

Lately Published, price 1s.,

MEMOIR OF THE LATE JAMES PILLANS, LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF ROMAN LITERATURE, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH,

INCLUDING

A REVIEW OF HIS SERVICES IN THE CAUSE OF EDUCATION.

By "FREE LANCE,"

AUTHOR OF "THE FUTURE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND;" "MIDDLE CLASS EDUCATION;"
"UNIVERSITY EDUCATION;" "FACTS AND FALLACIES RELATIVE TO SCOTTISH
CHURCHES AND SCHOOLS," ETC.

EDINBURGH: MACLACHLAN & STEWART, 1869.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"The 'Memoir' does not exceed fifty-six octavo pages; but within these limits the author has condensed a vast amount of valuable information regarding the history of Pillans and some of his celebrated contemporaries on both sides of the Tweed. The style of this little work is always clear, accurate, and scholarly; while the analysis, alike of personal character and of educational systems, shows great perspicacity of intellect and equity of judgment. Pillans is here vividly portrayed as Francis Horner's favourite playmate; as one of Dr Alexander Adam's prize-boys; as Dugald Stewart's devoted student and admirer; as a resident tutor in Ayrshire, Northumberland, and Eton; as rector of our Metropolitan Grammar School; as our Metropolitan professor of Latin; as a well-employed 'Edinburgh Reviewer;' as the champion of classical learning against the vulgar sciolism of Materialistic quacks; as the advocate of national instruction; as the scholastic Nestor who taught and survived whole generations of pupils; and, finally, as the cherished friend and constant correspondent of many, ranking among the greatest Englishmen and foreigners of his time."—*Edinburgh Courant*.

"The author has a ready and practised pen, and has set forth with vigour and accuracy the leading facts in Dr Pillans's life. The Professor's services to the cause of education, first as Rector of the High School, and afterwards as Professor of Humanity in the University of Edinburgh, were great. The principles for which he contended are now accepted as truisms by the scholastic world; but none the less do we owe gratitude to pioneers who, under many difficulties and much ill-disguised contempt, familiarised the public with sound educational ideas. . . . The general reader will find much to interest him in this Memoir, for Dr Pillans formed one of a society of men who made their mark on the time in which they lived; and among these he was an honoured fellow-worker."—*Scotsman*.

"The author, as an old pupil of Pillans, not only manifests a familiar acquaintance with his preceptor and a genial veneration for his memory, but also an intimate knowledge of the contemporary events and circumstances and individuals whose history is associated with the subject of the Memoir. He has thus been enabled to communicate much interesting information which will be new to many, and which will be found to be valuable and suggestive."—*Edinburgh Daily Review*.

"The author has written on high-class education, and what should be its main constituents, with remarkable vigour, comprehensiveness, and sagacity; and now he places before the public the career and character of a distinguished high-class educationist in Scotland—for an *In Memoriam* over the close of his life and labours—the genial, graphic, yet discriminating celebration of his virtues as a man, his attainments as a scholar, and his manifold yet rare qualifications as a teacher, which the author offers in this little work. He may well be proud that he has given precise and brilliant expression to the justest and most generous of those admiring estimates of Pillans, which have been cherished by so many successive companies of pupils through more than half-a-century; and that he has also exhibited a living image of the High School Rector and the University Professor to a generation that can never see or listen to Pillans."—*Fife Herald*.

"All the qualities of a good biography are here—enthusiasm, fidelity, and pith. The glow of geniality which breathes through the 'dialectician's' reminiscences of a once eminent man makes quite charming the only contribution of facts yet made to the memory of one of the noblest of Romans."—*Fifeshire Journal*.

FACTS AND FALLACIES

RELATIVE TO

SCOTTISH CHURCHES AND SCHOOLS:

Twelve Tracts for the Times,

ADDRESSED TO THE

HON. LORD ARDMILLAN, AND RIGHT HON. GEORGE YOUNG, M.P.,
LORD ADVOCATE OF SCOTLAND.

By "FREE LANCE,"

SOMETIME PRESIDENT OF THE EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY DIALECTIC SOCIETY; AUTHOR OF
"THE FUTURE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND;" "MEMOIR OF PROFESSOR PILLANS;"
"MIDDLE CLASS EDUCATION;" "UNIVERSITY EDUCATION," ETC.

"Fingunt simul creduntque."—TACITUS.

"There are more false facts current in the world, than false theories."—DR. CULLEN.

"Prove (test) all things; hold fast that which is good."—1 THESS. v. 21.

EDINBURGH:
MACLACHLAN & STEWART, 64 SOUTH BRIDGE,

BOOKSELLERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

GLASGOW: THOMAS MURRAY AND SON.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

MDCCCLXXI.



110. m. 52*

P R E F A C E.

THE following twelve Tracts on "Scottish Churches and Schools," though intended as a sequel to "The Future Church of Scotland," are not borrowed from that Essay, with the exception of a very few paragraphs. Each of the Tracts is complete in itself, though all are meant to prove and illustrate the desirableness of a definite and practical proposal. Since the publication of my former Essay, I have received numerous communications from gentlemen of the highest distinction in ecclesiastical, political, academical, and literary circles, most of whom have expressed their general approval of its sentiments, whilst all have admitted the impartial accuracy of its narrative. For some kind corrections of minor local inaccuracies I must express my obligations to the Right Rev. Bishop Wordsworth, of Saint Andrews; to the Rev. Dr Macfarlane, London; to the Rev. Dr Taylor, Busby; to the Rev. Dr Gibson, the Rev. John Isdale, Mr Alexander Birrell, and Mr John Knox, Glasgow; to the Rev. Dr Begg, the Rev. Andrew Gardiner, M.A., Mr Joseph Grant, W.S., Mr J. Dundas Grant, advocate, and the late Mr John Carmichael, M.A., Edinburgh; and to the late Rev. William Robertson, Aboyne.

I have to inform the reader that I have discussed at considerable length the relations of Scottish Churches and Schools,

because in Scotland they have been always closely connected, and because recent Ecclesiastical dissensions have greatly tended to dislocate and degrade National Education. Further, I must remind him that these Tracts are written by a Scotsman for Scotsmen. It was once the boast of Scotland, that in point of intelligence, morality, industry, and order, she so greatly surpassed countries greatly her superior in soil, climate, wealth, and geographical position. If I am not mistaken, I have indicated the mode by which she may retain or recover her proud pre-eminence. The School and the Church are like the two Grecian rivers celebrated in the ancient legend, and by our own poet Milton,—

“That renowned flood, so often sung,
Divine Alpheus, who by secret sluice,
Stole under seas to meet his Arethuse.”

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH,
April 1871.

CONTENTS.

TRACT FIRST.		PAGE
INTRODUCTION,		1
TRACT SECOND.		
ENDOWMENTS,		8
TRACT THIRD.		
CLAIM OF SPIRITUAL INDEPENDENCE,		20
TRACT FOURTH.		
ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF SCOTTISH VOLUNTARIYISM,		27
TRACT FIFTH.		
PHASES AND DEFECTS OF VOLUNTARIYISM,		48
TRACT SIXTH.		
CHURCHES AND MORALS IN GLASGOW,		72
TRACT SEVENTH.		
CONFLICTING THEORIES OF MORALS,		85
TRACT EIGHTH.		
PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,		99
TRACT NINTH.		
TENDENCIES IN OLD GREYFRIARS' CHURCH,		112
TRACT TENTH.		
CAUSES OF DISUNION IN THE FREE CHURCH,		129
TRACT ELEVENTH.		
POSITION OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIANS,		141
TRACT TWELFTH.		
SCOTTISH NATIONAL EDUCATION,		154

ERRATA.

- Page 12, line 14, *for Ellis, read Ellice.*
- „ 51, line 9, *for aborrence, read abhorrence.*
- „ 75, line 13, *for sixty, read fifty-two.*
- „ 76, line 28, *for Millin, read Milton.*
- „ 127, line 26, *for loud, read low.*

FACTS AND FALLACIES

RELATIVE TO

SCOTTISH CHURCHES AND SCHOOLS.

TRACT FIRST.

Introduction.

“The Future Church of Scotland”—Public Interest excited—Opinions of the Press—“Facts and Fallacies”—Force of Prejudices—State of the Presbyterian Churches—Lord Ardmillan’s Advocacy of Presbyterian Union—His Connection with Edinburgh—Political and Ecclesiastical questions—Robert Burns and Ayrshire—Fifeshire—Eminence of its sons in Science, Art, Philosophy, Literature, and Jurisprudence—Its pre-eminence in Ecclesiastical Transactions.

EXACTLY twelve months ago, I published a volume entitled “The Future Church of Scotland, in Relation to Religion, Education, and Social Progress: An Essay in Favour of a National Presbyterian Church, on the Basis of Toleration, Economy, and Utility.” In the Preface to that book I hazarded the conjecture that my “suggestions would arrest the attention of hundreds whose freedom from bias and clerical dictation amply qualified them for grappling with a subject of this nature.” In that expectation I have not been disappointed. Nothing in literary experiment or ecclesiastical controversy has excited in my mind greater surprise than the very favourable reception which my work obtained. The explanation is to be

sought, not in its intrinsic merits, but in the interest awakened by the subject, and in the real advantage proposed to be gained by the reconstruction of the National Church of Scotland on the principles of John Knox, and Andrew Melville, and Thomas Chalmers, as preferable to a partial union based on compromises of questionable expediency.

It would be idle affectation to pretend that I have not been gratified by the encomiums of the Scottish press, including the most respectable journals of every shade of politics between Maidenkirke and John o' Groats, as well as of some London journals of high character and extensive circulation. What I prize most in these reviews has been the strong testimony borne to the rigid accuracy of my historical narrative, and to my diligence in the collection of relevant facts. Nearly all of my reviewers are personally unknown, though I am warranted in stating that they comprise gentlemen of high standing—eminent authors, acute critics, shrewd journalists, learned Professors, eloquent divines, and counsel learned in the law.

I now take the liberty of presenting the people of Scotland with an exposition of "Facts and Fallacies relative to Churches and Schools in Scotland." Many of the Facts may be new to most of my readers, but they will be proved to be indisputable. Interwoven with the Facts are several pernicious, but not quite transparent popular Fallacies or Sophisms, which I have attempted to detect. What success may have attended my labours it does not become me to surmise. I submit them to the judgment and revision of all persons really desirous of arriving at sound conclusions on various problems of permanent and national importance. To individuals who are unused to think for themselves, and who have been putting implicit faith in the policy of certain clerical guides, the following pages will probably contain much distasteful matter, though it is both true and seasonable. If they are not prepared to exercise their own faculties, and to act on their own beliefs, I advise them to close this publication without delay. But as I profess to write without prejudice or passion, I entreat them to follow my example, and to choose the better part. One of my favourable reviewers thinks that I have borne too hard on certain

leaders in the Free Church. With regard to these Free Church leaders I retain my belief that, at the outset of their career, they improperly endeavoured to cripple or extinguish evangelical Dissenters; that they next waged war against their Moderate brethren in the Establishment; and that they are using questionable means to accomplish an Union offensive to the earnest and constitutional convictions of their brethren in the Free Church. These facts are established by history. Another favourable reviewer pronounces the only weak part of my Essay to be a special pleading in behalf of the Scottish Establishment. I am not quite convinced that this charge is well founded; but before my readers have finished the perusal of these pages, they will acknowledge that I have spoken still more unfavourably of some Established clergy, to whom such grave imputations must be very unpalatable. Unless these imputations are unjust, a heavy responsibility rests on their sounder and more consistent brethren, who are entrusted with the preservation of purity and order in the Church. It is not improbable that my strictures on Voluntaryism may displease some of my Voluntary friends, especially at the present crisis, when strenuous efforts are put forth to harmonise ecclesiastical theories once deemed incompatible. I invite them to reconsider seriously the fundamental principles of their system, and to meet my arguments in no captious or irritable frame of mind. In a certain sense, I am a Voluntary, but I must dissent from Voluntaryism as an exclusive scheme of finance, and still more as a regulating principle in the legislation of a Christian Commonwealth.

I addressed my former Essay to the Lay Presbyterians of Scotland. This publication I address to the Honourable Lord Ardmillan, and to the Right Honourable George Young, Lord Advocate. On many grounds I have long held Lord Ardmillan* in high respect as an able man, an useful citizen, an

* My knowledge of Lord Ardmillan as a platform speaker commenced at a meeting held in 1836, in the Waterloo Rooms, to condemn American slavery. He was then plain Mr Crawford, advocate, known as a keen Whig in the Parliament House. He may remember that a speech of great force and eloquence was delivered by the Rev. W. L. (now Dr) Alexander, then newly settled in Edinburgh. Mr Crawford was frequently employed as counsel in the General Assembly. On one occasion, I remember that when the Rev. Mr Weir, of Newry, was expatiating

esteemed Free Church elder, a sincere Christian, and an upright judge—exemplary in the discharge of all the onerous duties appertaining to his high station. In his successive capacities as an Advocate, a Crown Counsel, a Sheriff of Perthshire, and a Judge in the Court of Session, he has won the respect of all with whom he came in contact. Since his elevation to the Bench, he has sacrificed much desirable leisure in delivering lectures to the young men in Edinburgh, who are in danger of exchanging the standard doctrines of Christianity for the baseless speculations propounded in some of her pulpits. But Judges are not infallible on the Bench. Still less are they in popular assemblies. Lord Ardmillan has taken a prominent part in promoting the proposed Union between the Unendowed Scottish Presbyterian Churches. In the Spring of 1870, he delivered an important speech in support of this Union, at a meeting of the Society of the Sons of the United Presbyterian Ministers. In the Spring of 1871, he took the chair at an Union meeting in Bristo Street United Presbyterian Church, and spoke still more forcibly on the same side. By such acts he has assumed the attitude of a party in this movement. Yet I propose to plead my cause as if I were an Advocate at the bar of his Court, liable to be interrogated in mustering my array of Facts, and in analysing the mental process which has resulted in so many delusive Fallacies. At the same time, I reserve the liberty of doubting whether it be a prudent course in a Judge of the Supreme Court to descend into the arena of the Union controversy, or to bandy charges of political motives with Mr William Kidston, of Ferniegair. Lord Ardmillan may be safely acquitted of any such influences, which have been also indignantly disavowed by the Rev. Dr Buchanan, of Glas-

on the progress of Protestant Presbyterianism in Ireland, Mr Crawford was waiting at the bar for the hearing of his case, and joined heartily in the applause which greeted Mr Weir's speech. Shortly before the Disruption, I heard Mr Crawford speak very earnestly at an Anti-Patronage meeting in the Assembly Rooms, comparing the Non-Intrusionists to the children of Israel in the Red Sea, when his minister, Dr Candlish, termed him "one of the rising hopes of the Scottish Bar"—a compliment which Dr Cunningham seconded. I attended another Anti-Patronage meeting in December, 1870, in the Queen Street Hall. Lord Ardmillan was not present, but Mr E. S. Gordon, M.P., attended, and condemned Patronage. Might not Lord Ardmillan have taken the chair, and called on Dr Guthrie to repeat his dear "words Anti-Patronage, so sweet to his ear?"

gow, and by the Rev. J. S. Mill, United Presbyterian minister in Leith. But Lord Ardmillan must be aware that the proposed Union dissensions may be transferred to the Civil Courts, which alone can decide in litigations respecting church property. He remembers, doubtless, how the late Lord Moncreiff retired from the Established General Assembly as soon as it came into collision with the Court of Session. That Lord Ardmillan will adjudicate righteously in any lawsuit between the two parties in the Free Church, will be questioned by no one acquainted with his unsullied probity. Still, many thoughtless and prejudiced persons—always a large class—may be inclined to suspect that his judgments might be unconsciously warped by his previous zeal as a partisan.

