growth of mission funds is in a still higher ratio. It is necessary, however, while drawing attention to these facts to avoid giving encouragement to the idea that the contributions of the Church are on as large a scale as they ought to be, and as they might very well be without imposing an undue burden on its members. With the growth of larger and sounder ideas as to every man's duty in the sight of God in respect of the use of money, we may reasonably hope that the various funds of the Church will show more rapid development.

As has already been said, we have no desire to make comparisons between the Free Church and other Churches as regards liberality, and it is of course not our province here to raise questions about Church Establishments and Endowments. But it may be permissible to suggest that if it should ever come to pass that Presbyterianism in Scotland had to depend wholly on the free-will offerings of the people, the history of Free Church finance warrants the conclusion, that, with the increased stimulus

that would arise out of the circumstances, and with the economies to be expected from more cordial union and co-operation, an effective National Church might easily be maintained.

It is difficult, however, in this connection to avoid some reference to facts which have recently been forced on public attention respecting the Church of England. England is unquestionably a richer country than Scotland, and the Church of England includes among her adherents the great body of the wealthier classes. At the meetings of the Convocations of Canterbury and York which took place in February, 1893, much attention was given to "the depressed condition of clerical incomes." Prebendary Salmon, who moved a resolution on the subject, said he was within the mark if he put the average of incomes in the Church of England at £230. He estimated that one-third of all the livings in England and Wales were under £200 a year, and according to another authority about 1,400 of them are under £100 a year. These statements were confirmed by Bishops and other dignitaries. Presumably there is in most cases a parsonage house, but, as might easily be supposed in the case of such small incomes, the possession of a house which the incumbent has to keep in repair, pay taxes for, and is not allowed to let, is represented as being often a burden rather than a benefit. We have already given (pp. 342-3) the average value of each "living" in the Free Church, including the value of the manse, but we may here mention, for the sake of comparison, that, excluding the

value of the manse, the average income of our 1,047 livings is over £265.

Yet the members of the Church of England are not illiberal. According to the "Church Year Book" the contributions made by 12,299 congregations for church work during one year amounted to the not inconsiderable sum of £5,160,820. If the 1,047 congregations of the Free Church were to contribute on the same scale the amount would be about £440,000. After deducting from the total income of the Free Church the contributions given in India, &c., and the interest of capital sums, the income would be at least one-third more than according to the ratio of the Church of England. The only observation that need be made in this comparison is that necessity and a high initial enthusiasm have led, in the Free Church of Scotland, to the cultivation of a spirit, and the acquisition of a power and habit of giving for sacred objects, which have not only greatly promoted these objects but reacted on the intellectual and spiritual character of the givers.\*

\* A striking example of the material benefit of liberality may interest the reader. Some years ago a gentleman left £10,000 to be enjoyed by his sisters during their lives, and afterwards to go to one of the schemes of the Free Church. The ladies, being reasonably well off, and having themselves a spirit of high liberality, surrendered their interest in the money and allowed it to be paid over at once to the Church. Not long afterwards a Bank failed involving them in total ruin, which would have swallowed up their life interest in this fund if it had still belonged to them. The Church at once restored to them what they had so generously given, so that what they had "lent to the Lord" brought them a direct and important though most unexpected benefit.

One more subject connected with the Finance of the Free Church remains to be mentioned. We have hitherto spoken chiefly of yearly income and expenditure, but there has also been an accumulation of capital. The Fathers of the Church wisely based its support not on permanent endowment, but on the weekly and monthly and yearly contributions of the people ; thus leaving it dependent on their sustained spiritual life. But it has happened that during these fifty years large sums have from time to time been bequeathed to the Church, or devoted by some of its wealthier members during their lifetime, for one or other of its various objects, on the condition that the interest only was to be used, the capital being reserved as a permanent endowment. Legacies not so restricted in their use are either employed at once to promote the objects for which they were left, or, if they are of exceptionally large amount, the spending of them is spread over a term of years. The Church is not, according to Scotch law, capable of holding property in its corporate name. It appoints therefore, from time to time, a body of general trustees, in whose names its property may be secured. At the present time this body consists of some thirty-four lay members, who are charged with the safe custody of all permanent endowments. They have adhered to the principle of investing these moneys on first-class mortgages over landed estates in Scotland, under the advice of the Church's Law Agent. The gross amount of these investments at March 31, 1892, was not far from one million sterling, and was held for the following objects :—



## FREE CHURCH FINANCE

The Sustentation and Aged and Infirm					
Ministers' Funds	...	...	...	£301,606	14 4
Home Missions and Highlands	...	..	..	47,375	11 5
Education and Colleges, including Bursary					
Funds	...	...	...	200,315	8 2
Missions	...	...	...	188,924	16 9
Church Extension Building Fund	...	...	...	10,700	0 0
For numerous individual Congregations...	...	...	...	45,175	13 5
Miscellaneous objects	...	...	...	112,036	17 10
Total ... ..				£906,135	1 11*

In addition to this property the Free Church is the owner of considerably more than two thousand buildings, such as churches, manses, colleges, schools, &c., at home and abroad, which, on a moderate computation, must be worth between two and three millions sterling. These, for the most part, are held under what is known as the "Model Trust Deed," an instrument carefully devised at an early period to give unity and stability to the Church's interest in these properties. The documents are under the charge of an officer known as the Custodier of Titles.

An endeavour has now been made to present a view of the history and characteristics of the Finance of the Free Church during the fifty years of its separate existence. Many of the matters dealt with will, it is hoped, have an interest from a merely business point of view ; but the subject, as a whole, has a higher aspect. In the early Church,

\* This amount is independent of very large sums held in trust for the Church by separate bodies of trustees.

and under the immediate influences of the day of Pentecost, the disciples were not only "of one heart and of one mind," but "neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own"; and though this led them into the practice of a Communism the evils of which were not slow to declare themselves, and which they were led to abandon, the principle is an eternal truth. If we are indeed followers of Christ, we are bound to acknowledge that we are not our own, but have been bought with a price; still less, then, can we be the absolute owners of our earthly possessions, or anything but God's stewards for the right use of them. How that stewardship has been exercised by a Church and by its members, from what motives, to what ends, and with what advantage to the world, ought to be a worthy subject of inquiry. Rightly regarded, it may serve as a stimulus to others, while to those whose annals it records it will afford ample reason both for humiliation and for thankfulness.

FINIS.

Journal

1861

Jan 1

Feb 1

Mar 1

Apr 1

May 1

Jun 1

Jul 1

Aug 1

Sep 1

Oct 1

Nov 1

Dec 1

## INDEX

- ABBOTS OF IONA, Descent of, 12
- Aberdeen (Earl of), Proposals of, regarding the Church, 258, 259; Bill of, 259, 260, 261; difficulty between, and Dr. Chalmers, 260; agrees with suspended ministers, 261; presents petition of deposed ministers to House of Lords, 274; referred to, 281, 282, 291
- Aberdeen, Churchmen of diocese of, to put away their concubines, 75
- Aberdeen, Assembly of 1640 meets in, 150; University of, 57
- "Abjuration Oath," The, 177, 178
- "Act of Separation and Deed of Demission," 303
- Adamnan, Abbot of Iona, 22, 23
- Adamson (Archbishop of St. Andrews), Articles submitted to English Archbishops by, 103, 106; sentence of excommunication against, 108
- Aidan, Foundation of See of Lindisfarne by, 20, 21
- Aikenhead, executed for blasphemy, 187
- Alexander I., King of Scotland, Reign of, 35, 36; Diocesan episcopacy developed under, 36
- Alexander II., Ecclesiastical troubles during reign of, 44, 45; Mendicant Orders introduced into Scotland during reign of, 45
- Alexander III., Succession of, 45; events of his reign, 46; death of, 46, 47
- Anne (Queen), Accession of, 190; favour shown to patrons and Episcopalians by, 197; death of, 198
- Antiburghers and Burghers, Dispute between, 212
- Anti-Patronage Society, formation of, 235
- "Apologetic Declaration," The, 177
- Arbroath, Abbey of, founded by William the Lion, 41, 42, 44
- Argyll, Foundation of the See of, 43
- Argyll (Earl of), forces submission to Covenant in the North, 150; arrest and execution of, 165, 166; accepts the Test Act, 176; imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle, 177; execution of, in 1685, 180