Lord Ardmillan has mentioned in one of his addresses that his ancestors in Ayrshire were Prelatists in the times of the Covenanters, though he is an ardent Presbyterian. He is an enthusiastic admirer of the Ayrshire poet, Robert Burns, and he delivered an eloquent panegyric on that ill-fated genius at the centenary of his birth. On another occasion, he descanted on the attractions of his native county as the land of poetry and song, of romantic prospects, and glowing sunsets. I happen to be a humble native of Fifeshire, a county which has no reason to be ashamed of the intellectual prowess of her sons, or of the services they have rendered to the national welfare. In the arts of peace and the exploits of war, in science, philosophy, literature, and jurisprudence, her sons have attained the highest ranks, so that the late Robert Chambers, himself a Peebleian, speaks of that county “so prolific of illustrious Scotsmen from the earliest period of our national history.” Scotland has produced few poets equal to Sir David Lindsay, or lawyers equal to Professor Erskine and Lord Campbell; no surgeon comparable to Professor Syme, or anatomist like Professor Goodsir; no Natural Philosopher to match Sir John Leslie; no painter superior to Sir David Wilkie; Dr Adam Smith remains unrivalled in Political Economy.* But Fifeshire is chiefly distinguished by its close association with ecclesiastical history.

* Adam Smith was not the father of this science. That honour belongs to Sir James Hunter, of Coltness, Lanarkshire, and even he had been partly anticipated by Aristotle.

Saint Andrews was the cradle of the Reformation. The martyrs, Patrick Hamilton and George Wishart, were burned in her streets. She was the seat of the Primacy during the ascendancy of the Roman Catholic Church, and, latterly, of the Scottish Episcopacy. The University of Saint Andrews had the honour of educating John Knox, the promoter of the first, and Andrew Melville, of the second Reformation. They were preceded by John Mair, Regent of Saint Salvator's College, who numbered John Knox and George Buchanan among his students. Among the four Scottish Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly were two natives of Fifeshire. George Gillespie, eminent for his learning, judgment, and zeal, rendered great service to that Assembly, especially in framing the Directory of Worship, the Catechism, and other important articles of religion. Alexander Henderson, a divine conspicuous for his ability, erudition, wisdom, eloquence, and intrepidity, was Moderator of the Glasgow General Assembly of 1638, which abolished Patronage, and he mainly contributed to effect the union between the Scottish Covenanters and the English Parliament. Alexander Leslie, of Balfour, Earl of Leven, who had been trained to arms under Gustavus Adolphus, was the military leader of the Covenanters. David Hackston, of Rathillet, who bore a signal part in the defeat of the royal army at Drumclog, was taken prisoner at Bothwell Bridge, after a brave resistance, and put to death under circumstances of unprecedented cruelty. Descending to later times, the county retained its pre-eminence in the ecclesiastical annals of Scotland. Dr John Erskine, the venerable minister of New Greyfriars', Edinburgh, was the son of Professor John Erskine, the author of the "Institutes," and a remote kinsman of Ebenezer Erskine, both being descended from the Earls of Mar. One of his contemporaries was Principal Hill, of Saint Andrews, the author of a standard work on Theology, and leader of the Moderate party in the Church of Scotland. His mantle fell on Dr John Inglis, at whose death, in 1832, Dr George Cook, Professor of Moral Philosophy at Saint Andrews, led the Moderates till the Disruption in 1843; whilst the leader of the Evangelical party was Dr Thomas Chalmers, a native of Anstruther. Dr Andrew Thomson, of St George's, Edinburgh, whose father was minister

of Markinch, was, at the age of eighteen years, parish schoolmaster of the same town.*

Of my own competency to discuss the topics of these Tracts it does not become me to speak with confidence. If I fail to set forth accurately the chief ecclesiastical transactions of the last thirty years, the failure cannot arise from any desire to sacrifice historical truth to denominational prejudice. Neither can it be attributed to ignorance of persons with whom those transactions are closely associated. I watched with the deepest interest the rise and progress of the Voluntary controversy. I listened with rapt interest to nearly all of the critical and protracted debates on Non-Intrusion and Spiritual Independence in the General Assemblies. I witnessed with mingled regret and admiration the Disruption, which rent the Church of Scotland asunder. Though the son of a United Secession minister, and mingling for many years almost solely with individuals of that denomination, I was never a convert to the extreme Voluntaryism which the great majority of her members suddenly avowed, whilst I sympathised largely with the views and aims of the Non-Intrusionists, though I could not approve of all the measures employed to secure their realisation. To most of the opinions which I then held I still adhere for reasons which I proceed to unfold.

* When Mr Andrew Thomson was elected schoolmaster, he jocularly suggested to his father that his brother Willie (the late Dr Wm. Thomson, of Perth) ought to be appointed beadle! In my boyhood, there was in Markinch a sort of infidel club, which met on Sabbaths. It was attended by infidels from other villages, and the members discussed Tom Paine's "Age of Reason," and other kindred works, much to the annoyance of the Rev. James Sievwright, the excellent parish minister, who seceded in 1843.

TRACT SECOND.

Endowments.

Lord Ardmillan's Repudiation of Endowments—Free Church Sustentation Fund—Highland Free Church Ministers—Rev. Evan Gordon quoted—Finance of the United Presbyterian Church—Rev. Robert Rutherford quoted—Small Stipends of many Established Ministers—Mr Maclaggan, M.P., Dr John Cook, Dr Norman Macleod, and Sir George Clerk, quoted—Expensive Education and Precarious Prospects of Presbyterian Ministers.

AT the meeting of the Society of Sons of Ministers of the United Presbyterian Church, Lord Ardmillan is reported to have expressed himself very unambiguously on the question of Endowments in the Free Church:—"If Endowment were offered to the Free Church now, with the prospect of a great Nonconformist Union, a Free United Presbyterian Church before us—I speak for myself alone—but for myself, I say, I would not again put our liberty in peril by connection with the State. We have great cause for thankfulness, and I would trust, as not in vain we have trusted, and would prefer the security of the free-will offerings of the people. Unless I greatly mistake, this would be the people's answer to the proposal, and the answer of the ministers whom the people trust. (Applause.) If a time of danger should come; if in darkness and trouble the vessel of the Free Church labours among the breakers; if some say, 'Seek aid from the State and steady the ship with Endowments,' I would reply, 'Overboard with your theory of Endowments, guide her by the light of the Gospel, and ballast her with the affections of the people.'" (Applause.)

Passing over the nautical metaphors in this decision, reminding one strongly of the Rev. Dr Guthrie's speeches, I beg leave to examine the scheme of finance which is peculiar to the Free Church—the Sustentation Fund. To speak slightly of that Fund, would be to impeach the wisdom and insult the memory

of its illustrious founder, Dr Chalmers, who united the sagacity and forethought of a political economist to the genius of a profound philosopher, and the godliness of an eloquent divine. But I must be permitted to observe that the sound practical policy displayed in the scheme of the Sustentation Fund was not dictated, and is even now hardly sanctioned, by Voluntaryism. Previously to the Disruption, the Voluntaries had never dreamt of such a uniform and comprehensive mode of supporting the Gospel ministry. No Voluntary could have ventured to propound or recommend it. Some of them, more open to conviction than the majority, have begun to admit its merits; but it is notorious that a large proportion of the laymen and ministers of the United Presbyterian Church regard it with disfavour, though its example has operated very strongly in determining the congregations of that Church to raise clerical incomes. Justice compels me to admit that, since the death of Dr Chalmers in 1847, his favourite scheme has been elaborated and administered with commendable skill and zeal by Dr Robert Buchanan, in spite of some heavy discouragements. Let us examine the progress and result of this fund. I willingly admit the rapid extension of the Free Church. Instead of 474 ministers, as at the Disruption of 1843, the Free Church, at the General Assembly, 1868, had 900 ministers. At the time of the Disruption it was the aim of Dr Chalmers and the Free Church to secure for every minister a minimum stipend of £150. This was not reached till 1868. In the year 1867, it was proposed to increase the £150 to £200, and Dr Buchanan seems to have been sanguine in his expectations that the £200 would be reached in 1868, but he was disappointed. At the Free Church Assembly of 1870, the minimum stipend was £150, and a smaller sum was paid to 160 ministers who do not occupy what is termed the "equal dividend platform." Now, I must invite special attention to the fallacy involved in the minimum stipend of £150. There is no reason to believe that Dr Chalmers deemed this yearly income a fitting remuneration, even in 1843, for duly qualified and efficient incumbents. But to estimate the comparative value of £150 in 1845 and 1871, we must look steadily at the dearer rate of living since the Disruption. Distrusting my own judgment in

this matter, I have applied to two intelligent provision merchants in Glasgow,* who agree in stating that, within the last twenty-five years, the cost of living has risen 30 per cent. in the country, and 50 per cent. in the larger towns. Probably the great increased cost of living may be overlooked by successful lawyers, whose incomes have experienced a fourfold increase since 1843. "But why," it may be asked, as Mr M'Lagan, M.P., recently observed, "is this augmentation [of the small livings of the Church of Scotland clergy] considered necessary now, when so many generations of ministers have lived and thriven, and brought up their families on even smaller stipends than those now complained of? The answer to this is simple. The stipends, even of the same money value, are not of the same intrinsic worth, owing to the depreciation in the value of money, and the increased expense of living, clothing, education, and everything else connected with the upbringing of a family. £200 are not of more value now than £130 or £140 were some few years ago. Now, this is not only the case with the stipends of ministers of all denominations, but it is unfortunately too true of the fixed salaries of the learned professions; generally, of the soldiers' pay, and similar emoluments; and those clergymen who are paid by the fiars' prices have an additional ground of complaint, for their stipends are diminished on account of the great reduction in the price of grain since the repeal of the Corn Laws. The difference in the circumstances and position of the minister now from what it once was will be more apparent if we make a comparison. For instance, in my own county, a manse was built some eighty years ago, and the wages of the masons who worked at it were 1s. 4d. a-day, and of the labourers, 10d. A manse is about to be erected in the same parish, and the wages of the masons and labourers who will be required to work at it are 4s. 6d. and 2s. 8d. per day, being an increase of fully 300 per cent. And yet these men do not save more money, nor appear to be more comfortable."† If I am reminded of the supplements in the Free Church, I answer that the congregations of 650 Free Church ministers not being self-sustaining re-

* Mr John Middleton and Mr Donald Maccorquodale.

† Speech at Edinburgh, April 22, 1867.

ceive no supplement, while the remaining 250 maintain their own ministers, and supplement the stipends of the large majority depending on the Central Fund. Is this a satisfactory state of matters? Emphatically I answer, No. There was a time when ministers were supposed by spouting demagogues, or even by decent artisans, to be handsomely remunerated with £150 a-year, though I never heard of a Court of Session Judge, with £3500 a-year, and a retiring pension after twenty-one years' service, lending his name to this cry. Doubtless, every Church is infested with ministers who are not worthy of that scanty stipend, or of a more pitiful dole. There will always be a class of licentiates to whom £150 will be an object of ambition; however, as society demands an improvement in the quality, and a diminution in the quantity of the clerical material, it does not seem desirable to foster their growth. If so many intelligent laymen are unaware of the expense and hardships undergone by Free Church ministers in the Highlands, they will thank me for printing the following communication from a Free Church minister,* who was settled in the parish of Kilmonivaig, Inverness-shire:—"This parish is nearly sixty miles in length. It begins at the west end of Loch Laggan, in Badenoch, and extends westward along the road to Fort-William, and ends in that direction within a mile of Fort-William. From Fort-William it stretches along the south side of the Caledonian Canal to Invergarry, then takes in the whole of Glengarry and Glenquoich, and ends at Lochearnhead. The population is very small, considering the large territory occupied. Some years ago, it was 2500—a considerable proportion being Roman Catholic. The Catholics are chiefly confined to the Macintosh estate in the Braes of Lochaber. For a long time back, the parish minister, whose manse is at Speanbridge, had an ordained missionary in the districts of Glengarry and Glenquoich, and a share of the services of a similar agent employed in connection with the parish of Kilmalie. It may be said that three men were required to labour with any effect in this parish. At the period of the Disruption, many of the people had given their adherence to the Free Church, but had not an ordained minister settled among them till the year 1858.

* The Rev. E. Gordon, an able and energetic minister in Glasgow.

The Free Church had only one minister in this extensive parish. After about ten years of work, his health had completely failed, and he was obliged to remove to another sphere. He has been since translated to Glasgow. The causes of his ill-health were the incessant labours required, exposure to the wet climate, and an uncomfortable dwelling-house. There was no manse in his time. A minister in such a parish requires to keep a good horse, which will cost him £30 a-year, if he is without land; and if he is without a supplement, and nothing but the equal dividend, it will be difficult to make two ends meet. The congregation at the first never contributed more than £70, and not more than £50 for many years. Glengarry and Glenquoich have been recently erected into a parish, through the influence of Mr Ellis, M.P., the proprietor. How can an unendowed Church maintain its ground long in such circumstances?" The writer of this very pertinent letter does not continue the tale of his strangely disastrous history. After quitting the scene of his extensive clerical wanderings, he was settled at Grantown, near Inverness, where, after a short incumbency, his manse was burned to the ground, his library and the whole of his furniture being consumed in the flames.