- Argyll (Duke of), introduces a Veto Bill in House of Lords, 270, 271; letter from, to Dr. Chalmers, 293, 294
- Arles, British Bishops in Council of, 5
- Arran (Earl of), appointed Regent of Scotland, 64
- Arran, Captain Stewart created Earl of, 103
- Assembly of the Reformed Church of Scotland, The First General, 85, 86; in Edinburgh in 1561, 88; Meetings of, 96; Work of the, 90, 102, 106, 108, 109; Persecutions by the, 115; ratify excommunication of Lords Huntly and Errol, 116; held at Perth in 1597, 119; held at Dundee, 119, 120; convened at Linlithgow, 127; of 1608, 127; held in Glasgow in 1610, 128; of 1616, work of the, 131; of 1617, refuses to act as the King desired, 132; of 1638, held in Glasgow, 147, 148; work of the, 148, 149; of 1640, meets in Aberdeen, 150; of 1641, meets in St. Andrews, 151; of 1643, receives Commissioners from English Parliament, 154; of 1643, Westminster, 155; of 1647, Intolerance of, 158; of 1649, work of the, 159; of 1651, work of the, 162, 163; of 1653, dismissed by Col. Cotterel, 163; of 1690, Persecutions authorized by, 184, 185; friction between the, and King William, 186; of 1707, special action of, against Anglican liturgy, 193; of 1796 and foreign Mission work, 227, 228; of 1838 and Auchterarder Case, 248, 250; of 1841 and Patronage, 270, 271; on Strathbogie Case, 271; deprive Mr. Edwards of his licence, &c., 272; action of interdicted, 272, 273; of 1842, work of the, 283; resolution of, against Patronage, 284; and "Claim of Rights," 284, 285; of 1843, Meeting of the, 299 *et seq.*
- Associate Synod, foundation of, 207, 208; rejoins the Establishment, 289
- Auchnacroish, Hardships of congregation of, 310, 311
- Auchterarder, Case of Craig of, 200; antipatronage celebrity of Presbytery of, 204, 237, 244-246; appealed to House of Lords, 250, 251; final decision in, 292
- "BARRIER ACT" of 1697, The, 188.
- "Basilicon Doron," written by James VI., 120
- Bass Rock turned into a prison, 173
- Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, 58; appointed primate of Scotland, 62; becomes Regent, 64; imprisoned, 65; heresy hunt by, 66; assassination of, 67

- Bible, the Translation of the, 122.
- Bishop (William) consecrated  
Bishop of Chalcedon, 134
- Bishops of Scotland support Robert  
the Bruce, 48, 49; consecrated  
in the English manner, 129;  
subserviency of, to the King, 139;  
Creation of New Episcopal, in  
Scotland, 167, 168; recalled as  
Lords of Parliament, 169
- Black (David), sermon preached by,  
abusing Queen Elizabeth, &c.,  
118
- Blackburn, Bishop of Aberdeen,  
125
- Blackwell (James), Arch-priest, 130
- Blaikie (Rev. Mr.), presentee to  
parish of Madderty, 204
- "Book of Canons and Constitu-  
tions Ecclesiastical," 139, 140;  
rules of, to be obeyed, 140-142
- "Book of Common Order," 92, 139
- "Book of Discipline," The, 83-85,  
88, 95; The Second, 102
- Boston (Mr.), Minister of Jedburgh,  
220
- Bothwell Bridge, Battle of, 175
- Breadalbane (Marquess of), on the  
Free Church, 311
- Brecbennoch of St. Columba, 44
- Brougham (Lord), on Auchterarder  
Case, 237, 251, 252; on decision  
in Auchterarder Case, 305
- Burgess Oath, The, 212
- Burnet (Archbishop) of Glasgow,  
Remonstrance of, 172
- CALDERWOOD (DAVID) banished the  
kingdom, 132
- "Call," Induction of Ministers with-  
out a, 226
- Cameron (Bishop), Deathbed of,  
53
- Cameron (Richard), the Covenanter,  
175
- Cameronians, Persecution of, 177;  
continue to hold Conventicles,  
180
- Campbell (Alexander) appointed to  
See of Brechin, 93
- Campbell (Mr.) introduces Duke of  
Argyll's bill into House of Com-  
mons, 282
- Candlish (Mr.) affirms non-intrusion  
principle, 271
- Canonmills, Disruption meeting at,  
302
- Carey (William), Baptist Missionary,  
227, 228
- Cargill (Donald), the Covenanter  
175, 176
- Carstares (William), 182, 186
- "Catstone" at Kirkliston, The, 4,  
5
- Ceadda (Chad), first Bishop of  
Lichfield, 21
- Celtic Church, Individuality of the,  
16, 17, 18
- Chalmers (Rev. Mr.), Presentation  
of, to Aberdeen, 204
- Chalmers (Dr.) on Church Establish-  
ment, 222; Funeral Sermon on  
Dr. Andrew Thomson, 231; on

- Pluralities, 232 ; on Veto Law in Ordination, 240 ; action of, on decision in Auchterarder Case, 251 ; and Lord Melbourne, 252, 253 ; on dissent of congregation, 258 ; difficulty between, and Lord Aberdeen, 260 ; opposition of, to Patronage, 267 ; on the Strathbogie Case, 271 ; moves that the seven ministers be deposed, 272 ; presses on preparations for Disruption, 293, 295 ; on the Establishment, 298 ; appointed first moderator of Free Church, 302 ; on the Voluntaries, 307 ; on light-heartedness of Disruption ministers, 309 ; launching of Sustentation Scheme by, 319-322 ; scheme of ministerial support devised by, 324, 325
- "Chapel of Ease" discussion, &c., 227, 289 ; Ministers of, excluded from Church Courts, 304
- Chapels of Ease, Discussion on status of ministers of, 242 ; Act anent, passed, 243
- Charles I., Commencement of reign of, 135 ; enriches revived bishoprics, &c., 137 ; visits Scotland to be crowned, 138 ; attempts to enforce Service Book, 140-142 ; summons the Army against the Covenanters, 149 ; refused supplies by English Parliament, 1640, 150 ; summons the "Long Parliament," 150 ; visits Scotland in 1641, 152 ; surrenders to Scottish Army, 157
- Charles II., Proclamation of, as King, 159 ; promises to take the Covenant, 160 ; crowned at Scone, 162 ; returns to London from Breda, 165 ; unseats Archbishop Burnet, 172 ; death of, 179
- Church in Scotland under special Protection of Rome, 42 ; enrichment of, 43 ; governed by its own Synods, 45 ; First Collegiate, established at Dunbar, 49 ; and Church of England, Relations between the, 90, 91
- Church Services altered to English style by James VI., 133
- Church Question (Scottish) discussed in House of Commons 281, 282, 290, 291
- Church Extension Scheme, Foundation of, 338, 339
- "Claim of Rights," The, 284, 285, 290
- Clark (Mr.) appointed Assistant to Incumbent of Lethendy, 249 ; deprived of his licence, 283
- Clelland (Mr.) Synod Minister of Stewarton, 289
- Cockburn (Lord), on the Veto Act, 242, 243 ; on Auchterarder Case, 246 ; on Lethendy Case, 250 ; on Lord Aberdeen's Bill, 260 ; on interference of Civil Courts in

- Church affairs, 278; on number of Seceders, 292
- Colinsburgh, Relief Church built at, 220
- Communion with Clergy of Relief Presbytery forbidden, 223
- Concubines of Churchmen in diocese of Aberdeen, 75
- "Confession of Faith," The, 79, 80
- Congregational Funds of Free Church, 348-350
- Congregations, Contributions of, to Sustentation Fund, 333
- Constantine transfers Primacy to St. Andrews, 26, 31; enters community of Culdees in St. Andrews, 32
- "Conventicles" held by outcast Ministers, 170
- Convention of Evangelical Ministers summoned, 286, 287
- Convents founded by David I. of Scotland, 38
- Cook (Dr.), Leader of Moderates, 241; on the decision in Auchterarder Case, 251; referred to, 252; 254; on the suspended Ministers, 262, 263, 271, 275; motion of, on "The Claim," 285; action anent Chapel Ministers, 290
- Cottenham (Lord), on Auchterarder Case, 305
- Cotterel (Colonel), dismisses Assembly of 1653, 163
- Council in Scotland, First, called by Roman Papal Authority, 38, 39
- Court of High Commission established, 128, 129; reinstated in 1664, 170; union of the two, 131
- Covenant of "The Lords of the Congregation," 73
- Covenant, National, of 1638, 145 *et seq.*
- Covenanters force passage of the Tyne and invade England, 150; Intolerance of, 155, 156; defeat Royalists at Philiphaugh, 156; Intractability of the, 157; agree to proclamation of Charles II., 159; Letter to, from Cromwell, 161; crown Charles II. at Scone, 162; divided into Protesters and Resolutioners, 163; power of Cromwell over the, 164; defeat Claverhouse and march on Glasgow, 174
- Craig refuses to marry Mary and Bothwell, 94
- Craw (Paul), burnt for heresy, 52
- Crawford (Earl of), on Church patronage, 202, 203
- Cromwell, Letter to Covenanters from, 161; power of, over the Covenanters, 164; death of, 165
- Culsalmond, Ordination of Mr. Middleton to, 277, 278, 281
- Cumberland added to Crown of Scotland, 32
- Cumming (Dr.), of London, on the Seceders, 292



- DALHOUSIE (EARL OF), withdraws from Assembly, 252
- Dalziell (General), Cruelty of, 171
- Danes, Inroads of the, 24
- Darnley (Henry), Marriage of, to Mary Queen of Scots, 92, 93; murder of, 94
- David I., King of Scotland, Anglo-Norman sympathies of, 36; Episcopal Sees created by, 37, 38; convents and monasteries established by, 37, 38
- David II. of Scotland, Reign of, 49
- Deacon's Court in Free Church, Duties of, 328, 329
- Denmark, Marriage of James VI. in, 109
- Dickson (Richard), Imprisonment of, 133
- "Directory for the Public Worship of God," 155
- "Discipline, The First Book of," 83-85, 88, 95; "The Second Book of," 102
- Disruption of 1843, 95; preparation for the, 293, 295; the controversy of, 296 *et seq.*
- Duff (Dr.) sent as Missionary to India, 234; referred to, 307
- Dunbar, Battle of, 161
- Dundee, Assembly convened at, by James VI., 119, 120
- Dunkeld, Primacy of, 25; relics of St. Columba transferred to, 25; Abbacy of, hereditary in one family, 32
- Dunkeld (Bishop of) removed from his See, 180
- Dunnichen, Battle of, 22
- "EDINBURGH, THE TREATY OF," 78, 79; Edinburgh divided into quarters ecclesiastically, 135, 136; Free St. Andrew's Church, building of, 346
- Edinburgh Christian Instructor, The*, 233
- Education made compulsory, 188
- Education in Free Church, Provision for, 351-353
- Edwards (Mr.), Presentation of, to Marnoch Parish, 250, 255, 256; action against Strathbogie Presbytery by, 267, 268; ordained by seven suspended ministers, 268, 269; deprived of his licence, 272
- Elders, Ordination of, 239, 240
- Elizabeth, Death of Queen, 122
- Elphinstone, Bishop of Aberdeen, 57
- "Engagers," The Army of the, 158
- Episcopal Church in Scotland at end of eighteenth century, 229, 230
- Episcopalianism established in Scotland, 107; collapse of, 164; re-establishment of, in Scotland, 166, 167, 168
- Episcopalians and Presbyterians, Proposed union between, 185
- Episcopalians in Rebellion of 1715, 198; favour the Pretender, 211

- Erastians and Usagers, 199  
 Errol (Lord), Excommunication of, 116, 117  
 Erskine (Ebenezer) on Patronage, 205, 206; arms himself for defence of Stirling, 211  
 Erskine (Dr.), Mr. Pleydell of "Guy Mannering" on, 225, 226; leader of Popular Party, 227; supports Foreign Missions, 228  
 Evangelical Ministers, Convention of, 286, 287
- FEUDALISM IN SCOTLAND in reign of David I., 36, 37, 38  
 Fife (Earl of), Patron of Marnoch, 250, 255  
 Flodden, Battle of, 57; condition of Scotland subsequent to, 58  
 Forman, Archbishop of St. Andrews, 58  
 Fort Augustus, Abbey of, 76, *note*  
 Free Church, Difficulties of, in obtaining building sites, 309; the Marquis of Breadalbane on the, 311; Supplement Fund of, 326, 327; Deacons' Court of, 328, 329; Control and Administration Offices of, 330, 331; administration, work of, 332; finances of, 315-318; number of churches and manses of, 317; Missions of, 317; Sustentation Fund of, 319-344; Surplus Fund of, 335-337; Society for Benefit of Sons and Daughters of Ministers of, 342; Ministers and Missionaries Widows' and Orphans' Fund of, 343; training of Ministers of, 343; salaries of, 344; Manse Building Fund of, 345-347; Congregational Funds of, 348-350; provisions for education in, 351-353; training of the Ministry of, 353; home missions and missionary work in the Highlands, 356; foreign missions, 358-366; summary of finances of, 367-375
- GEORGE I., Accession of, 198  
 Gillespie (Thomas), Minister of Carnock, deposed, 217, 220  
 Glasgow, Earl of Lennox attempts to acquire Revenues of See of, 104  
 Glasgow, Archbishopric of, held by Beaton, 124; Assembly held in, in 1610, 128, 129; Assembly of 1638 held in, 147, 148  
 Glass (Rev. John), Minister of Tealing, 201, 202, 208, 209  
 "Gowrie Conspiracy," The, 121  
 Graham, Archbishop of St. Andrews, 54, 55  
 Graham of Claverhouse defeated by Covenanters, 174  
 Gravel-pit, Free Church congregation meets in a, 310, 311  
 Greenshields, Episcopalian Minister, use of liturgy by, 193  
 Greyfriars Church, National Covenant signed in, 146

- Grig the "Usurper" of the Throne, 26
- Guthrie (Dr.) and the Disruption Ministers, 304; Speech of, at Inverness Assembly, 308
- HAMILTON (ARCHBISHOP), Papal Provincial Council summoned by, 75
- Hamilton (John), Archbishop of St. Andrews, Execution of, 96, 97
- Hamilton (Duke of) commands Scottish Parliamentary Army, 158
- Hamilton (Marquis of), Commissioner of Charles I. to Scotland, 147, 148
- Hamilton (Patrick), burned for Lutheranism, 60
- Hampton Court Conference, 123, 125
- Hannay (Rev. Dr. James), Tablet to, in St. Giles' Cathedral, 141
- Hay (Robert), elected Bishop of St. Andrews, 97
- Hay (Bishop), Vicarate of, 224; his library robbed, 224
- Henderson (Rev. Alexander), Moderator of Assembly in 1638, 148; controversy with the King, 157
- Henry VIII., schemes of, against Scotland, 58, 59, 62, 63; instigates James V. to take ecclesiastical supremacy to himself, 62; death of, 68
- Heresy, Prosecutions for, 201, 210
- Hertford (Earl of), Invasion of Scotland by, 65
- Hill (Sir R.) on "Moderate" divines, 214, 215
- Hill (Principal) becomes leader of the Moderates, 226, 232
- Holyrood Chapel, adapted by James VI. for English Church services, 131
- Home, author of "Douglas: a Tragedy," 216, 217
- Home Mission Scheme, Establishment of, 338, 339
- Hope (Lord President) on Church Pluralities, 234
- Hope (Mr.), Dean of Faculty, and Veto Act, 241, 242; on Case of Mr. Kessen, 249; on non-intrusion of Lethendy discussion, 254; on number of seceders, 291
- Huntly (Lord), Excommunication of, 116, 117
- INCHCOLM, Cell of Columba on 13, 20, 25
- Independents, The, 154, 155
- Inquiry, Committee of, in 1847, 309
- Interdict against Commission of Assembly and Presbytery of Strathbogie, 265
- Iona, Descent of Abbots of, 12; Monasteries of, 13, 14; during the reign of William the Lion, Events in, 43
- Irvine (Sir Alexander) protected from Covenanters, 164