Nor will it avail the argument of any Free Church or United Presbyterian Unionist to maintain that Mr Gordon's is an exceptional case. Many others nearly as painful can be cited and attested. During several journeys among the Western Highlands and Hebrides, I have been forcibly impressed with the scarcity and poverty of the inhabitants, and with the almost total want of gainful employment. Conscious of their utter inability to provide school or Church instruction for themselves, our munificent ancestors provided funds to supply their lack of money in their lonely glens and scattered islands; but, strange to say, men of high professional and social position, and withal distinguished by their zeal in the cause of religion and education, deliberately propose to discard the revenues which have been instrumental in reclaiming these extensive regions from ignorance and barbarism. Some persons are disposed to say that the Highland Teinds ought not to be appropriated by the Established Church, which has a merely nominal existence in several northern counties, where

the Established ministers, if endowed with ordinary sensitiveness, feel their position very keenly. For it is notorious that these Highlanders will listen neither to the Established ministers nor to the United Presbyterian, against whom they have been strongly prejudiced by recently-circulated tracts. In Caithness the Free Church numbers 69 per cent. of the people; in Sutherland, 89; in Ross and Cromarty, 83.

As this is a strictly financial Tract, I may be pardoned for alluding to an official document well worthy of an attentive perusal—the “Annual Report of the Home and Foreign Missionary Operations of the United Presbyterian Church for the year ending April, 1869.” Whilst the United Presbyterian Church professes to depend on the voluntary contributions of its members and adherents, she does not refuse the aid of other individuals disposed to subscribe to its funds. In the last page of this Report is a “Form of Bequest to the different Funds of the United Presbyterian Church.” To guide the testator — who, for aught that Mr James Peddie, W.S., the treasurer of the Church, knows, may be a Jew or a Pagan—he is furnished with a list of the funds which he may prefer to increase. These funds are eleven in number, and are applicable respectively to Home Missions and Weak Congregations, Foreign Missions, Church Extension, Synod House, Scholarships, Aged and Infirm Ministers, Scheme of Educating Missionaries’ Children, Extension of the United Presbyterian Church in London, Fund for Manses, and Permanent Loan Fund. Last year the Synod received a legacy of £20,000 from Mr John Henderson, of Park, which is a species of endowment. Until very recently, the congregations of the United Presbyterian Church were, with very few exceptions, self-sustaining: the stipends of their ministers, miserably small as they were in many cases, were paid by each congregation, and the ministers could boast of their scanty independence. In the “Synod’s Minutes” of thirty years ago, there are records of grants of £10 to weak congregations struggling to prolong their precarious existence. Latterly, more liberal measures have been devised. Two secretaries, the Rev. Dr Macgill and the Rev. Dr Scott, whose salaries have been raised to £500 a-year, respectively superintend the Foreign and Home Mis-

sions, while the treasurer receives an annual salary of £350. Loud complaints have been raised against the recent increase of these salaries. Experience has, however, proved that, in administrative departments of the Church as well as of the State, well-paid and efficient officials are in the long run the cheaper men. Sir Robert Peel with £5000 a-year was a cheaper national servant than William Cobbett, who offered to fill the office for £300. This Report contains some statistics which must surprise all who have attentively watched the financial operations of the United Presbyterian Church, whilst it has suggested grave doubts whether the Fund for Augmenting Ministers' Stipends has been judiciously distributed. From the Report of 1870 it appears that 229 congregations, amounting to nearly a half of the congregations of this denomination, are receiving supplements from the wealthier congregations, the supplements varying from £20 to £60.

That so large a sum as £10,000 should have been raised to aid the brethren, may be quoted as a triumph of Voluntaryism; but it is a modern phase of that principle, and is, moreover, censured by many consistent Voluntaries as an abuse of Voluntaryism. For what are the facts? First, few United Presbyterian congregations are found in the very poor districts of Scotland—that is, the Highlands and Islands, or north of the Grampians—excepting the Orkneys, where they long ago obtained a firm footing. Secondly, this new Augmentation Fund is alleged to have lessened the efforts of the aid-receiving congregations, and to have diminished the diligence of the ministers whose stipends have been augmented. Thus the Rev. Robert Rutherford, United Presbyterian minister of Newlands, has challenged public attention to the doubtful tendency of this Augmentation Fund:—"Granting it is the duty of every Church, and more especially, it would seem, of every Presbyterian Church, through its courts and committees, to endeavour to develop, as far as possible, a healthy energy and liberality in the various congregations under its charge, as also to secure a befitting maintenance for the ministers ordained, under its sanction, over these congregations—and this in part, if need be, by the help of sister congregations, in accordance with the apostolic precept, that every man look not on his

own things, but also on the things of others—the question is, What are the best means or methods to be employed in order that each of these ends may be attained without marring or missing the other? The careful cultivation of a spirit of generous liberality, and thereby of self-reliance and self-respect in a congregation, is one thing; the suitable maintenance and comfort of its minister is another. Which of the two is the more important, and ought to take precedence of the other, it is not needful now to determine. Enough that, so far from conflicting, they will, if only sought aright, healthfully harmonise and invigorate each other. But if an exclusive or even disproportionate regard be paid to either while the other is overlooked or undervalued, then, to the same extent, sooner or later, serious moral mischief cannot fail to ensue. If, on the one hand, the maintenance provided for the minister be inadequate, an act of injustice is done, seeing he is, or at least in every case must, till the reverse is proved, be presumed, like every other labourer, to be worthy of his hire, and this injustice will operate more or less unfavourably on his ministrations, and through these on his congregation and the Church and ministry at large. On the other hand, if mere ‘stipend augmentation’ be made the main thing, if little or no solicitude be felt how or whence that stipend is obtained, whether from the people for whom the minister directly labours, or from others on whom his claim is only indirect—if that people be left very largely to the belief that, be they as remiss as they may in providing for his support, that support will nevertheless be secured, the result will be equally if not still more disastrous, even more certainly and speedily than the present Scottish Poor-law has impaired, and in some cases all but destroyed, a spirit of self-respect and independence in those who might either wholly or in part have dispensed with its aid, will not a few congregations, numerically large and otherwise strong, be by such a policy and process in like manner demoralised?***

But Mr Rutherford has omitted to refer to what some United Presbyterians have represented as a gross abuse in the distribution of their Supplementary Fund. For in their anxiety to

* See “Daily Review,” 27th December, 1870.

maintain their denominational standing, the Committee have been voting large annual grants, not to one congregation only, but to two congregations, even in prosperous towns! The worst result, perhaps, remains to be told; since I have been assured on high United Presbyterian authority that [the two aid-receiving congregations in such towns, instead of cultivating the brotherly love becoming their dependent position, are commonly found to be at bitter variance.

It may not be inappropriate to advert here to what is suggested by the mention of these facts—I mean the maintenance of small, superfluous Dissenting Churches at a considerable yearly cost. A very candid and intelligent United Presbyterian elder, who had taken a leading part in the Voluntary Controversy, and who had read my “Future Church of Scotland,” has candidly owned to me the magnitude of this evil, from which, on Voluntary grounds, he sees no escape. One of the main arguments put forward by Dr Robert Buchanan in favour of his Union scheme is, that it would enable the United Church to concentrate its strength by suppressing many weak and superfluous charges. Before we can resign ourselves to this pleasing anticipation, it behoves us to look back to the result of past Dissenting Unions. The United Presbyterian Church was formed in 1847 by the junction of the United Secession and the Relief Churches. What has been the history of the United Presbyterian Church? Although many of her churches are confessedly superfluous, and although 229 of her congregations, nearly a half of the whole number, are aid-receiving, she has not suppressed half-a-dozen of her burdensome and costly charges. What, then, is the remedy for this admittedly crying grievance? Simply a return to the territorial system on which the Church of Scotland was modelled by John Knox and the early Reformers—a system so powerfully enforced by Dr Chalmers, and so well appreciated by many of his followers in his extensive Church enterprises, then young ministers in the Establishment, but now ministering in the Free Church. Surely they have not forgotten the lessons and example of their illustrious leader. From his lips they learned the value of the territorial principle, and the necessity of a moderate Endowment. What was necessary thirty years ago has not

become less so in the present day, when ignorance, vice, and crime are on the increase. Voluntaries may plead some excuse in this respect, as they have acted mainly on the "shop-keeping" principle, and many Established ministers have followed their example with less justification.

To prove that the hardships of small stipends are not confined to the foregoing Churches, I shall conclude by glancing at the incomes of the ministers of the Church of Scotland. If any of my readers fancy that all of them are in receipt of incomes adequate to their profession, wants, and social status, he labours under a sad hallucination. To arrive at correct information on this subject has been a matter of some difficulty. But I have been fortunate enough to recover copies of two pamphlets containing much interesting, and, I may add, rather painful intelligence.* These are Reports of Proceedings at Meetings held respectively at Glasgow and Edinburgh in 1866 and 1867, to augment the smaller incomes of the clergy. The names of the chief speakers are ample guarantees for the value and interest of the speeches: they include Dr Cook, of Haddington, Mr Campbell Swinton, of Kimmerghame, Mr Sheriff Barclay, of Perth, Dr Norman Macleod, the Rev. A. H. (now Professor) Charteris, the late Sir George Clerk, the Rev. William (now Dr) Smith, Mr Maclaggan, M.P., and Mr J. A. Campbell, younger of Stracathro. In his Glasgow speech Dr Cook said:—"Putting this aside, however, or leaving it to those who are competent to provide for such cases, I must return to the subject which the resolution more immediately contemplates—the case of the small livings. Of these there are, as I have already stated, 196 exchequer livings little exceeding £150 per annum, and in some years, when the price of grain is low, even less; from 80 to 100 more, where the teinds are exhausted, under £200 a year; then to this have to be added 42 Parliamentary Churches, the stipends of which are £120; and 107 Churches erected under Sir James Graham's Act, the stipends of which are £120 if no manse is provided, £100 if there is a manse." I greatly fear that Lord Ardmillan, like many

* I had much difficulty in procuring copies of these instructive reports; but having been directed to apply to Dr Winchester, 42 Inverleith Row, Edinburgh, he kindly furnished me with them.

others, has greatly underrated the expense of the protracted academical education of a Presbyterian probationer. It is double that of the course of study required by the Church of England, or by her Nonconformist Churches. At the age of, say, 24 years, a young man is licensed to preach. Both for his own sake and that of the Church, it is not desirable that he should receive immediate ordination, even though that step be within his reach, which rarely happens. In the Free and Established Churches, the interval of anxious and sometimes over-protracted probation is a season of mitigated starvation, clerical employment being plentiful, whilst remuneration is rare and scanty. At length the patient, expectant probationer procures a settlement. If he belongs to the Free Church, he will very probably become the spiritual overseer of one of the 650 aid-receiving congregations, with £150 a-year, or much less. If he is a Church of Scotland licentiate, he may be ordained in one of the 400 congregations paying a stipend of less than £200 a-year. And let it be kept in mind that the Scottish Church cannot, like the English, hold out the goodly prospect of comfortable Canonries, Precentorships, Prebendal Stalls, far less of rich Deaneries or Bishoprics. Neither is she nearly so well favoured, in a pecuniary sense, as the legal faculty, some of whose eminent members have realised £8000 a-year by their practice, whilst many others of their brethren in good practice enjoy sheriffships yielding annually £600 or £800. Yet, if she had not been stripped of her lawful patrimony by the rapacity of the Scottish nobles, the stipends of some of the Scottish clergy might have nearly equalled those of the supreme Scottish judges.

How does an underpaid minister commence his pastoral career? The following graphic description by Dr Norman Macleod will furnish the best answer:—"Mr Wiseman [a supposed adviser] declares that the young minister must occupy the official residence provided him, and enter his manse. Well, then, how is he to pay his way for the year, and to put a few sticks of furniture into his empty house, to accommodate himself and servants, with probably a near relative to act as landlady? He applies, we shall suppose, in this emergency to an insurance office for a loan, say, of £400. To obtain this he has to insure his life for £800, to pay say £50 of the debt,

with five per cent. interest for eight years, and to pay also his insurance premium, say £16 per annum, with £7 odds to the widows' fund, thus leaving him during his first and most difficult years about £100 wherewith to meet all his year's expenses. His seat of Presbytery may be 15 miles off. His parish may be a large one, extending for several miles in length and breadth. Mr Wiseman tells him that he must keep a horse, to discharge his duties; and having a horse, he must keep a man to keep the horse; and having a 'minister's man,' he must keep ploughs, carts, and harrows, and work the glebe, in order, if possible, to keep the man. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) He is now in the fair way of becoming an able-bodied and most respectable pauper, for it is certain that at the end of the year his whole income will not average that of most good workmen, say 30s. per week. (Hear.) There is hardly one feature in this picture that was not true of myself when in my first parish—in which I laboured for five years—and I was in far more comfortable circumstances than many of my brethren. Once the spectre of debt, thus almost forced on him, trends upon the minister, it is apt to follow him and dog him for years."

At the Edinburgh meeting, Sir George Clerk, himself a large landowner, explained that the Teinds or Tithes did not belong to the proprietors of the soil. The property, which originally belonged to the Church, was estimated at one-fifth the value of the rental of the whole country. Two centuries ago, a scheme was adopted for the commutation of the Teinds. Instead of the minister collecting a tenth part of the fruits of the earth, which would have gradually amounted to a large sum, as the wealth and agricultural skill of the country increased, a maximum sum was fixed as the property of the Church. At present the Teind Court is empowered to grant, at intervals of twenty years, such augmentation of stipend as it may judge expedient. The remainder, or unappropriated Teinds, remains in the hands of the country gentlemen. Eight chalders of victual were fixed as a minimum stipend. Soon afterwards, a great number of these stipends were converted into a money-payment at the then value of the price of grain, the consequence being that, in future, they did not participate in any portion of the benefit that accrues from the increase of the value of corn.

TRACT THIRD.

Claim of Spiritual Independence.

Lay Patronage in the Church of Scotland Condemned—Conduct of the Free Church Leaders in the Anti-Patronage Movements—Household Suffrage—Collision between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts—Claim of Spiritual Independence—Dr Chalmers on the Indolence of the Church of Scotland in the Eighteenth Century—Mr E. S. Gordon, M.P., and the “Perthshire Advertiser,” quoted on Spiritual Independence—Real Cause of the Disruption Pamphlet by “Veritas.”