- JAMES I. of Scotland, Succession of, 50; Condition of country and Church at accession of, 50; return from England, 51; represses Church irregularities, 52; struggles between nobles and crown on death of, 52, 53
- James II. of Scotland, Reign of, 53.
- James III. of Scotland, Accession of, 53; Influence of, on the Church, 54
- James IV. of Scotland, Reign of, 56, 57; Bastard son of, Archbishop of St. Andrews, 56
- James V. of Scotland, Condition of Scotland during minority of, 58, 59; Marriage of, 61; Death of, 63
- James VI. of Scotland, Birth of, 94; Usurpation of ecclesiastical power by, 107; Marriage of, 109; and the bishops, 114; Deputation to, anent Lords Huntly and Errol, 117; "Basilicon Doron" written by, 120; and the translation of the Bible, 122; departure for London, 122; Missionary zeal of, for Presbyterians, 125; has Scottish Bishops consecrated in the English way, 129; Alterations in Holyrood Chapel by, 131; commits Ministers Hewat and Simpson to prison, 132; succeeds in altering Church Service to English style, 133
- James II. of England, Accession of, 179; attacks liberty of English Bishops, 181
- Jeffrey (Lord) and the Disruption Seceders, 302
- Jesuits in Scotland, Labours of the, 129, 130
- KENNEDY (BISHOP) of St. Andrews, 53
- Kenneth Macalpine, King, Unification of Scotland, &c., under, 23, 24; Successors of, on the throne, 26
- Ker (Dr.), Capture of, 115
- Kessen (Mr.), Ordination of, at Lethendy, 249, 250
- Kilmarnock, Obtrusion of a minister at, 221
- Kinnoull (Earl of), Patron of Auchterarder, 244; sues against Presbytery of Auchterarder, 286
- Knox (John) joins garrison of St. Andrews, 68; carried prisoner to France, 68; returns to Scotland, 71; communion administered in English manner by, 72; sermon of, against idolatry, 76, 77; preaches against the plunderers of the Church, 85; preaches against Queen Mary's mass, 87; sent for by Queen Mary, 87, 88; on Privy Council's division of Church property, 88, 99; friction between, and Queen Mary, 91; interferes

- in case of Edinburgh Rioters, 92; and murder of Rizzio, 94
- LAUD, DEAN OF GLOUCESTER, at service in Holyrood Chapel, 131; accompanies Charles I. to Scotland, 138; created Archbishop of Canterbury, 138
- Lawrence of Lindores, 52
- Leighton (Dr.), Branding and torturing of, 168
- Leighton (Robert) created a Bishop, 168; offered the Archbishopric of Glasgow, 172; resigns the Archbishopric, 173
- Leith, Convention of Church held at, 97
- Lennox (Earl of), Regent of Scotland, 96
- Lennox, Esme Stewart created Duke of, 103; attempts to secure Revenues of See of Glasgow, 104; influence of, with King, 105
- Leslie (General) commands army of Covenanters, 149, 150
- Leslie (Mr.), dispute of 1805 over, 232
- Lethendy Case, The, 248, 249
- Leven (Earl of) and Patronage, 213
- Lindisfarne, Foundation of See of, 20, 21
- Linlithgow, Assembly convened at, 127
- Liturgy, Assembly action against introduction of Anglican, 193
- Lollardism, Spread of, in Scotland, 51, 57
- Lollards, Persecution of, 57
- Lords of the Congregation, 77; Covenant of, 73
- Lord's Supper, Admission of members to, 337
- Lorne (Marquis of) on Lord Aberdeen's Bill, 260
- Lorraine, Cardinal of, on the leaders of Reformation, 84
- Loudoun (Earl of), Imprisonment of, in Tower, 150
- MCCRIE (DR.), Works of, 233
- Macfarlan (Principal) presented to High Church of Glasgow, 233
- McGill (Professor) opposition to Pluralities, 233, 234
- Macknight (Mr.), candidate for Edinburgh Chair of Mathematics, 232
- Macbeth a benefactor of the Church, 32, 33; his benefactions to poor of Rome, 33
- "Maid of Norway," heir to Crown of Scotland, 47
- Maitland (John), Benefactor of Free Church, 330
- Malcolm Canmore, Coronation and marriage of, 33; death of, 34
- Manse-Building Fund of Free Church, 345-347
- March (Earl of), First Collegiate Church founded by, 49; and Patronage, 213

- Margaret, Queen of Malcolm Canmore, 33, 34; influence of, 34, 35
- Margaret, Queen Regent of Scotland, 57, 58; marriage of, to Earl of Angus, 58
- Marnoch Case, The, 248, 250, 255, 256, 261-269, 271, 272, 274, 294
- "Marrow Controversy," The, 200, 201
- Martin of Tours, Monastic customs of, &c., 6, 11
- Mary of Guise becomes Regent, 71; proclamation of, concerning the reformers, 76; death of, 78
- Mary Queen of Scots returns to Scotland, 86; charged with idolatry, 86; sends for John Knox, 87, 88; friction between, and John Knox, 91; married to Darnley, 92, 93; abdication of, 94; a prisoner in England, 96; writes to Pope Gregory XIII. for help to College at Pont-à-Mousson, &c., 106
- Maule (Mr. Fox) introduces petition of Commission into Parliament, 290; on hardships of Free Church congregations, 309
- Maxwell, a Romanist lord, quarrels with Earl of Arran, 108
- Melbourne (Lord) and Dr. Chalmers, 252, 253
- Melrose, Monastery of, burned by Kenneth Macalpine, 25
- Melville (Andrew), 100; controversy with Earl of Morton, 101; speech of, against the Bishops, 101; sermon of, in 1582, 105; speech of, to King James anent Earls Huntly and Errol, 117, 118; referred to, 123; summoned before Privy Council, 126
- Mendicant Orders introduced into Scotland, 45
- Methven (Paul), summoned for "heresy," 72
- Milne (Walter), Burning of, 74
- Middleton (Mr.) and Presbytery of Garioch, 277; induction of, annulled, 283
- "Middleton's Drinking Parliament," 166
- Ministerial Support, Scheme devised for, 324, 325; administration of, 333; in 1891-92, sums expended for, 342
- Ministers suspended from their functions, 256, 257; Counsel for, heard, 261, 262, 265; served with libel by Assembly, 267; ordain Mr. Edwards at Marnoch, 268, 269; maintain their claim to sit in Assembly by representatives, 270; suspended, deposed from ministry, 272; petition from, to House of Lords, 274; training of, 343
- "Ministers' Widows' Fund," Origin of, 210
- Missions, Institution of Foreign, 227, 228, 233, 234