SINCE Lay Patronage was condemned by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1869 by 193 votes to 88, and again, more decisively, in 1870, by 241 votes to 68, it has become manifest that the difference between that Church and the other Presbyterian Churches is, in point of theory, greatly diminished. All profess their attachment to the same Confession of Faith, to the same system of Presbyterian Government, and, excepting the use of instrumental music, to the same plain and simple ritual. Such is the uniformity in these respects, that an intelligent Episcopalian or a Congregationalist may be present in each of these congregations on the same Sabbath, and remain ignorant of the fact that he has been worshipping successively in an Established Presbyterian Church, a Free Presbyterian Church, and an United Presbyterian Church. In the prospect of Patronage, the old wall or partition being hewn down by Parliament, responding to the petition of the Church and the people of Scotland, vigorous attempts have been made to erect another impassable wall between the Established Church and the Presbyterian Dissenters, namely, that of Spiritual Independence.

Impartial onlookers must have observed how some men and parties now regard certain claims which their own principles

should lead them to favour. When the Church of Scotland was engaged in the noble struggle for the vindication of popular ecclesiastical rights before the Disruption, the Non-Intrusionists appealed in vain to the Voluntaries, the professed descendants of the Erskines, who had found Patronage to be an intolerable burden. Unlike the Erskines, they had discovered Patronage to be an inseparable appendage of an Established Church, though the history of the Church might have taught them that, during the two periods of eleven years each in which Patronage was absolutely abolished, the Church had been peaceful, efficient, and prosperous. Nevertheless, they turned deaf ears to the pleadings of Dr Guthrie and Dr Candlish in Edinburgh, and of Dr Buchanan and the Rev. William Arnot in Glasgow. These gentlemen maintained that unlimited Patronage was a serious hindrance to any Church, endowed or unendowed. Thirty years have passed since they delivered those speeches, and preferred those claims. Whilst it would be irrelevant to inquire whether they were warranted in all the measures adopted to vindicate those claims, it is undeniable that the Voluntaries, as well as the Moderates, made no exertion to avert the collision with the Civil Courts. The old Anti-Patronage cry has again been raised.* Has any one of these champions of popular privileges in the old establishment expressed one word of sympathy with the renewed popular agitation for the abolition of Patronage? Has the space of thirty years converted a blessing into a bane? Are the members of the Established Church less qualified to choose their own pastor, or to discern spiritual gifts? Has not household suffrage become the law of the land? Is not every householder entitled to elect or reject a candidate at every dissolution of Parliament, which occurs at an average interval of four years? Does it not stand to sound reason that he should have a voice in selecting his spiritual

* At the annual meeting of the Edinburgh City Members with their constituents, held in December, 1870, I ventured to ask if they would vote for the abolition of Patronage. Mr Miller, who is a Free Church elder, at once answered Yes. Mr M'Laren's answer was defective in his usual perspicacity. He appeared to see some incongruity between endowments and popular elections, as if the Church were asking for something to which she was not entitled, or as if she had not been robbed by the Infidel Bolingbroke. Does Mr M'Laren not see that he is borrowing an objection from his opponents?

teacher, by whom he and his household are to be bound by a stronger and holier tie than that of political representation? Feeling the force of these reasons, though not openly confessed, the Free Church leaders and their United Presbyterian coadjutors have combined to raise the cry of Spiritual Independence. The cry is specious. Independence is a much-coveted boon. Every man prizes it, and likes to be independent of his neighbour, and perhaps superior to him. Spirituality is also a specious term, as implying elevation of soul, contempt of things temporal, and a yearning for higher than earthly enjoyments. Surely, then, Spiritual Independence must be a firm basis of reunion among all the non-established Presbyterian Churches, to the exclusion of the Established Church.

If this principle, or alleged principle, were of vital importance, and peculiar to Dissenting Churches, and if it were strictly defined, easily intelligible, and practically applicable, it would merit the importance which its admirers have attached to it. Let us examine this exclusive claim of Spiritual Independence. It first occurs to me to remark that, before the Disruption, the Voluntaries stoutly opposed this claim, and treated it with the utmost contumely, as a baseless assertion of priestly authority, subversive of civil government and popular rights. I challenge any one to deny the accuracy of my statement, which can be confirmed by a reference to the published speeches of the most authoritative Voluntaries of those times. Here, again, they exceeded the Moderates, in holding up to derision the very name of Spiritual Independence. Secondly, it must not be forgotten, that this claim arose out of the struggles of the Church Courts for the modification of Patronage, when the national mind was violently agitated by keen debates in the Ecclesiastical Courts, by impassioned harangues in public meetings, by the evident determination of some Patrons to set at nought the reasonable wishes of the Christian people, and by the dogged refusal of some of the Moderate leaders and shortsighted statesmen to listen to their counsels when reconciliation was possible. Thirdly, it is indisputable that certain individuals, in various Churches, have mixed up with the demand of Spiritual Independence, pretensions involving such breach of solemn contracts as to raise alarm and suspicion in the minds

of all who love justice and mercy. What, then, is the nature and extent of the legitimate Spiritual Independence appertaining to a Christian Church in Scotland? Have the Civil Courts evinced any perceptible desire to intermeddle with the internal government of the Church of Scotland during her history of three centuries? That she has been too often betrayed, and her dearest interests sacrificed to indolence, cupidity, and worldliness, is at once conceded. But by whom? Let Dr Chalmers answer:—"The Church of Scotland was herself the author of that woeful degeneration which took place in the eighteenth century. It was not patronage singly which brought the withering regimen of Moderatism into our Establishment. It was the Church which arbitrated unrighteously between the patrons and the populace."

Confining our attention to the relations of the Church of Scotland to the Civil Courts at the present time, where do we find the encroachments of the Civil Courts? Do they interfere with the admission of members to the Communion—with the dispensation of baptism—with the education and licensing of students—or with the trial of heretical and immoral ministers? Will any man duly versed in the ecclesiastical history of Scotland deny that, if the Presbyteries of the Church had bestowed proper attention on the training of her students, and had refused to license candidates who were glaringly unworthy of the office, the Erskines might never have felt it to be their duty to quit the Church of their fathers, and the Disruption might have been a word unknown in the annals of the Church of Scotland? In all the essential elements of real Spiritual Independence, then, the Church of Scotland is on an equal footing with Dissenting Churches. I go a step further, and maintain that, as she possesses a jurisdiction recognised by Acts of Parliament, she possesses even greater liberty. As Mr E. S. Gordon, M.P., has said—"Our Established Church is possessed of a recognised jurisdiction, under Acts of Parliament, with very extensive and exclusive powers. On the other hand, what is the position of Non-Established Churches? Their rights depend entirely on contract; and whenever a dispute arises, the party who maintains a claim under their contract is entitled to take them to the Court of Session. The Courts are then entitled to examine

the contract; and if they are of opinion that the contract has been violated, and civil rights have been affected, the Court of Session will be entitled to interfere, and enforce these civil rights. Therefore, the non-Established Churches in this country are just as open to the interference, on the part of the Court, as the Established Churches are. . . . I do not say this in the least, either in the way of throwing any disparagement on our brethren who belong to the non-Established Churches, or for the purpose of exciting any alarm as to the terms upon which they hold their rights. I am merely stating it with the view of pointing out the distinction between the General Assembly possessing a jurisdiction recognised by Acts of Parliament and those Churches whose rights depend merely on contract.”*

Here we have a luminous exposition of the facts of the case and the law of the land, by an eminent Advocate, whose exertions to obtain the abolition of Patronage and the reconstruction of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland on a sound, unsectarian, and comprehensive basis, might be advantageously followed by many lukewarm ministers of his own communion. I may remind the reader of my strictures on the action of the Free Church in the Cardross case, many years after the Disruption.† None of the parties implicated in that famous and intricate transaction has ever attempted to deny my assertions, and no critic has assumed their task by proxy. Such is the danger of confounding a private grudge with a public ecclesiastical grievance. To quote the words of my able reviewer, in the “Perthshire Advertiser”—“Properly regarded, the much maligned Cardross case was a protest in favour of civil liberty and salutary ecclesiastical Independence. The claim of Dr Buchanan in the west, and Dr Candlish in the east, when rightly analysed, was simply the assertion of a Divine right to do wrong, on the ground that, to them, it seemed right. At the root of every legal system there are certain rules of natural equity which demand and receive universal respect. They are of the essence of social order. They are the basis of social right. The triumph of their antagonists is revolution.

* See “Chronicle of the General Assembly of 1870,” for Mr Gordon’s speech on Presbyterian Union.

† See “Future Church of Scotland,” p. 89-93.

No vapouring about the Headship of Christ—no assertion of the dominance of conscience—no pretence of spiritual authority—will avail to extenuate, much less to justify their infraction. So long as men, whatever be their calling, are human beings and live in society, their acts must be regarded as human and fallible, and approved or condemned by society according to the consequences they are calculated to produce. No assumption of spiritual authority can suspend the action of legal institutions. The civil judges must be the supreme determiners of what is legal or illegal, otherwise there is an *imperium in imperio*, which is anarchy. Contracts must be sacred and enforced, or the right of property would become a name. Bargains obstructing the administration of justice must be radically void, else oppression, extortion, or confiscation might be perpetrated with impunity. Social liberty, in every relation, has certain bounds, prescribed implicitly by the law, even when not expressed. Such were the principles which Mr Macmillan asserted in opposition to the contention of his opponents, that they were not responsible for their actions, as Free Church officials, to the Civil Courts, and that, as having a right to construe their own contracts, they could pronounce what appeared to the judges in such courts to be a most flagrant breach of bargain, an act in conformity with the law of Christ. The judges in the Court of Session repudiated these principles without any hesitation, and affirmed the obligation laid upon them by society of deciding what contracts were legal, and whether, if legal, any particular contract submitted to them had been observed. At the same time, they decided that bodies of religionists united for purposes of fellowship and devotion would be protected in the exercise of their faith and the possession of their property, and that their rules of association would be respected and enforced by the civil power, in so far as they did not interfere with the constitutional principles of right and liberty. The writer of this able volume refers to the Cardross case, as not only exhibiting the true position of the Free and Voluntary Churches, but also of showing the policy of union with the Establishment, in respect that the latter has all the liberty of these Churches, and something more. Its courts are really such. Their members have a jurisdiction positively independent of the civil tribunals.

While, upon relevant allegations of wrong, the ordinary judicatories are bound to inquire not merely into the regularity of the procedure, but also into the merits of cases of discipline in Voluntary Churches, the judgments pronounced in the courts of the Established can only be quashed or altered in respect of manifest informalities resulting in tangible injury and loss to the sufferer.”*

It may not be out of place to add a few words respecting a question now frequently mooted, What was the cause of the Disruption? Was it the demand for the abolition of Patronage, or for the concession of Spiritual Independence? I answer distinctly, that the people clamoured for a potential voice in the nomination of their pastors. Patronage they felt to be a real grievance, and an infraction on their patrimonial rights. Spiritual Independence, again, was a more novel and less tangible claim, involving some nice points connected with co-ordinate jurisdiction, not easily intelligible to ordinary minds. There can be no doubt that the assertion of Spiritual Independence would never have been made but for the frustration of the demands for the abolition of Patronage. At the same time, I frankly admit that, among a certain portion of the Non-Intrusion Ministers, Spiritual Independence was a weightier consideration, and, since the Disruption, they have given some unpleasant indications that it possesses for them strong attractions, even though the privileges of the Christian people should be curtailed. That the Civil Courts are fond of intermeddling with strictly spiritual questions is utterly untrue. On the contrary, they have a decided aversion to them, as demanding an amount of study and research foreign to their province. For the accuracy of this assertion, Lord Ardmillan will, doubtless, be a ready voucher.†

* I have talked with many Free Churchmen who now entertain grave doubts whether Mr Macmillan was wrong in his action.

† See a recent pamphlet by “Veritas,” entitled “The Church of Scotland and the Free Church: their Relation to Patronage, Spiritual Independence, and the Civil Courts,” Glasgow: James Maclehose, 1870. The writer, a Glasgow Solicitor, as I understand, comments very severely on the conduct of Dr Buchanan and Dr Candlish, challenging them to account for it. Both are equally able and willing to answer an assailant who is in the wrong. But the Solicitor had chosen his ground skilfully. Dr Buchanan, too, is an adept in logical fence, and is surpassed by few in ecclesiastical disputation. He did not deem it prudent to answer “Veritas.”

TRACT FOURTH.

Origin and Progress of Scottish Voluntariyism.

Dr Andrew Marshall's Voluntary Sermon—Emancipation of the Irish Roman Catholics—Voluntary Agitation in Scotland—Dr Marshall's Ten Objections to Civil Establishments of Religion Reviewed in the "Christian Instructor"—Dr Marshall's Reply to the Reviewer—Disruption of 1843—Dr Marshall quits the United Presbyterian Church—Failure of Action to eject him from his Church—Application for Admission into the Free Church refused—Decline of his Reputation among his Voluntary Allies—Isolation and Death—Dr Buchanan's Lecture against Voluntariyism—His Eulogy on Dr Gibson—His Strong Repudiation of Voluntary Principles—Lord Ardmillan's Apology for Voluntaries—Rev. Alexander Anderson's "Voluntary Principle Vindicated"—His Censure of the Union Committee's Articles of Agreement—United Presbyterian Synod's inaction.

WITH much truth has the Duke of Argyll observed that the history of a Church is the best exposition of its principles. Similarly it will often hold good that the life of a public man will convey to posterity a more adequate conception of his doctrines and character than is derived from his speeches or writings. Hence the charm attaching to the biographies of great and good men, especially when executed by competent hands. Some readers may need to be reminded that the principal originator of the Voluntary controversy in Scotland was the Rev. Dr Andrew Marshall,* of Kirkintilloch, whose sermon, preached in Greyfriars' United Secession Church, Glasgow, on October 14, 1829, produced a deep sensation among the unendowed Scottish denominations. "In the same year," says the author of the "Scotch Kirk," "when the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed, 1829, Dr Andrew Marshall, of Kirkintilloch, a Secession minister, published a sermon under

* I am aware that the Rev. Mr Graham, of Newcastle, and the Rev. Mr Ballantyne, of Stonehaven, wrote in favour of Voluntariyism at a much earlier period, but they raised no controversy.

the title of 'Ecclesiastical Establishments Considered.' This timely deliverance fell on the excited mind in Scotland like a spark among tinder, and straightway kindled the well-known Voluntary controversy, which blazed over the land during those years—say, from 1829 to 1834—and precipitated those movements within the Establishment which led, in the next decade, to the Disruption and the creation of the Free Church."

The epoch was favourable to the propagation and reception of extreme theories and sweeping changes. In Ireland a furious agitation had extorted, in the Imperial Parliament, the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act by the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel—an Act which, though in itself just, has never produced the extension of Protestantism, so ardently desired and so confidently predicted by many of its Protestant supporters; whilst Roman Catholic loyalty, which might have been anticipated with greater confidence, has been displayed in rather fitful and suspicious forms. Then came the second French Revolution, which drove Charles the Tenth from his ancestral throne, and the Reform Bill of 1832, which invested the middle classes with the governing power in the State. Extravagant hopes, soon to be dispelled, were cherished respecting these Bills. Ireland was to become peaceable, industrious, and loyal. Orangemen and Ribbonmen were to break up their lodges, and to tear up their flags. Within the excellent National Schools organised by the late Earl of Derby, would be instructed Roman Catholic children and Protestant children, who, on reaching manhood, would practise the lessons of Christian charity inculcated in their common class books. In England and Scotland, too, the Reform Bill, a wise and necessary measure, was lauded to the skies, not only as saving the country from a revolution, but as certain to banish discontent, to enfranchise industry, and to feed the famishing millions in the large manufacturing towns. The rotten boroughs had been deprived of their elective monopolies. Daniel Whittle Harvey had held up to merited scorn the bloated Pension List. Joseph Hume was, with rare patience and persistency, inculcating economy in the expenditure of the national finances. The gross abuse of the enormous revenues of the Protestant

Episcopal Hierarchy, who were a scandal to the Church, were exposed to the scorn of an indignant nation. Amid so much craving for change, it was natural that the Church of Scotland should be also assailed. She found an assailant in Dr Andrew Marshall, a man of powerful talents, of great moral courage, and of unquestionable integrity in doctrine and life. When I was a boy-student in Edinburgh University—Dr Marshall occasionally visited that city to deliver powerful and argumentative Voluntary speeches. I heard him frequently in South College Street Relief (now United Presbyterian) Church, then occupied by the Rev. Dr French, and now by the Rev. J. Mitchell Harvey. Dr Marshall I repeatedly heard; and even now I remember him well—a short, broad-chested man, with a forehead broad and high; very argumentative after his fashion; quite convinced of the justice of his cause as well as of the soundness of his arguments; evidently possessed of great strength of will, and of unquestionable moral earnestness. Assuredly he was a formidable debater.

Dr Marshall's sermon was extensively circulated and eagerly perused. An active agitation was instantly set afoot. Voluntary meetings were convened all over Scotland, followed by the formation of Voluntary associations, with presidents, and secretaries, and treasurers, and funds for promoting the overthrow of the Established Church. Voluntary newspapers were started, and a Voluntary magazine, edited by Dr Marshall, was published for many years, to counteract the effects of the "Church of Scotland Magazine," conducted by Dr Gibson. As Dr Marshall's sermon is inaccessible to the great majority of those who accept and of those who reject Voluntaryism as their ecclesiastical creed, it may be doing both classes a service to analyse its contents. It was reviewed at great length, and with considerable severity in the "Christian Instructor," not by Dr Thomson, the editor, but, as is commonly believed, by the Rev. James (now Dr) Lewis, lately of Free St John's Church, Leith, and now minister of the Free Church in Rome. Let me introduce the preacher and the reviewer.

Dr Marshall condemns religious establishments for ten reasons.

First, "A religious establishment," he argues, "cannot be necessary for propagating the Gospel, or for maintaining it,

because there is no reference to any such thing among the institutions of Christ." This is a plausible stock argument of the Voluntaries, and is apparently based on Holy Scripture. Mr Lewis answers that Scripture contains no command against religious establishments; that it enjoins no legal provision for the poor, which is surely a Christian duty; that it never refers to the Solemn League and Covenant, though that Covenant was eminently conducive to the purity of the Church; and that the Christian religion, worthy of the wisdom of its Author, is a religion, not of details, but of principles.

Secondly, Dr Marshall contends that "a religious Establishment cannot be necessary for propagating the gospel, or for maintaining it, because there is no trace of any such thing in the early history of the Church." This argument also seems cogent, but will hardly bear close scrutiny. After remarking that the circumstances of the Church are changed, Mr Lewis comes to close quarters with his assailant. Christianity is universally admitted to be purified by the fires of persecution. Does Dr Marshall, therefore, court persecution, and provoke the hostility of the civil power? In addition to persecution, the miracles accompanying the preaching of the gospel powerfully aided its propagation. Dr Marshall is reminded that, after all, prior to the era of the civil recognition of Christianity by the Emperor Constantine in the fourth century, only a few of the great cities had been visited by the light of the gospel, these being the capitals of provinces, and the emporiums of merchandise; that the great body of the Roman people followed their ancient superstitions; and that Paganism was still the prevalent religion. As to the objection that corruptions crept into the Church after its establishment by Constantine, Mr Lewis maintains that, before his time, she carried about with her the seeds of corruption. Ignorance had begun to quench the light of knowledge, paving the way for superstition. Monasticism, by substituting the forms for the spirit of religion, had introduced penances and mortifications, whilst a false philosophy, imported from the Grecian schools, and grafted in Christianity by the ingenious Origen, had corrupted the simplicity of the primitive faith. "No error, however, is more common in historical reasoning than connecting events as cause and effect,

which only accidentally agree in time, as if every two men who happened to walk abreast in the street were necessarily father and son. That the corruption of Christianity was contemporaneous with her establishment no more proves that it was the result of it, than the fact that on the day in which a man happened to fall heir to an estate he sickened and died, would prove that his good fortune was the cause of his death." In connexion with the civil recognition of Christianity by Constantine, it may be added that he discountenanced the practices of the old religion of Rome; abolished the punishment of the cross; ordered the children of destitute parents to be fed at the cost of the State; promoted the emancipation of slaves in the Christian Churches without the interference of the civil magistrate; protected the poor when persecuted by rich oppressors; abolished the punishment of flagellation inflicted on defaulters in the payment of taxes; introduced improvements into the discipline of the prisons; repealed the old laws against celibacy; forbade concubinage formerly sanctioned by the Roman laws; prohibited nocturnal assemblies, and various obscene rites of Paganism; enacted the observance of the Lord's Day, and prohibited work on that day; abolished the brutal combats of the gladiators; and ordered that the convicts, who were formerly compelled to fight against them or against the wild beasts, should be employed in working the mines. Thomas de Quincey points out very emphatically how Constantine, the earliest of Christian princes, achieved what Paganism had never attempted. Founding on the Scripture warrant that the poor should never cease from the land, he "conferred upon misery, as a mighty potentate dwelling for ever in the streets of populous cities, the privilege of appearing by a representative and a spokesman in the council chambers of the empire." Here is his description of the great Roman orator and philosopher:—"Our wicked friend Cicero, for instance, who *was* so bad, but *wrote* so well, who *did* such naughty things, but *said* such pretty things, has himself noticed in one of his letters, with petrifying coolness, that he knew of destitute old women in Rome who went without tasting food for one, two, or even three days. After making such a statement, did Cicero not tumble down stairs and break at least three of his legs in his

hurry to call a public meeting for the redressing of so cruel a grievance? Not he: the man continued to strut up and down his library, in a toga as big as the 'Times' newspaper, singing over—

'Cedant arma togæ : concedant laurea laudi.'

And if Cicero noticed the case at all, it was only as a fact that might be interesting to natural philosophers in speculations on the theory of a *plenum* and a *vacuum*, or to the Greek physician investigating the powers of the human stomach, or to the connoisseurs in old women. No drachma or denarius, be well assured, ever left the secret lockers or hidden fobs of this discreet barrister upon so kind a commission as that of carrying consolation to a superfluous old woman, not enjoying so much as the *jus suffragii*.*

Thirdly, Dr Marshall holds that "a religious establishment is at best a human device, and considered as a human device, it is chargeable with impropriety." Mr Lewis shows that this proposition is merely the negative statement of the first, reiterated in different language; and that the preaching of the gospel, the celebration of the Christian ordinances, and even the Scriptures themselves, are but instruments in the work of Christianisation, which must be quite unavailing without the influence of that Spirit who alone creates the clean heart, and implants the principle of a spiritual life.

Fourthly and fifthly, Dr Marshall asserts that "a religious establishment seems at variance with justice, and must be pronounced impolitic." Mr Lewis answers these objections at great length, remarking, that arguments founded on the abstract rights of man are commonly futile; that many of our political institutions, admitted to be practically useful, are monstrous innovations on the principles of abstract justice; and that, although men choose to be ignorant, the State does not treat them with injustice when they are compelled to pay for their instruction and reformation, however they may refuse to profit by the means which it provides. Admitting, with Dr Marshall,

* See De Quincey's Works, vol. vii., article "Protestantism." See also Dr Gibson's able essay, commonly styled the Constantine Pamphlet. Francis William Newman, in his "Phases of Faith," and Henry Rogers, in his "Eclipse of Faith," treat of the same subject, though, of course, on different sides.

that all religious denominations are alike entitled to the protection of Government, Mr Lewis denies that they are all equally entitled to its favour. The favour enjoyed by the parish schools and Universities trench as much on the abstract rights of private teachers as that extended to an Established Church. Dr Marshall was a thorough hater of Popery, and believed that its withering influence must be best checked by the diffusion of Voluntaryism. Let him speak for himself:—“Adopt these principles, and the ambition of Popery is at an end—its efforts are paralysed—its hopes are cut off—and, viewed as a religious system, it must quickly become, of all others, the least considerable, because, of all others, it has the least support from reason or from Scripture. That these principles might be before the eyes of his countrymen, in the event of such a crisis occurring (the struggle of Popery for the ascendancy), as he has supposed, is the main reason that has induced the author to allow this discourse, with all its imperfections, to be printed.” Comment on this passage is superfluous. More than twenty years after Dr Marshall’s death the Protestant Church of Ireland was disestablished. Nearly two years have gone since that measure was passed. It is no business of mine to vindicate or condemn it. With some redeeming features, the Irish Protestant Establishment was chargeable with many defects and a few scandals. But has its disestablishment fulfilled the sanguine expectations of Dr Marshall? Has Irish Popery become more tolerant? Are its priests less offensive or more grateful? Does Cardinal Paul Cullen relax in his insolent demands that the Government shall place the education of the Irish people under his exclusive control?

Sixthly, Dr Marshall thinks that “a religious Establishment has a tendency to secularise the Church of Christ—to bring it into conformity with the kingdoms of this world—giving it much of the appearance, and what is worse, much of the spirit of a political institution.” In contrasting the purity of Dissenting Churches with the corruption of the Established, he indulges in strongly figurative language:—“The Church of Christ, [that is, the Church of United Secession, or of other Dissenters,] is a holy temple, the dwelling-place of the God of Israel, where His glory is seen—where His presence is vouch-

safed—and where He is worshipped acceptably with reverence and godly fear.” She is the pillar and ground of the truth—a solid structure of heavenly workmanship. The Church of the Establishment is a temple profaned by “the uncircumcised and the unclean.” While the former is “the bride, the Lamb’s wife,” the latter is “the woman whose name is Mystery, and who has in her hand a golden cup full of bitterness and abominations.” Under this sixth head, Dr Marshall strongly condemns what reflecting and enlightened Voluntaries of the present day have recently adopted—the advantage of the territorial system, in other words, the division of the country into parishes. Nevertheless, his objection to the territorial system still finds some advocates among irrational and impracticable Voluntaries. Such persons are reminded by Mr Lewis, that the efforts of Dissenters, however disinterested in their aim, must always be partial in their results, and that, inadequate as their provision is to meet the necessities of a whole country, their system of distribution diminishes still more the little which they possess. Probably Mr Lewis was not aware, of what Dr Marshall must have heard, that one section of Dr Marshall’s own United Secession Church, namely, the Anti-Burghers, had actually recognised the territorial system thirty or forty years before the publication of his sermon. At that time, the Rev. Dr Muter and the Rev. Dr Mitchell were the only Anti-Burgher ministers in Glasgow, Dr Muter’s church being situated in Duke Street, and Dr Mitchell’s in Cheapside Street, Anderston, then a township distinct from Glasgow. Dr Muter stuck so firmly to his rights, that no Anti-Burgher residing east of Jamaica Street, the boundary of their respective districts, was allowed to become a member of Dr Mitchell’s, who was the younger and more popular preacher. I am informed by a United Presbyterian minister in Glasgow, the son of an Anti-Burgher minister, that hundreds of persons who applied to Dr Mitchell for membership were courteously told by him that he had no authority to receive them. Dr Mitchell’s sons, who occupy high legal positions in Glasgow, and Dr Robson, Dr Mitchell’s colleague and successor in Wellington Street Church, will be able to test the correctness of the allegation.

Seventhly, Dr Marshall maintains that “a religious Establish-

ment sets aside altogether a positive ordinance of the Saviour—that ordinance in which He has appointed the members of the Church to provide, by their free-will offerings, for the support of its institutions.” In advancing this proposition, he quotes two Scripture texts frequently adduced in the Voluntary controversy:—“If we have sown to you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap from you carnal things?” “Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things.” “A religious Establishment,” argues Dr Marshall, “sets aside a positive ordinance of the Saviour—that ordinance in which He has appointed the members of the Church to provide, by their free-will offerings, for the support of its institutions.” Mr Lewis quietly answers, that Dr Marshall must have drawn largely on his inventive powers. Remonstrances had been made, and complaints reiterated, that the Establishment drew too largely on the public funds, but it was a novel charge that it forbade the exercise of Christian liberality. So far from setting aside a positive ordinance of our Saviour, it provides against such a violation of his commands, by securing a permanent support to that religion which He Himself founded, and commissioned to be spread through the whole earth. Mr Lewis concedes that the time may come when the liberality of Christians shall supersede the liberality of the State; when the avarice, selfishness, or indifference of men shall no longer refuse to religion that portion of their substance which its necessities demand; and when they shall give as freely as they now eagerly withhold, and shall be as prodigal of their wealth in the service of God as they now are in squandering it upon the gratification of their own passions. Till that happy period shall arrive, Mr Lewis is reluctant to part with a religious Establishment.

Eighthly, Dr Marshall professes that “the compulsory provision for the clergy makes a religious Establishment be felt as a burden.” To Voluntaries of the present day, who are continually asserting, with reason, that the Teinds or Tithes are national property, Dr Marshall’s position must appear startling. “Let it not be said,” he exclaims, “that the provision for the clergy, Tithes or Teinds, is the property of the State. Let it not be said that the landholders, who pay those Tithes or those

Teinds, are only the almoners of the State." That the Teinds do not belong to the landowners is now so generally acknowledged, both by Dissenters and Churchmen, that no explanation is needed to remove Dr Marshall's misconceptions.