- Monasteries of Iona of the Irish form, 13, 14
- Monasteries founded by David I. of Scotland, 36, 37, 38; in Scotland, destruction of, 77
- Moncrieff (Sir H.), leader of Popular Party, 227, 232
- Moncrieff (Lord), Veto Law of, in Church ordination, 240
- Monmouth (Duke of) leads English regiments into Scotland, 175; defeats Covenanters at Bothwell Bridge, 175
- Montgomery, Minister of Stirling, 104
- Montrose (Earl of) and the Service Book, 143; leads Covenanters' army into England, 150; luke-warmness to Covenanting cause, 151; goes over to Charles I., 156
- Moray (Earl of) declared Regent of Scotland, 94, 95; assassination of, 96
- Morton (Earl of) obtains gift of bishopric of St. Andrews, 97; and Andrew Melville, 101
- NEVIL, ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, 54
- Non-Intrusion discussion in Assembly, 251, 252, 254
- "OATH OF ASSURANCE," The, 186, 187
- Ogilvie (John), The Jesuit, Trial and execution of, 130
- Ordination to Church vacancies, 239, 240
- Overton (Colonel), Commander of Republican troops at Aberdeen, 164
- PARLIAMENT OF ENGLAND ask help from the Covenanters, 154
- Patronage in the Church in reign of James IV., 56; declared an evil, 159; difficulties regarding, 183, 184; Abolition of, 195; restored by Act of Parliament, 196, 197, 203; difficulties concerning, 204, 205; agitation against, 207; efforts for settlement of question of, 212, 213, 215, 221; Question of, 238, 253; Assembly of 1841 and, 270, 271; Government and Crown, 282
- Peel (Sir Robert), Interview of Evangels with, 279
- Perth, Destruction of monasteries, &c., in, 76; Assembly held at, in 1597, 119
- Philpahaugh, Battle of, 156
- Picts, Conversion of the Northern, 15
- Pius IV., Communication from, to Mary Queen of Scots, anent heretics, 91
- Pluralities, Controversy regarding, 232-234
- Presbyterianism to be the only State Church government in Scotland, 191; difficulties of the, 113, 114;

- and Episcopalians, proposed union between, 185
- "Presbytery of Relief," The, 221
- Primacy of Dunkeld, 25; of St. Andrews, 26, 27, 31
- Printing introduced into Scotland, 57
- Protest of Free Churchmen considered, 305, 306
- Psalms, New Version of the, 158
- Puritans of England encouraged by success of Covenanters, 152
- "RAID OF RUTHVEN," The, 105, 106
- Rebellion of 1715, The, 198, 199; of 1745, 211, 223
- "Recissory Act," Consequences of, 166, 167
- Reformers, Difficulties of the, 82
- Reformation in Scotland, Establishment of the, 79-81
- Renwick (James), Execution of, 180
- Resby (James), English priest and Wickliffite, 50, 51, 52
- "Riding Committee," Appointment of a, 215, 216
- Rizzio, The Murder of, 93
- Robert III., Succession and Reign of, 49, 50
- Robertson (Principal), the Historian, 216, 217, 218, 221, 224; Influence of, in the Church, 225
- Roman Catholics, Relief Bill passed for Scottish, 230, 235
- Romanists, Repeal of penal laws against, 223, 224
- Rome, Extension of power of Church of, in Scotland, 164, 165
- Roxburgh, First Council in Scotland convened by Papal Authority at, 38, 39
- Russell (Lord John) and Question of Non-Intrusion, 254, 255
- Rutherford (Rev. Samuel) quoted, 140; death of, 166
- Rye House Plot, The, 177
- ST. ANDREWS, Primacy transferred to, 26, 27, 31; Bishops of, 35, 42; Establishment of University of, 51; created an Archbishopric, 54; Archbishops of, 54, 55; Bastard son of James IV. Archbishop of, 56; Benedictine Monk martyred at, 61; Castle of, held by assassins of Cardinal Beaton, 68; monasteries and cathedral of, spoiled, 77; Bishopric of, 96, 97; Assembly of 1641 meets in, 151; Assembly of 1651 meets in, 162; Church, Edinburgh, 346
- St. Augustine, Landing of, in Kent, 19
- St. Columba, Breckennoch of, 44; Mission and work of, 12-18; successors of, in the Church, 22, 23; relics of, transferred to Dunkeld, 25
- St. Giles' Cathedral, Riot in, 141



- St. Kentigern and his labours, 8, 9  
 St. Ninian, Dedications to, 5; settlement of, in Wigtownshire, 6; death of, 7  
 St. Ninian's, Sale of living of, 226  
 St. Palladius, Mission of, 7  
 St. Regulus and relics of St. Andrew, 31  
 St. Wilfrid of Lindisfarne, 22, 24  
 Sancroft (Archbishop), Letter to, from Primate of Scotland, 177  
 Sandemanians, Glassites so called in England, 209  
 Schools, Public, of Free Church, 351  
 Scone, Destruction of Abbey of, 77  
 Scots, Migration of, from Dalriada, 10  
 Seceders arm against the Pretender of 1745, 211, 212  
 Seceders of 1733, Formation of new Church by, 207; intolerance of, 209  
 Secession from State Churches, 134  
 Sharp (James, afterwards Archbishop) sent to London to look after interest of Scottish Church, 165; returns to Edinburgh, 166; attempts on life of, 171; sermon of, at opening of Parliament, 172; opposes calling a national synod, 173; murder of, 174  
 Sheves, Archbishop of St. Andrews, 54, 55; created Primate of Scotland, 55  
 Simson (Professor), Trial of, for Arminianism and heresy, 200, 201  
 Sinclair (Sir G.), Negotiations of, for settlement of Church affairs, 280  
 "Society of Jesus," Members of the, land in Scotland, 106  
 "Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge," Foundation of, 191  
 "Solemn League and Covenant," The, 154  
 Solway Moss, Battle of, 63  
 Somerset (Earl of), Invasion of Scotland by, 68, 69  
 Spottiswood (Archbishop) at the trial of the Jesuit Ogilvie, 130; made Primate of Scotland, 131; Sycophancy of, 145  
 Spottiswood (Sir R.), Execution of, by Covenanters, 156  
 Stark (Rev. Mr.), Intrusion of, at Kinross, 206  
 Stewart (Esme) created Duke of Lennox, 103  
 Stewart (Captain) created Earl of Arran, 103  
 Stone with Christian inscription at Whithorn, 5, 11  
 Strathbogie Case, The, 261-269, 271, 272, 274, 283; final decision in, 292; deposed ministers of, replaced, 304  
 Surplus Fund, Establishment of, 335-337  
 Sustentation Fund of Free Church,

- 293, 319-344 ; Demands on the, 333, 334, 338
- Sweetheart Abbey, last Scottish Abbey founded, 46
- Sydow (Rev. A.), on the "Scottish Church Question," 306
- "TABLES, THE," Committees of, 144
- Tertullian on Christianity in Britain, 3
- Test Act passed by Parliament, 176 ; Evil effects of the, 177
- Thomson (Dr. Andrew), 231, 233, 235
- Thurlow (Lord), and Relief of Scottish Episcopalians, 229, 230
- Toleration for Scotland, Act of, passed, 194, 195
- Torpichen, Dispute over presentation to living of, 215, 216
- Treason, Trial of Ministers for, 124
- "Treaty of Edinburgh," The, 78, 79
- Troops from France and England brought into Scotland at Reformation, 78
- "Tulchan Bishops," 98
- Turgot, Prior of Durham, 35
- Turner (Sir J.), Barbarities of, to Covenanters, 171
- Tyne, Passage of the, forced by Covenanters, 150
- UNION OF SCOTLAND AND ENGLAND, 191, 192
- University of St. Andrews, Establishment of, 51, 57
- Usagers and Erastians, 199
- VACANCY IN CHURCH, Manner of Presentation to, 239, 240
- Veto Act, and Church ordination, 240, 241, 242 ; working of the, 252
- Veto Bill introduced into House of Lords by Duke of Argyll, 270, 271 ; into House of Commons, 282
- WALLACE (ADAM), Burning of, 69
- War of Scottish Independence, 48
- Webster (Dr.) originates "Ministers' Widows' Fund," 210
- Welsh (Dr.) outgoing Moderator in 1843, Sermon of, 299, 300 ; withdraws from Assembly, 301
- Westminster Assembly of 1643, 155
- "Whiggamore's Raid" into Edinburgh, 158
- Whitby, Hilda, Abbess of, 21 ; Council of, 21
- Whitfield invited to preach in Scotland, 209
- Whithorn, St. Ninian and, 6, 7 ; inscribed stone at, 5, 11
- Wickliffe, Teachings of, 50
- William the Lion, Succession of, to the Throne, 41 ; capture of, by English, 41 ; foundation of Arbroath Abbey by, 41, 42, 44 ; Excommunication of, 42