Ninthly, Dr Marshall appeals to experience: "A religious Establishment is insufficient." In proof of this proposition, he instances the Highlands of Scotland. Mr Lewis obviates this objection by mentioning the simple fact, that the moral wilderness in those regions was due, not to a religious Establishment, but to the want of an Establishment adequate to the necessities of the country. He might have added that, a few years before Dr Marshall delivered his sermon, Dr John Brown, of Edinburgh, had preached and published an earnest appeal to the government to plant additional places of worship in these very Highlands. Mr Lewis's notices of the functions in an Established Church appear to be so just and reasonable, that both Churchmen and Voluntaries may profit by the perusal of them:—"If the problem were proposed to us, What is the best possible expedient for Christianising a country? we should answer, An Establishment that is commensurate in its extent with the natural boundaries of the country, and which allots to each pastor a limited field of operation, with a guardianship of sectarians, hovering upon the borders of each parish, and ready, so soon as the clergyman sleeps upon his post, to enter and shake him out of his slumber, or take possession of his hearers. We would have a system of means corresponding with the greatness of the end, and a system of superintendence to take cognizance of their legitimate direction. In a word, we would assign to the Dissenters the office of *auditing the accounts of the Establishment.*"

Tenthly, Dr Marshall concludes with remarking, that "a religious Establishment is proved to be unnecessary." In confirmation of this statement, he alludes to the revivals of religion in the United States of America as an evidence of spiritual life and activity. Mr Lewis might have referred with equal confidence to the revivals in Cambuslang and Kilsyth in the last century. He prefers to contend that partial revivals in any country indicate a previous general decay. In fact, the number and frequency of local revivals cannot be safely counted

upon as trustworthy evidence of the comparative efficiency of the Established and Dissenting systems. There may be found, in every evangelical denomination, ministers and laymen of the highest character, that look with distrust on such manifestations, especially when aroused and controlled by strangers whose history is unknown to their hearers, and who do not scruple at mingling with their reckless expositions occasional sneers at the unfaithfulness of the regular ministers.*

Such is a brief digest of this duel on the claims and merits of Voluntaryism. Dr Marshall, however, was neither convinced nor satisfied. He is said to have taken umbrage at Dr Thomson's delegating the review of his sermon to so young a defender of Establishments as Mr Lewis. Accordingly, he addressed to Dr Thomson a small volume of 175 pages, replying to his reviewer's criticism of his ten propositions, and complaining of the petulance betrayed in those criticisms. To follow him a second time would be tedious and uninteresting, yet it must be confessed that he retaliates on his assailant with great vigour and severity. Few readers, however, will agree with him in thinking that David Hume, the historian, was as wise a man as Dr Chalmers, or that a legal provision for the poor violates a divine command. On the other hand, many will concur in his conjecture that, if the Teinds were diverted from the maintenance of religious ordinances, they would probably "be absorbed in a quarter where they would be of little or no use to the cause of religion." Dr Chalmers and Dr Marshall heartily agreed in preferring the relief of the poor by officers of the Christian Church to that doled out by such Poor-

* In my "Future Church of Scotland," I adverted to the countenance shown by many Free Churchmen to itinerant revivalists of doubtful antecedents and high pretensions. Within three months after its publication, a noted English revivalist was convicted in a civil court of a very heinous offence, aggravated by deliberate and repeated perjury. The evidence against him was irresistible. He is a man of uncultivated mind and strong passions. He has announced his intention of resuming his services, and of revisiting Edinburgh, where he had a goodly number of followers and admirers, with some highly respectable Presbyterian patrons. How the Cheshire rabble exulted over his fall and exposure! About ten years ago, a very vulgar and self-confident American revivalist made a great noise in Glasgow, and was largely patronised by a certain class of Free Churchmen, whom he gradually disgusted by his violence and self-glorification, though I am not aware that he was convicted of any gross immorality.

law guardians. Two years before the death of Dr Chalmers, and twelve years before that of Dr Marshall, Scotland witnessed the extension to Scotland of a Poor-law, which was imperatively required, mainly because the various Secessions from the Church of Scotland had so curtailed her resources, that she was no longer able to feed the hungry and clothe the naked in the land.

Let us overlook sixteen years, and examine the ecclesiastical transactions of the year 1845. During that critical interval, Scotland had witnessed many violent and startling vicissitudes. Within the Establishment there had arisen a loud and righteous protest against Lay-Patronage, followed by a more questionable assertion of Spiritual Independence, a lamentable collision between the Civil Courts and the Ecclesiastical, and finally, in 1843, a great Disruption or Secession, which rent the Church in twain. In 1845, Dr Marshall believed that his own denomination had become tainted with heresy, and that of her four Professors of Theology two, not the least illustrious—Dr John Brown of Edinburgh, and Dr Robert Balmer of Berwick-on-Tweed—taught unscriptural doctrines on the Atonement. Dr Brown and Dr Balmer stood high in the estimation of their brethren as masters in the United Secession Israel: Dr Brown was a profound Biblical expositor; Dr Balmer was a philosophical theologian of Dugald Stewart's school: both were popular preachers and saintly divines. To impeach the orthodoxy of such men was an invidious and perilous task. Dr Andrew Marshall, however, was a pre-eminently courageous man. Accordingly, he libelled the two Professors for heresy, being seconded by the late Dr James Hay of Kinross,—a minister of great weight in the United Secession Church. After a painful and lengthened trial, the Professors were acquitted by large majorities, varying on the several counts of the indictment. Dr Marshall's position had now become very uncomfortable, since he was minister in a Voluntary denomination which had tolerated in its pulpits and Professors' Chairs what he had impeached as false teaching. In the year 1847, when the union between the Secession and Relief Churches was consummated, matters must have assumed a gloomier aspect, for he quitted the Church of his fathers,

retaining his place of worship and the majority of his congregation; and an attempt to eject him by a process in the Court of Session signally failed.

The remainder of Dr Marshall's ministerial career is curiously interesting and instructive. Feeling, doubtless, his isolated position to be painful, he applied for admission to the Constitutional Synod of Seceders (Old Light Anti-Burghers), without success. What was his next step? Very few persons now living can tell, and, as far as I know, it has never appeared in print. Most men who are interested in the history of Voluntariyism, and in the negotiations of the present Union Committee will read with attention, perhaps with incredulity, this narrative of Dr Marshall's procedure. Having failed to make terms with the rigid Old Light Anti-Burghers, he called on Dr Gibson, then minister at Kingston Free Church, and clerk to the Free Presbytery of Glasgow, to whom he signified his wish to be admitted to the ministry of the Free Church. Dr Gibson officially laid the request before the Presbytery, which appointed a committee to confer with Dr Marshall. Several meetings were held, and, as might be expected, particular reference was made to his Voluntary principles. He conceded this much to his interrogators, that he would not trouble the Free Church with his Voluntaryism, and he even stated that he saw no objections to the endowment of churches in the Highlands, Islands, and other poor and thinly-inhabited districts in Scotland. But these concessions were of no avail. He was required to make "a formal and public recantation of Voluntaryism;" and among the prominent members of the committee were Dr Robert Buchanan and Dr James Henderson, who are now seeking a union with the United Presbyterian Voluntaries. Old and dispirited as Dr Marshall was, he could not brook such an indignity; consequently, he withdrew his application. In imposing this condition on Dr Marshall, Dr Buchanan was either interpreting the Confession rightly or was not. On the former supposition, he admitted that it contains the Establishment principle, which he now denies. On the latter supposition, he was adding to the thirty-three articles of the Confession a thirty-fourth of his own imposition.

Another attempt was made, though not formally, by Dr Marshall to connect himself with a Presbyterian Church. The only other unendowed Presbyterian body in Scotland was the Reformed Presbyterian or Cameronian Church, then noted not only for its strict Calvinistic theology and rigid discipline, but for forbidding its members to take oaths of allegiance to the Hanoverian dynasty, because at the Revolution of 1688 William of Orange declined to renew the Solemn League and Covenant of 1638. There is no evidence that Dr Marshall made overtures to the Cameronians, but I have satisfactory reasons for believing that he sounded a neighbouring parish minister respecting his admission into the Establishment. That minister, who cherished a deep admiration for the Voluntary leader's orthodox theology and Christian character, consulted some influential members of the Glasgow Presbytery; but the application was coldly received, and Dr Marshall died in 1854, out of communion with any Presbyterian Christian Church.

Although the preceding statement of facts may not be palatable to Voluntaries, I have deemed it right to detail them. It is amusing to contrast their estimates of Dr Marshall at the two eventful stages of his life. As the redoubted Voluntary, he was a great thinker, an enlightened reformer, a logical reasoner, an eloquent orator, a valiant assailant of the corruptions in Church and State. After he libelled Dr Brown and Dr Balmer, how cheap was his reputation among his former allies! They now discovered him to be a bigot in theology, an accuser of the brethren, a renegade from Voluntaryism, a dotard in intellect, a man destitute of all claims to admiration or respect. Yet this was a man whom the Voluntaries had extolled as the trusty leader of their phalanx in the Voluntary controversy, when his name was a tower of strength to his admiring partisans. No sooner had he forsaken their ranks, than the Goliath became an ordinary and not very trustworthy individual. No longer were his abilities and services trumpeted in Voluntary newspapers and on Voluntary platforms. During the closing years of his chequered life, his old coadjutors renounced his friendship, Dr Gibson proving his fastest friend. Such was the history of the ablest and most intrepid assailant of Scottish Voluntaryism. The end of the

great Voluntary champion was nigh. From a brief obituary, written probably by an old, though latterly estranged ally, I extract the following lines:—"Dr Andrew Marshall died November 26th, 1854, in the 75th year of his age and 53rd of his ministry. It was his honour to be the originator and most prominent champion of the movement which produced so deep and so widespread agitation of the public mind—which has already occasioned unexpected unions and more unexpected disruptions—which may be suspended, but must not be abandoned, and which, when it is resumed, must be prosecuted till, in Scotland at least, the Church is free. . . . It was to be deplored, not on his own account only, that he should have been alienated in his declining years from a communion in which so much of his life had been spent, and in which his learning and character were so highly appreciated. He has now renewed his fellowship with the dearest friends of his youth and manhood in a land where the Atonement is not the subject of debate, but the burden of an everlasting song."*

I have seldom read a more lucid and cogent defence of National Church Establishments than is found in a lecture, consisting of thirteen pages. This lecture was the first of a course delivered in Glasgow during the year 1835, and is devoted to an exposition of the "Nature and Importance of the Question at issue." It is not my business to justify the harsh charges launched by the lecturer against his Voluntary antagonists, such as, that "they are violators of the Tenth Commandment;"† that "the denial by the Voluntaries of the right of the Civil Magistrate to extend religion involves an impious libel upon the wisdom of God;"‡ that "a Volun-

* A Free Church minister who was present at Dr Marshall's funeral, and who is now well stricken in years, has related to me an incident worthy of mention. Among the number who had come to Kirkintilloch to see his remains consigned to the tomb was an old minister, who had come from Edinburgh, and who, a stranger to nearly all present, remained outside the manse. He was the Rev. Dr John Ritchie, formerly minister of Potterrow United Presbyterian Church,—the trusty ally of Dr Marshall as a keen Voluntary and a strict Calvinist, who warmly sympathised with him in his libelling Dr John Brown and Dr Balmer. I have been told that Dr Brown, too, would have been glad to grasp the hand of his libeller ere he had given up the ghost; for he believed Dr Marshall to be a truly good man. Dr Brown died in 1857, and Dr Ritchie in 1861.

† P. 4.

‡ P. 8.

tary Civil Magistrate must be in one sense a Christian, in another an infidel;”* that, according to the Voluntary system, “God must be virtually excluded from the government of the world;”† that “a Voluntary must be set down and treated as a *knave or a fool*;”‡ that “the grand dogma of the Voluntary system is, “that as every man pays his own baker or butcher, physician or lawyer, so every man ought to pay his own minister;”§ that Voluntaries, unconvinced by his facts and statistics, must be “thick-headed or hard-hearted;” and that Voluntaries are leagued with Satan “in chasing God’s word from the throne, from the senate, from the judicial chair, from the statute-book;”|| and that if the aims of the Voluntaries were accomplished, they were “so destructive of the best interests of our country’s population, that it seems as if nothing but the grossest ignorance, or the blackest treachery, or the blindest judicial infatuation, could engage them in such a cause.”¶ Such were the curses hurled against Voluntaryism and Voluntaries in 1835. For my part, I curse nobody, being anxious to say a good word of everybody and everything, and having, according to a distinguished critic, erred, perhaps, on the side of profuse panegyric. But what must be the astonishment of my readers to learn that the lecturer was the Rev. Robert (now Dr) Buchanan, of the Tron Church, Glasgow? Nor will their astonishment be lessened to hear that, in the last Free General Assembly, Dr Buchanan avowed that he had not changed his opinion on this question.

Whilst many members of the present Church of Scotland would shrink from such harsh strictures, they will heartily acquiesce in such of Dr Buchanan’s positions as the following:—That “with a large number of Voluntaries the controversy seems to be regarded altogether in the light of a strictly pecuniary question;” that “they have suffered themselves to be persuaded that the funds of the Church have been, somehow or other, drawn out of their pockets, and that they clamour for its overthrow just as they would for the repeal of some oppressive system of taxation;”*** that “the good old Established Kirk of Scotland has done and suffered more for the vindication of Christ’s Headship over his Church than the Volun-

* P. 9. † P. 11. ‡ P. 12. § P. 13. || P. 16. ¶ P. 15. *** P. 4.

taries;”* and that the Voluntary argument, founded on the assumed incompetency of the Civil Magistrate to discover and countenance the true religion is simply “the hackneyed argument of the infidel, who pretends that, because so many different opinions exist as to what the Bible really teaches, there can be no precise or definite truth in it at all, and therefore rejects the whole volume as unworthy of his confidence;”† that “the Voluntaries reason sophistically in ascribing to the principle of State recognition the numerous heresies and abuses which have crept into the Church since the time of Constantine, inasmuch as they have studiously confounded what is *accidental* with what is *essential*, on grounds on which it were quite as easy to erect a charge against the Christian religion itself.‡ Descending from speculative heresies in theology to the graver question of the practical conduct of mankind in this world, and their destiny in the world to come, it is distinctly laid down that “the question at issue between Church and Voluntaries is vitally important, *first*, as it involves a great principle of Christian morals; and, *second*, as it is a question which has innumerable practical bearings, both on the temporal and eternal welfare of mankind.”