- William of Orange, Landing of, in England, 181, 182; accepts Throne of Scotland, 183; refuses to be a party to persecution, 184; protests against persecution, 185; death of, 189
- Willock (John), appointed Moderator of Assembly, 92
- Wilson (Dr.), the Missionary, 307
- Winzet (Ninian), Schoolmaster of Linlithgow, 89
- Wishart (George), the Martyr, 67
- YORK (DUKE OF), Royal Commissioner to Parliament, 176
- Young (Robert), presented to living of Auchterarder, 244; Action in Court of Session by, against Presbytery, 245, 247, 249, 286

# THE FREE

## ABSTRACT OF THE SUMS CONTRIBUTED BY

Year.	Building Funds, Local and General, including Debt Extinction.	Sums raised for Support of the Ministry.				Ordinary and Miscellaneous Congregational Collections after deducting Supplement.					
		(a) Sustentation Fund including Donations and Legacies and Supplementary Sustentation Fund.		(b) Congregational Supplements.	(c) Aged and Infirm Ministers and Predisruption Ministers' Fund.		(d) Total of (a), (b) and (c).				
		I		3			5		6		
£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
1843-44	227,836	19 10	61,513	6 10				61,513	6 10	41,540	11 11
1844-45	131,737	14 6	76,180	6 7				76,180	6 7	69,985	15 3
1845-46	89,839	14 8	80,290	8 10	24,863	10 7				45,811	9 8
1846-47	85,367	0 2	82,166	8 8	25,187	10 5				53,039	8 2
1847-48	57,835	5 7	89,051	8 11	24,046	14 3				47,803	12 4
1848-49	65,992	1 10	87,519	0 10	23,541	8 5				47,837	18 5
1849-50	77,316	16 2	89,648	17 10	24,605	13 9				52,983	19 0
1850-51	69,950	11 7	92,074	9 3	24,565	2 7	809	4 2	111,869	13 5	
1851-52	42,510	7 2	91,468	15 0	4,772	0 2	1,323	15 10	121,411	12 0	
1852-53	42,315	10 9	90,660	18 8	24,988	10 9	1,957	13 2	118,414	18 11	
1853-54	40,777	0 2	107,870	2 8	25,496	10 1	2,404	13 3	118,562	2 0	
1854-55	35,591	1 1	108,843	0 5	26,090	11 9	1,382	19 4	135,343	13 9	
1855-56	36,674	13 7	103,776	13 1	27,730	3 1	3,570	11 10	135,077	8 0	
1856-57	50,218	13 8	110,974	16 4	27,947	10 2	2,475	17 4	139,266	7 11	
1857-58	62,857	14 3	110,751	19 6	28,903	17 4	4,733	6 0	144,611	19 8	
1858-59	50,519	16 0	111,007	8 8	29,290	17 2	3,660	8 6	143,703	5 2	
1859-60	42,571	13 1	109,742	1 8	30,270	7 1	15,275	5 10	156,553	1 7	
1860-61	42,550	15 10	114,016	16 9	32,454	13 1	6,966	2 9	149,165	17 6	
1861-62	42,347	8 0	113,409	3 9	33,760	5 0	8,169	2 9	155,946	4 6	
1862-63	52,990	12 1	115,305	7 6	34,526	6 2	5,434	13 1	153,370	3 0	
1863-64	50,296	3 5	118,109	8 0	36,544	2 4	5,973	5 8	157,822	15 6	
1864-65	44,068	14 4	118,981	19 7	37,888	18 8	6,585	2 5	162,583	9 1	
1865-66	55,188	6 1	123,124	4 9	39,930	2 4	7,018	15 10	165,930	17 9	
1866-67	48,735	1 5	124,876	16 6	42,373	13 8	15,104	0 9	180,601	19 2	
1867-68	59,316	7 0	133,633	15 8	43,539	9 1	7,461	1 0	175,877	6 7	
1868-69	62,318	16 7	137,745	12 10	46,162	6 8	8,538	5 6	188,334	7 10	
1869-70	53,684	11 0	134,595	13 6	46,891	3 10	8,031	6 10	192,668	3 6	
1870-71	43,416	6 3	138,682	15 7	48,331	7 6	8,857	17 2	191,784	18 2	
1871-72	56,682	17 0	140,674	18 7	48,977	18 6	7,572	9 5	195,233	3 6	
1872-73	75,930	16 11	137,939	9 8	50,592	10 8	7,539	3 3	198,806	12 6	
1873-74	52,662	10 6	176,838	11 3	52,523	17 7	7,541	11 0	198,004	18 3	
1874-75	64,178	6 1	168,094	8 2	53,926	16 10	7,511	16 2	238,277	4 3	
1875-76	63,462	18 3	177,008	10 3	56,285	11 10	10,352	4 6	234,732	4 6	
1876-77	89,372	2 5	171,252	8 10	58,537	8 10	9,204	10 9	244,750	9 10	
1877-78	99,531	8 7	179,667	6 7	62,838	4 3	9,853	3 4	243,943	16 5	
1878-79	81,581	4 4	178,492	6 7	66,473	4 5	9,178	4 1	255,318	15 1	
1879-80	76,254	4 9	174,332	17 11	68,171	3 4	9,053	8 11	255,716	18 10	
1880-81	98,643	3 8	178,027	12 3	69,717	7 0	10,849	14 5	254,899	19 4	
1881-82	93,164	19 8	205,181	13 3	71,317	11 6	12,011	8 2	261,356	11 6	
1882-83	81,602	7 6	172,031	7 11	71,634	4 7	13,045	8 0	289,861	5 10	
1883-84	92,119	17 7	178,045	3 0	72,486	14 0	11,098	16 1	255,508	16 3	
1884-85	101,854	13 0	179,097	17 8	72,855	14 3	9,225	7 3	260,978	19 2	
1885-86	61,923	5 7	173,649	17 6	72,936	18 2	8,405	14 4	254,992	10 0	
1886-87	57,882	16 1	172,525	2 6	74,894	8 9	9,738	17 8	255,158	8 11	
1887-88	69,475	16 8	179,465	18 0	72,793	4 11	15,903	10 1	268,162	13 0	
1888-89	85,586	12 0	182,549	3 4	75,471	15 7	27,861	15 1	285,882	14 0	
1889-90	85,119	8 9	171,295	8 2	75,514	5 1	31,115	3 11	277,924	17 2	
1890-91	80,714	9 11	184,372	14 7	74,098	13 3	24,587	7 2	283,058	15 0	
1891-92	70,620	16 4	176,735	1 2	75,669	7 8	14,438	17 7	266,843	6 5	

# FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

TRIBUTED YEARLY TO THE VARIOUS FUNDS AND SCHEMES OF THE CHURCH

1843-92

Ordinary and Miscellaneous Congregational Collections after deducting Supplement.		Education and Colleges.	Missions at Home and Abroad.					Colonial, Continental, and Jewish Missions.	Total of Home, Foreign, Colonial, &c., Missions, 8, 11 and 12.
			Home Missions and Highlands.	Foreign Missions.					
				(a) Raised at Home, including Ladies' Society.	(b) Raised in India and Africa (approximated).	(c) Total (a) and (b).			
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13		
£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.		
1,540 11 11	4,942 19 2	5,246 15 4	7,045 18 9	6,387	13,432 18 9	8,168 0 0	26,847 14 1		
9,085 15 3	13,224 7 7	4,747 12 3	14,598 4 9	4,413	19,011 4 9	16,543 17 10	40,302 14 10		
5,811 9 8	16,855 17 11	5,288 3 0	8,439 10 9	4,413	12,852 10 9	19,366 17 8	37,507 11 5		
3,039 8 2	18,613 18 0	20,953 10 5	9,816 15 6	4,000	13,816 15 6	18,421 17 4	53,192 3 3		
7,803 12 4	16,471 16 0	6,265 9 8	16,954 18 3	5,000	21,954 18 3	11,883 0 3	40,103 8 2		
7,837 18 5	19,970 1 5	5,317 1 11	12,767 5 0	2,120	14,887 5 0	8,705 4 6	28,909 11 5		
2,983 19 0	16,805 1 6	5,595 0 10	14,129 15 5	2,120	16,249 15 5	8,668 11 9	30,513 8 0		
9,907 4 4	28,000 15 4	6,093 15 5	17,204 2 8	2,120	19,384 2 8	10,892 0 2	36,369 18 3		
5,345 11 7	21,093 10 6	8,326 17 1	14,194 10 0	2,120	16,314 10 0	8,583 17 8	33,225 4 9		
4,219 3 7	23,525 0 7	7,837 6 4	17,709 8 11	3,278	20,987 8 11	13,049 10 0	41,874 5 3		
7,414 2 4	19,494 16 2	8,067 19 3	12,009 18 4	3,420	15,429 18 4	15,140 16 8	38,038 14 3		
8,140 16 9	23,495 1 0	6,753 7 4	25,440 2 8	3,558	28,998 2 8	11,133 11 4	46,885 1 4		
8,802 2 1	18,781 5 2	5,667 1 4	19,821 7 8	4,600	24,421 7 8	10,529 12 3	42,618 1 3		
8,967 1 10	21,217 3 11	7,901 11 6	15,916 8 8	3,851	19,767 8 8	9,126 15 2	36,795 15 4		
3,265 15 0	22,525 13 2	10,662 17 9	18,979 13 8	1,830	20,809 13 8	9,293 17 7	41,066 9 0		
4,211 12 5	26,765 3 8	3,853 14 3	19,210 2 6	4,454	23,664 2 6	8,618 8 8	42,136 5 5		
4,908 9 10	22,859 9 7	12,274 6 1	16,508 17 0	4,436	20,944 17 0	14,848 13 7	42,067 16 8		
6,374 1 0	23,955 18 6	7,613 9 1	20,217 16 3	6,599	26,616 16 3	11,553 8 2	45,783 13 6		
0,815 12 8	29,116 6 8	12,320 11 2	18,867 11 11	6,064	24,931 11 11	9,479 2 10	46,731 5 11		
5,220 0 7	23,484 7 7	6,324 0 11	14,033 19 8	7,397	21,430 19 8	10,123 18 11	37,878 19 6		
9,507 19 5	22,733 13 11	11,890 8 6	18,107 11 2	9,999	28,106 11 2	7,770 12 0	47,767 11 8		
3,434 2 8	25,493 1 2	10,112 11 2	27,317 12 2	11,416	38,733 12 2	10,189 8 1	59,935 11 5		
6,418 17 9	30,326 1 5	12,437 10 2	19,871 3 0	13,183	33,054 3 0	8,173 16 4	53,665 9 6		
8,720 9 7	28,031 6 1	7,419 1 0	19,975 12 0	12,680	32,655 12 2	10,421 8 3	59,496 1 5		
0,265 12 10	25,621 19 10	12,703 8 2	19,940 13 0	15,471	35,411 13 0	8,782 6 3	56,897 7 5		
9,554 10 0	30,514 3 11	7,740 11 5	28,494 5 6	13,489	41,983 5 6	12,906 5 4	62,630 2 3		
3,998 1 0	26,578 3 10	13,443 5 4	31,976 12 2	14,760	46,736 12 2	11,179 0 10	71,358 18 4		
6,886 6 0	31,967 13 5	10,500 9 8	30,262 0 1	17,768	48,030 0 1	14,074 4 8	72,604 14 5		
0,348 12 8	32,859 0 2	15,010 1 9	24,102 10 3	14,303	38,405 10 3	13,473 11 2	66,880 3 2		
5,191 8 6	28,081 14 11	9,534 17 4	29,044 0 3	14,911	43,955 0 3	14,229 18 0	67,719 15 7		
9,764 18 9	34,905 15 2	14,030 15 1	28,944 17 4	16,205	45,149 17 4	13,022 5 8	76,202 18 1		
2,620 9 11	42,258 6 2	16,611 5 4	44,897 3 7	18,328	63,225 3 7	14,792 1 7	92,628 10 6		
0,386 1 8	35,880 2 1	26,758 16 4	37,940 5 11	17,265	55,205 5 11	14,566 18 4	96,531 0 7		
3,451 18 3	44,508 4 10	18,400 8 6	32,765 13 0	19,293	52,058 13 0	22,055 1 3	92,514 2 9		
4,301 17 4	35,906 15 9	14,945 2 5	30,650 10 11	20,440	51,096 10 11	14,346 15 8	80,388 9 6		
1,779 16 9	35,337 14 10	13,347 8 2	30,126 10 4	17,993	48,119 10 4	12,896 17 0	74,363 15 6		
9,760 2 1	34,196 17 1	24,327 4 1	63,072 19 4	20,351	83,423 19 4	18,326 6 2	126,077 9 7		
9,705 1 9	40,923 14 10	13,112 8 6	42,710 9 6	21,257	63,967 9 6	13,297 0 2	90,376 18 2		
5,568 7 2	31,548 3 10	14,938 5 5	36,083 11 6	27,988	64,071 11 6	15,944 2 6	94,953 19 5		
9,655 9 10	33,378 2 3	13,803 2 3	48,686 18 0	28,398	77,084 18 0	17,502 1 9	108,390 2 0		
3,591 14 1	54,063 6 10	15,864 9 8	58,278 1 0	28,950	87,228 1 0	10,442 3 5	117,504 14 1		
2,895 12 5	34,480 12 4	12,596 4 8	62,720 8 9	32,612	95,332 8 9	15,816 15 9	123,745 9 2		
8,436 12 8	43,867 15 0	19,635 15 9	64,818 1 8	32,530	97,348 1 8	20,102 15 10	137,086 13 3		
1,730 8 4	36,373 15 6	13,146 4 9	46,135 15 3	37,172	83,307 15 3	23,738 10 9	120,192 10 9		
5,335 16 0	37,711 9 8	16,026 11 11	49,517 8 10	34,324	83,841 8 10	16,347 16 0	116,215 16 9		
5,302 16 11	43,361 19 8	13,873 13 9	56,976 10 11	33,666	90,642 10 11	17,492 9 7	122,008 14 3		
1,351 15 0	44,277 15 9	14,372 16 7	57,159 14 6	39,085	96,244 14 6	26,466 7 9	137,083 18 10		
6,074 10 4	49,281 11 0	16,076 10 3	55,014 18 10	39,173	94,187 18 10	19,167 8 10	129,431 17 11		
4,909 13 1	40,276 14 3	12,000 19 8	61,930 13 3	37,275	99,205 13 3	17,775 2 1	128,981 15 0		

# APPENDIX I


## CHURCH

d.							
Colonial, Continental, and Jewish Missions.		Total of Home, Foreign, Colonial, &c., Missions, 8, 11 and 12.		General Trustees and Miscellaneous.		Total of Columns 1, 5, 6, 7, 13, and 14.	
12		13		14		15	
£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
8,168	0 0	26,847	14 1	1,190	5 7	363,871	17 5
16,543	17 10	40,302	14 10	2,173	4 4½	333,604	3 1½
19,366	17 8	37,507	11 5	1,210	16 8	296,379	9 9
18,421	17 4	53,192	3 3	278	2 3	317,844	10 11
11,883	0 3	40,103	8 2	434	1 0	275,746	6 3
8,705	4 6	28,909	11 5	738	5 1	275,317	11 7
8,668	11 9	30,513	8 0	16,247	19 4	509,445	11 5
10,892	0 2	36,369	18 3	1,041	18 10	306,688	0 4
8,583	17 8	33,225	4 9	2,163	11 8	272,753	4 7
13,049	10 0	41,874	5 3	14,662	10 10½	295,158	13 0½
15,140	16 8	38,638	14 3	2,844	5 10	294,512	12 6
11,133	11 4	46,885	1 4	11,521	19 9½	311,795	0 5½
10,529	12 3	43,618	1 3	2,609	7 3½	295,668	4 9½
9,126	15 2	36,795	15 4	3,031	6 0	314,842	0 5
9,293	17 7	41,066	9 0	3,347	7 9	336,766	4 4
14,618	8 8	42,136	5 5	34,935	9 6	375,121	8 7
8,848	13 7	42,067	16 8	22,776	9 9	344,349	16 5
11,553	8 2	45,783	13 6	8,999	16 2½	343,610	9 6½
9,479	2 10	46,731	5 11	6,855	1 9½	349,235	18 0½
10,123	18 11	37,878	19 6	14,187	5 3	361,584	0 6
7,770	12 0	47,767	11 8	7,637	12 2	360,526	9 8
10,189	8 1	59,035	11 5	11,358	11 0	379,230	18 4
8,173	16 4	53,665	9 6	18,369	6 0	414,569	19 11
10,421	8 3	50,496	1 5	11,088	16 2	392,949	1 3
8,782	6 3	56,897	7 5	10,520	18 2	420,956	13 1
12,906	5 4	62,630	2 3	12,167	3 8	445,852	19 11
11,179	0 10	71,358	18 4	24,300	13 5	451,705	5 9
14,074	4 8	72,604	14 5	12,212	8 4	442,320	11 11
13,473	11 2	66,889	3 2	11,414	15 1	457,001	0 7
14,229	18 0	67,719	15 7	13,057	2 1	477,985	16 3
13,022	5 8	72,202	18 1	38,963	4 0	536,776	10 9
14,792	1 7	96,628	10 6	14,626	13 1	555,014	10 3
14,566	18 4	96,531	0 7	22,102	15 10	573,113	8 3
22,055	1 3	92,514	2 9	13,411	1 2	597,201	5 10
14,346	15 8	80,388	9 0	17,859	11 1	613,306	16 10
12,896	17 0	74,363	15 6	17,344	19 4	586,124	9 7
18,326	6 2	126,077	9 7	14,816	7 0	626,004	19 10
13,297	0 2	90,376	18 2	17,604	7 9	628,609	17 8
15,944	2 6	94,953	19 5	15,199	11 5½	650,296	7 4½
17,502	1 9	108,390	2 0	14,525	19 10½	623,060	17 8½
14,412	3 5	117,504	14 1	20,323	11 2	676,926	12 9
15,816	15 9	123,745	9 2	14,397	0 11	668,352	7 0
20,102	15 10	137,086	13 3	14,650	13 4½	640,957	9 10½
23,738	10 9	120,192	10 9	15,676	12 0½	617,014	11 7½
16,347	16 0	116,215	16 9	17,454	14 4½	644,356	6 5½
17,492	9 7	122,008	14 3	16,627	3 4	688,770	0 2
26,466	7 9	137,083	18 10	20,883	6 5	706,641	1 11
19,167	8 10	129,431	17 11	20,435	3 1	709,596	7 3
17,775	2 1	128,981	15 0	24,617	14 6	676,249	19 7



# THE FREE CHURCH


## INCOME 1843





# OF SCOTLAND

3-1892.



SCOTLAND'S FREE CHURCH

CATALOGUE OR ORDER SLIPS

[Entered at Stationers' Hall]

Their judicious acquisition and use may save many a hurried fruitless search for a piece of paper and a pencil, required at times to note down the title of a desirable book seen in the possession of another.

It is hoped that these slips, which have been drawn up and printed strictly in accordance with the British Museum Catalogue rules, will prove a convenience to Booksellers, Librarians, Cataloguers, and Bookbuyers generally.

**RYLEY** (G. BUCHANAN) and **MCCANDLISH** (J. M.). Scotland's Free Church, a Historical Retrospect and Memorial of the Disruption, with a Summary of Free Church Progress and Finance 1843-1893. (Illustrations, Financial Diagram, and Index), pp. xvi + 392. *Archibald Constable and Co., Westminster* (London). 1893. Flscp. 4<sup>to</sup>.

**RYLEY** (G. BUCHANAN) and **MCCANDLISH** (J. M.). Scotland's Free Church, a Historical Retrospect and Memorial of the Disruption, with a Summary of Free Church Progress and Finance 1843-1893. (Illustrations, Financial Diagram, and Index), pp. xvi + 392. *Archibald Constable and Co., Westminster* (London). 1893. Flscp. 4<sup>to</sup>.

**RYLEY** (G. BUCHANAN) and **MCCANDLISH** (J. M.). Scotland's Free Church, a Historical Retrospect and Memorial of the Disruption, with a Summary of Free Church Progress and Finance 1843-1893. (Illustrations, Financial Diagram, and Index), pp. xvi + 392. *Archibald Constable and Co., Westminster* (London). 1893. Flscp. 4<sup>to</sup>.

**RYLEY** (G. BUCHANAN) and **MCCANDLISH** (J. M.). Scotland's Free Church, a Historical Retrospect and Memorial of the Disruption, with a Summary of Free Church Progress and Finance 1843-1893. (Illustrations, Financial Diagram, and Index), pp. xvi + 392. *Archibald Constable and Co., Westminster* (London). 1893. Flscp. 4<sup>to</sup>.

**RYLEY** (G. BUCHANAN) and **MCCANDLISH** (J. M.). Scotland's Free Church, a Historical Retrospect and Memorial of the Disruption, with a Summary of Free Church Progress and Finance 1843-1893. (Illustrations, Financial Diagram, and Index), pp. xvi + 392. *Archibald Constable and Co., Westminster* (London). 1893. Flscp. 4<sup>to</sup>.

NOTE

---

Building Funds, Local and General . . .	<i>Shown thus</i> ———
Sums raised for support of the Ministry . . .	„ ———
Ordinary and Miscellaneous Congregational Collections, after deducting Supplement . . .	„ - - - - -
Education and Colleges . . . . .	„ - - - - -
Missions at Home and Abroad . . . . .	„ ———

SCOTLAND'S FREE CHURCH

CATALOGUE OR ORDER SLIPS

[Entered at Stationers' Hall]

Their judicious acquisition and use may save many a hurried fruitless search for a piece of paper and a pencil, required at times to note down the title of a desirable book seen in the possession of another.

It is hoped that these slips, which have been drawn up and printed strictly in accordance with the British Museum Catalogue rules, will prove a convenience to Booksellers, Librarians, Cataloguers, and Bookbuyers generally.

**RYLEY** (G. BUCHANAN) and **MCCANDLISH** (J. M.). Scotland's Free Church, a Historical Retrospect and Memorial of the Disruption, with a Summary of Free Church Progress and Finance 1843-1893. (Illustrations, Financial Diagram, and Index), pp. xvi + 392. *Archibald Constable and Co., Westminster* (London). 1893. Flscp. 4<sup>to</sup>.

**RYLEY** (G. BUCHANAN) and **MCCANDLISH** (J. M.). Scotland's Free Church, a Historical Retrospect and Memorial of the Disruption, with a Summary of Free Church Progress and Finance 1843-1893. (Illustrations, Financial Diagram, and Index), pp. xvi + 392. *Archibald Constable and Co., Westminster* (London). 1893. Flscp. 4<sup>to</sup>.

**RYLEY** (G. BUCHANAN) and **MCCANDLISH** (J. M.). Scotland's Free Church, a Historical Retrospect and Memorial of the Disruption, with a Summary of Free Church Progress and Finance 1843-1893. (Illustrations, Financial Diagram, and Index), pp. xvi + 392. *Archibald Constable and Co., Westminster* (London). 1893. Flscp. 4<sup>to</sup>.

**RYLEY** (G. BUCHANAN) and **MCCANDLISH** (J. M.). Scotland's Free Church, a Historical Retrospect and Memorial of the Disruption, with a Summary of Free Church Progress and Finance 1843-1893. (Illustrations, Financial Diagram, and Index), pp. xvi + 392. *Archibald Constable and Co., Westminster* (London). 1893. Flscp. 4<sup>to</sup>.

**RYLEY** (G. BUCHANAN) and **MCCANDLISH** (J. M.). Scotland's Free Church, a Historical Retrospect and Memorial of the Disruption, with a Summary of Free Church Progress and Finance 1843-1893. (Illustrations, Financial Diagram, and Index), pp. xvi + 392. *Archibald Constable and Co., Westminster* (London). 1893. Flscp. 4<sup>to</sup>.