Lord Ardmillan has recommended his United Presbyterian hearers to peruse the speeches of Dr Buchanan and Dr Adam in favour of their favourite Union Scheme. I recommend them and his Lordship to ponder Dr Buchanan’s earlier and abler production, which contains internal evidence of its expressing his strong and deliberate conviction. Most of my readers will be surprised to learn that, in 1835, Dr Buchanan complimented Dr Gibson for “not only vindicating the great general principles on which National Establishments of religion rest, but, with singular felicity, wresting the most famous weapons of the adversary out of his hands, and turning them into the most powerful assailants of the position he had rashly and ignorantly assumed.” Yet Dr Samuel Miller has declared, and I believe correctly, that Dr Buchanan is the “head and front” of the present Union movement. Dr Buchanan and Dr Gibson can recall the days when they and the late Dr Lorimer were the principal clerical contributors to the Conservative and High

* P. 6.

† P. 7, 8.

‡ P. 6.

Church "Scottish Guardian." The "Guardian" and Dr Lorimer are gone. Dr Gibson and Dr Buchanan survive. Dr Gibson has stuck manfully to the principles which Dr Buchanan has consented to compromise, if not surrender; though it would be difficult to cull from Dr Gibson's numerous refutations of Voluntaryism an extract so scornful towards Voluntaries as those abounding in the lecture of Dr Buchanan.

Lord Ardmillan, in his sanguine aspirations after a partial Presbyterian union, has plainly overstated the amount of harmony existing between the Free and United Presbyterian Churches. After admitting that there is some difference of opinion respecting the propriety of endowments, he approaches the far more vital subject of "the obligations of religion in the sphere of civil government:"—"We all hold that the Church is not an ordinance of the State, and that her spiritual jurisdiction must be free. We all hold that civil government is an ordinance of God, for His glory and for the public good. We all hold that the law of God is supreme and universal, and that there is no position of life and no sphere of duty or of action in which that law ought not to sway and guide our conduct. The suggestion has been made that the Voluntary principle, as held by our friends in the United Presbyterian Church, involves the denial of the authority of God's law, and of the obligations of religion in the sphere of civil government. If that were true, I should certainly be no advocate of this union. But it is not so. The imputation is as unfounded as it is unfair and ungenerous. It has been met, denied, and refuted by Dr Cairns and other eminent ministers engaged in the negotiations: it has been put down by the articles of agreement. It ought not to be repeated. It is a weak, and not an amiable, attempt to rekindle the expiring embers of an old controversy in which, on both sides, many things were said which should now be buried in oblivion."

These assertions are doubtless based on the Report of the Joint Committee on Union. How far the concession supposed to be made by the representatives of the United Presbyterians are sanctioned by the members of the Church, may be inferred from a remarkable pamphlet, published a few days after the delivery of Lord Ardmillan's speech, and entitled "The

Voluntary Principle Vindicated; being 'a Criticism on the Articles of Agreement contained in the Report of Union.'" Its author is the Rev. Alexander Anderson, M.A., of Montrose, a United Presbyterian minister of high personal character, who, when a student in the University of Saint Andrews, was conspicuous for a manifestation of mathematical talents resembling intuition. The sermon is prefaced with the text—"So they took up Jonah and cast him into the sea, and the sea ceased from roaring." I propose to criticise the "criticism." The figurative Jonah whom he proposes to cast from the leaky and weather-beaten ship "Union," now drifting among the rocks, is that suspicious and ill-favoured fellow who has sunk many a stout bark and many a gallant crew, while he, by some Will-o'-the-Wisp agility, has always contrived to escape scathless. During several voyages, he has sorely taxed the patience and vigilance of Captains Robert Buchanan, Robert Smith Candlish, Robert Rainy, James Harper, and Andrew Thomson, as well as of Captain George Johnston, who had recently suspected another Jonah in the person of George Gilfillan, a mutinous passenger in the old ship "Voluntary." This more dangerous Jonah, who has been amusing the captain as a gamesome Puck, and playing the two Dromios to perfection in the Comedy of Errors, has a long name, which renders him all the more dangerous. He is called "The power-of-the-Civil-Magistrate-in-religion." He is known to be gifted with a winning tongue, to have a large stock of ambiguous phraseology, and to cause theologians, who differ as the poles asunder, think that they are quite unanimous. But his wicked course has been cut short, for he has been caught by Mr Anderson, who has summoned the reverend captains to receive a rebuke. The "Voluntary principle" must be vindicated, and the impersonation of "The power-of-the-Civil-Magistrate-in-religion" must be cast among the raging billows of Voluntaryism and Spiritual Independence.

After this nautical proclusion, not inappropriate to the text of the pamphlet, my readers may be impatient to hear the gist of the writer. It may be aptly described as a protest against the unwarrantable betrayal of the Voluntary principle by the United Presbyterian members of the Union Committee, prompted by a wish to pacify the Free Church leaders. Mr Anderson's drift and

tone are explicit in every page :—“ Most of the statements in the Report on the subject of the Civil Magistrate are such as no united Presbyterian ought to accept.”* The Report “ contains such a compromise and contradiction of the Voluntary principle as United Presbyterians ought not to homologate.”† “ United Presbyterians must regard this point of the Report as unsound.”‡ The word “ rule” as applied to the Civil Magistrate is condemned as susceptible of four senses.”§ According to the power granted to the Civil Magistrate in enforcing the observance of the Sabbath, Mr Anderson asks “ if there be any limit to the oppression and absurdity that might accrue from it?”|| He further holds that a Voluntary Civil Magistrate, rather than enforce the Sabbath law, ought to “ lay aside his magistracy,”¶ and how the United Presbyterian part of the Committee should have agreed to the clause is, “ in its way, a kind of mystery.”** After a train of reasoning on the province of the Civil Magistrate in legislation, Mr Anderson concludes that according to the Union Committee’s deliverances, the United Presbyterian members of it “ *can render no good reason why there should not be actual endowments of religion.*” Will my readers, lay and clerical, gravely ponder this conclusion? Is Mr Anderson a truthful expounder of Voluntaryism? I believe he is. He was ordained in 1845, and he inherits the traditions of the wild Fifeshire Voluntaryism of 1832, to which I have often referred in my book. I believe his theory to be quite subversive of Christian Magistracy, just as the Quakers deny the right of self-defence, which they consign to those who repudiate Quakerism. But all lovers of Christian consistency and logical sequence must hail Mr Anderson’s contribution to a vexed and misunderstood question, which is far more important than that of electing and supporting ministers.

What was the result of Mr Anderson’s bold, uncompromising pamphlet? Only a few months previous to its publication, the Presbytery of Edinburgh had, on the motion of Dr George Johnston, decided to send to the Presbytery of Dundee certain passages from a recent work of the Rev. George Gilfillan which were deemed unsound. Did that reverend body take any

* P. 1. † P. 4. ‡ P. 8. § P. 8, 9, 10. || P. 12.
¶ P. 14. ** P. 15.

action in the case of the Rev. Mr Anderson, or forward his pamphlet to the Presbytery of Brechin? By no means. Was the omission supplemented by the United Presbyterian Synod, which met in May? No, action of any kind was taken. And why? Because the members well knew that Mr Anderson was not the extreme, eccentric, obscure man he has been described to be by some Free Church Unionists, who were so sorely troubled by his utterances, and that a violent disruption would be caused in the Church by any attempt to exercise discipline against him. Is it not remarkable, too, that Dr Cairns, in his Union speech, did not express the faintest censure of Mr Anderson's sentiments, and that Dr Macewen, his seconder, preserved a studied silence on the same dangerous theme?

TRACT FIFTH.

Phases and Defects of Voluntaryism.

Origin of the Term Voluntaryism—Different Meanings of the Term—Various Phases of Voluntaryism—Principles of the Erskines—Seceders alter the Confession of Faith—Clerical Autobiographies—Cairnbrock Bequests—Persecution of Dr M'Crise—Rise of Voluntaryism—Dr Wardlaw criticised by Dr W. L. Alexander—Criticism of Morality found in the Bible—No-Voluntary argument Founded on Alleged Mistranslation of the Bible—Voluntaryism in the Edinburgh Town Council—Historical Argument against Voluntaryism—Betting Agents—Judicial Salaries—Taverns' Act—Concert Halls and Theatres—Rev. Mr Nixon quoted—Testimonies against Voluntaryism by Dr Chalmers, Dr Candlish, and Dr C. J. Brown—Mr M. S. Tait's Report on the Cairnbrock Bequest.

THE ancient rhetoricians were wont to teach their pupils that, in the construction of their speeches, they should place their weakest arguments in the middle. Not professing to be a rhetorician or an orator, I only lay claim to an ordinary share of the dialectic faculty, as well as to a retentive memory touching events which have strongly arrested my attention. In this Tract I mean to touch on Voluntaryism, to examine its essence and scope, to trace its origin and development, to unfold its contradictions, or, at least, the contradictions of its most eminent exponents, to demonstrate its general impotency as a national system, and to expose its fallacious nature as applied to the great religious, political, and social problems of the age. Though quite convinced of the soundness of my own theory, my only fear is that I should not be able to present to my readers with due clearness the facts and arguments as they have weighed in my own mind. Conscious of my possessing what Emmanuel Kant terms the logical clearness, I entertain some fear of falling short in the æsthetical.

Like the Rev. J. H. Wilson, of the Free Barclay Church,

Edinburgh, I have "hereditarily suffered much from Voluntaryism," and I am free to confess that this circumstance may have materially influenced my maturer convictions. I cannot tell, and it is immaterial to inquire, by whom the term Voluntary was first applied to an ecclesiastical party. In the language of Shakspeare, it is synonymous with military volunteers. When the French and Austrian forces were encamped under the walls of the rebellious Angiers, Chatillon, the French ambassador, intimates the approach of Faulconbridge, the bastard son of the deceased Richard of the Lion-heart, with

" All the unsettled humours of the land—
Rash, inconsiderate, fiery voluntaries,
With ladies' faces, and fierce dragons' spleens,—
Have sold their fortunes at their native homes,
Bearing their birthrights proudly on their backs,
To make a hazard of new fortunes here."

The word Voluntary as well as the theory is specious, and well-fitted to gain converts and admirers. Its advocates shrewdly achieved a secure advantage by affixing an odious and offensive term to the doctrine of their opponents, in nick-naming it Compulsoryism. In this prompt selection of names, they gained a vantage-ground in the warfare that ensued,—a warfare long and fierce, often suspended and as often renewed, which placed in antagonism the highest intellects of the British empire, and roused the passions of an ignorant populace, generally deaf to argument, and prone to defy authority. To an ingenuous mind, imbued with the love of freedom and the scorn of tyranny, what watchword could be more popular than Voluntaryism, or Willinghood, as Mr Edward Miall, M.P., calls it? Or what name is so invidious and repellent as Compulsoryism? How flattering to equitable judgment and generous emotion, to cherish and propagate principles derived from the freedom of the will! On the other hand, how repugnant to reason and the rights of conscience, to aid in the extension of doctrines which are rejected as false and pernicious! Whether these epithets accurately indicated the theories to which they were respectively affixed, I shall presently inquire. Meanwhile nobody can question that the

Voluntaries, at the outset of the controversy, gained an advantage of which they were not slow to avail themselves.

During the debates on the currency question in the House of Commons, the late Sir Robert Peel affirmed that the whole argument turned on the question, What is a Pound? Pursuing the same method, I ask, What is Voluntarism? With the immense majority of those who profess it, and style themselves Voluntaries, it means that Christians are bound to give cheerfully of their substance what they can afford to extend the cause of Christianity at home and abroad, among the ignorant and immoral masses in our own country, as well as among the pagan nations in foreign parts, who have not been blessed with the Holy Scriptures and the fruits of Christian civilisation. In this sense some of the staunchest champions of Established Churches have been equally staunch Voluntaries. Dr Chalmers, though repudiating the Voluntary theory, was a very determined Voluntary, both in the Established Church of Scotland as well as in the Free, and might be ranked as a Voluntary. Between the years 1835 and 1841, he raised above £300,000 for the cause of church extension in the Church of Scotland. After the Disruption, Dr Robertson (formerly Mr Robertson of Ellon), a special favourite of Dr Chalmers', who, when visiting Ellon, pronounced him a model parish minister, was also a very energetic and persistent Voluntary. In the space of ten years, amid much apathy and discouragement, he raised £400,000 for the endowments of the newly-erected parishes in the Church of Scotland. Since his death in 1860, his work has devolved on Dr William Smith, of North Leith, whom I take to be a pretty strenuous Voluntary, in the Chalmerian and Robertsonian acceptation. He has engaged to raise £100,000 within the next five years. Dr Norman Macleod, too, is a very formidable and persevering Voluntary. Many years ago, he publicly declared that as soon as he entered the Glasgow Exchange, the merchants flew from him in a panic, well assured that he had come to dun them for subscriptions to some one of his many evangelical, educational, or charitable agencies in his overgrown Barony parish. Shortly after the opening of the Rev. Dr Macduff's church at Sandyford, Glasgow, he is reported to have preached there on one

occasion, to have had the number of copper pieces in the collection plate counted, and to have rebuked the congregation for the excessive superfluity of that plebeian coinage. In pleading for the Home Mission Fund in the General Assembly of 1870, he earnestly exhorted the ministers of that body to stir up their congregations to give liberally for that scheme: "Do stir up their souls that they may not put in that abominable brown penny clinking into the plate, and in everything in heaven and earth." A similar abhorrence of copper in extraordinary collections has been expressed from his pulpit by Dr Andrew Thomson, of Broughton Place United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh, a professed Voluntary, without fanaticism, and I dare say that his antipathy to the obnoxious coin would be shared on fitting occasions by his co-Presbyter, the venerable Rev. Dr Smart, United Presbyterian minister in Leith, who, like his father and uncle, ministers in Stirling and Paisley respectively, is understood never to have professed or held the Voluntary principle in any form. Thus I see there is perfect agreement and harmony between these ministers, of whom the first passed from the Established Church to the Free, the second continuing in the Establishment; the third and the fourth never having belonged to any other than a Dissenting Church, but differing in what is supposed to form the distinctive principle separating it from the two former.

But we are thrown back on the question, What is Voluntaryism? I cannot tell. Neither do I know any Voluntary now living who can enlighten my ignorance. I know what Dr Andrew Marshall, Dr Ralph Wardlaw, Dr John Brown, Dr Hugh Heugh, Dr David Young, and Dr William Anderson, have taught as sound and scriptural Voluntaryism, but now repudiated by the many prominent members of the United Presbyterian Church, who have been sitting for the long period of seven years in the Union Committee, namely, Dr David King, Dr John Robson, Dr Alexander MacEwen, Dr Andrew Thomson, Dr James Taylor, and Dr William Marshall of Coupar-Angus. I am equally certain that I can demonstrate by quotations from their publications that several of these committee-men formerly entertained the extreme theory avowed by the first group, and it is not uncharitable to conclude that

they have modified their creed to harmonise it with the professions of the committee belonging to the Free Church. Equally certain is it that the Articles of Union are openly repudiated by various United Presbyterian ministers, who maintain that Voluntaryism has been misconceived and misinterpreted by their Committee; that the United Presbyterian Synod has never accepted these articles as binding; that they have been condemned by such men as the Rev. Dr Davidson of Edinburgh, the Rev. H. Renton of Kelso, the Rev. George Hutton of Paisley, the Rev. Alexander Oliver of Glasgow, the Rev. James Inglis of Johnstone, the Rev. James Rutherford of Falkirk, and the Rev. Alexander Anderson of Montrose; and that the repudiation of such articles by any minister has been allowed by the Synod to be no bar to the Moderatorship, or to a Professorial chair. Hence it plainly appears that every kind of Voluntaryism is tolerated in the United Presbyterian Church. Her representatives in the Union Committee have, as we have seen, so far modified their theory as to secure the acquiescence of their fellow Free Church members of the Committee, who seem noways reluctant that the Free Church should tacitly abjure her testimony to the principle of an Established Church.

Nobody possessing a decent knowledge of the history of the Seceders needs to be told that the Erskines firmly held the principle of a Civil Establishment of religion—so firmly indeed, that they would have instantly cast forth from their pale any professor of modern Voluntaryism. The Erskines and their several followers held that a belief in the perpetual obligation of the Solemn League and Covenant was essential to membership in their communion. After his death in 1754, Ebenezer Erskine was, in conformity with his request, interred at the centre of his church, in a spot opposite to the pulpit, where a large stone covered the grave, with the following inscription:—

2 Junii 1754, ætat 74, Dormiit in Jesu,
 Reverendus Dominus EBENEZER ERSKINE,
 Officio pastorali, primo apud Portmoacenses 28,
 dein apud Stirlinenses 23, fidelissime functus,
 In æde hoc sepeliri voluit,
 ut, mortuus, testimonium firmaret,
 quod, dum vivus, mordicus tenuit.*

* I have to thank the Rev. J. T. Gowanlock, United Presbyterian Minister, Stirling, for sending me a copy of this epitaph. A melancholy interest attaches

The inflexible adherence of the Erskines to their original principles ought not to attach any blame to their character. Their father, the Rev. Henry Erskine, of Chirnside, a Presbyterian minister of the Established Church in Durham, had been ejected by Charles the Second's infamous Uniformity Act of 1662, had taken refuge in Holland, and had been imprisoned in the Bass Rock Fort for three years, from which he was liberated through the influence of his kinsman, the Earl of Mar. His sons, Ebenezer and Ralph Erskine, witnessed the Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745. They knew from history and tradition the countless woes inflicted on the Presbyterian Church by the unpatriotic minions of the house of Stuart. They must have heard from eye-witnesses of the brutal cruelties of the Duke of York, afterwards James the Second, who, when in Scotland, delighted to gloat his eyes upon the devout Covenanters undergoing the agonies of the boot and thumbscrew. That the successors of the Erskines gradually renounced their tenets about the end of last century is well known. I desire to call special attention to the date. The first French Revolution had just been accomplished—a revolution stained by atheism, lust, and blood, yet an inevitable recoil from the grinding despotism of the Bourbons, and from the infidelity and licentiousness that had polluted the French Roman Catholic Church. The contagion of revolution soon extended to England, Scotland, and Ireland. Established institutions of all kinds were put in great jeopardy. Popular representation, especially in Scotland, was merely nominal. A fierce protest was raised against Mr Pitt, a great statesman, though much maligned in his own time. A general outcry itself to the transmission. Mr Gowanlock I have not the pleasure of knowing, but my late very dear and accomplished friend, Mr John Carmichael, M.A., Senior Classical Master of the High School, Edinburgh, in whose class Mr Gowanlock had been Dux, promised to write to him for a copy. Ere he could fulfil his promise, he was removed by death, amid the profound regret of all his old pupils, and his numerous friends throughout Scotland. Mr Carmichael was a man of prodigious and varied acquirements, a ripe and elegant scholar, an admirable teacher, and a thorough gentleman. Whilst all the other Edinburgh newspapers bore truthful testimony to his fine powers and many virtues, the "Scotsman" inserted a brief, inaccurate, and heartless obituary, of which the writer ought to be heartily ashamed. It was penned a few hours after Mr Carmichael had ceased to breathe. Only one man in Edinburgh could have so degraded himself. I believe it was not the editor.

was raised against the existing political institutions. At such a juncture, it was natural that Church Establishments should be also assailed. Among her fierce assailants were infidels, convinced that the ruin of Church establishments must be followed by the destruction of the faith they were instituted to teach and propagate. Far different was the position of the other class—the Burghers and the Anti-Burghers. Their orthodoxy in doctrinal questions was unimpeachable. Their personal character was stainless. They had striven by precept and example to maintain a high standard of purity of doctrine and life in their flocks. Their preaching was more Calvinistic than that of Calvin himself, or of the Erskines, or of the Marrowmen. On the other hand, there was much lukewarmness among many ministers in the Establishment. The lately published posthumous autobiography of Dr Alexander Carlyle, of Inveresk, while they present a faithful picture of the class of clerical worldlings and coxcombs to which he belonged, also explain the strong hold which the Seceders obtained over the devout peasantry of Scotland. When it is added that Dr Carlyle finished the record of pastoral career without expressing one word of compunction or regret, we shut the book with feelings akin to disgust. In another autobiography, of more recent date, that of Dr Sommerville, of Jedburgh, who professed himself an adherent of the Evangelical party, Dr Sommerville, without an apparent sense of the impropriety of his conduct, gravely relates how he, a married man, when on a protracted visit to London, used to spend his evenings in the theatres and the beershops! Whether the theatre or the beershop first received the honour of his nightly visits, or whether they enjoyed the honour of his patronage alternately, is not recorded. What if some Jedburgh layman, we will not say Seceder, had encountered the parish minister in his nocturnal London rambles!

Proverbially, one extreme provokes another. The Seceders proceeded to tamper with the Confession of Faith. Their reasons and motives I can partially realise. Profoundly convinced of the divine origin and inconceivable value of the Christian faith, and of its wonderful adaptation to the wants of man in every clime and condition, why should it seem to

worldlings and sceptics to need any aid or recognition from any power alien to itself? Ought not professing Christians to make their light so shine before men that its beams should be clearly discovered? Ought not their pure faith and good deeds to be so manifest, that men of the world would do homage to the heavenly influence, which sustained their fainting spirits amid obloquy and persecution? Such we may conceive to have been the language of the early Seceders. Such is the language frequently employed by Voluntaries in our own day, who, while mindful of the obligations laid upon the Christian in his individual capacity, are strangely forgetful of the duties he owes to society, and of the duties imposed on the Civil Magistrate by the same Scriptures on which he relies as the foundation of his holy faith. What has always struck me as defective, not to say mischievous, in the current form of Voluntariyism is, as I shall prove, its want of cohesion and consistency as a system: it is vague, one-sided, and often practically obstructive in the discharge of relative and public duties.

I may remark, by the way, that I had recently the satisfaction of listening to a discussion on Voluntariyism, conducted by about half-a-dozen United Presbyterian ministers. The principle itself all appeared to hold in some sense, but when they came to the "application," as Dr Rainy would say, their discord was irreconcilable. The discussion was waxing hot, when one of their number, a man of eminence in his Church, and a candid man to boot, interfered, and silenced all opposition by propounding sentiments such as are advocated in these pages; urging with great cogency, that United Presbyterian ministers who accepted grants from the Ferguson Bequest might as consistently participate in the Teinds, which were originally bequeathed to the Church by persons as pious and exemplary as Mr Ferguson of Cairnbrock, who was not a member of any Church, and was a man, moreover, of miserly habits.

I now return to the history and developments of Voluntariyism. About the end of last century, when the nation was alarmed by novel theories of government, and by the dread of French invasion and intestine tumults, the Burghers and the Anti-Burghers remodelled their Testimonies, the Anti-Burghers, the more extreme of the two bodies, refusing to give the Civil

Magistrate any power in matters of religion. From this resolution the illustrious Dr M'Crie dissented, who, with nine brethren, clinging like him to their original principles, formed themselves into the Constitutional Associate Presbytery. For the same reason the Burghers were forsaken by three members, who also refused to abandon their original views. Then came a memorable crop of litigations for church property, raised by the adherents of the old and new views in either denomination. And it is remarkable that the pursuers were the New View men, who sought to deprive their former brethren of their humble chapels, because they had remained faithful to their ordination vows, thus proving that men professing liberalism, and abjuring any appeal to the Civil Magistrate in matters of religion, do not hesitate to invoke the aid of that same functionary in stripping of their property, brethren who could not follow the majority with a safe conscience. Among the sufferers was Dr M'Crie, whom the military were employed to eject from his place of worship.

I now overleap about thirty years, during which there was a Union of the Burghers and the Anti-Burghers. We are thus brought to confront the Second French Revolution of 1832, and the Reform Bill of Earl Grey passed in that year. Again the revolutionary fervour, which inflamed France and drove Charles the Tenth into exile at Holyrood Palace, soon overspread the British Isles. Then also commenced in right earnest the Voluntary controversy, followed by the formation of the Edinburgh Central Board for vindicating the rights of Dissenters, and of affiliated societies throughout Scotland, with the avowed purpose of overthrowing the Church of Scotland. Seeing that our modern Voluntaries differ so widely as to the essence and limits of their doctrine, it is very important to ascertain how it was interpreted by one of its ablest and most authoritative expounders. In making my selection, I will not even name any of the obscure, thoughtless, and uninfluential clerical speechifiers or pamphleteers who rushed on the platform or into print, with rhapsodies as wild as they were incoherent. I prefer to choose a representative man, of profound theological learning, of fine literary culture, of tried skill in controversy, and eminent for his courtesy and suavity in all the relations of

life, and possessing a high reputation on both sides of the Tweed—I allude to the Rev. Dr Wardlaw, of Glasgow. Such was the confidence reposed in his ability and prudence, that after Dr Chalmers had delivered in London his celebrated course of lectures in defence of National Establishments, Dr Wardlaw was selected by the Voluntaries to proceed to London and deliver another course in reply. They were afterwards published, widely circulated, and generally, perhaps universally, welcomed by the Voluntaries as the most complete, convincing, and triumphant vindication of Voluntaryism. Now, Dr Wardlaw, in the course of his lectures, took occasion to discuss the delicate and vital question of the Civil Magistrate's office in relation to religion. What is his conclusion? It is that "the true and legitimate province of the Magistrate, in regard to religion, is to *have no province at all*"—"a conclusion so startling and unwelcome," as his biographer, Dr W. L. Alexander observes, "that it had need to be founded on very cogent reasons to command our assent." On what grounds, then, has Dr Wardlaw rested this conclusion? In the first instance, on the assertion that Scripture has confined the magistrate's function within the sphere of civil matters. But has not the lecturer stumbled here at the very threshold? If the magistrates have *no* province in regard to religion at all, with what consistency can he appeal to the Bible, the standard of religious truth and duty, to determine in what his proper province is? Or if he may be authorized legitimately, as a magistrate, to learn his functions from the Bible, how can it be justly said that he has nothing whatever, as a magistrate, to do with religion? . . . It would not be fair to represent men of Dr Chalmers's way of thinking on this subject as if they contended for the right of magistrates to compel men to believe, or pretend to believe, a given set of dogmas; when all they assert is the right of the magistrate to make provision for the religious instruction of the community, leaving it free to all to accept that instruction or not as they please. On this point I frankly confess that I cannot see how the negative can be maintained, as an abstract general proposition, without reducing the functions of the civil magistrate to those of a mere policeman, set up to enforce the will of the majority. . . .

It is usual with those who take the extreme views adopted by Dr Wardlaw to lay stress on the question, Who is to determine what is to be taught for religious truth to the community? There is no doubt a difficulty here; but it is one which has been immensely exaggerated both theoretically and practically. In this country, the omniscience of Parliament is as much a principle of government as its omnipotence—in the modified sense, of course, in which alone such language can be used of any human institution. . . . It will not be easy to show why a body, in whose powers of ascertaining truth in all other departments of knowledge the community implicitly confides, should be pronounced hopelessly incompetent in the department of theological truth. . . . The only secure and consistent line of argument on this subject seems to be that of those who admit that the magistrate *has* to do with religion.”

Blinded by his vicious theory, Dr Wardlaw, though a firm believer in the divine origin and perpetual obligation of the Christian Sabbath, maintained that the Civil Magistrate had no right to enforce its decent observance as a scriptural institution, but merely as a civil holiday. Dr John Brown espoused the same view. Dr Alexander, however, exposes the fallacy clearly and conclusively, by showing that the magistrate must base his interference on the sacred and religiously impartial character of the Sabbath, and that when he is restricted to secular grounds, he has no right to make the violation of the Sabbath a punishable crime, or to prohibit popular amusements which do not injure life or property.*

In denying the right of the civil magistrate to interfere with religion, a doctrine still openly avowed by some Voluntaries, and tacitly cherished by others, the mischievous consequences of such a denial appear to be left out of account. It strikes at the root of sound Christian legislation, and hampers the Christian Civil Magistrate in the efficient discharge of his office; for, alike in his legislative and executive capacity, he must be actuated by a moral criterion, or standard of right and wrong. “Two problems,” observes Sir James Mackintosh,

* See Alexander's “Life of Dr Wardlaw,” pp. 384, 385, 386. Is Dr Alexander now a Voluntary? A very doubtful one. At the general election of 1868, he voted for the Earl of Dalkeith, as candidate for Mid-Lothian.

“ must be clearly apprehended by all who attempt to construct moral systems: first, the nature of the distinction between right and wrong in human conduct; and, secondly, the nature of those feelings with which right and wrong are contemplated by human beings. The latter constitutes what has been called the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*; the former constitutes an investigation into the *Criterion of Morality in Action*.” And what ought the Christian Magistrate’s standard to be? Ethical writers have recommended various standards. There is a standard of truth, and justice, and mercy, paramount to all the systems by which it is partially or wholly excluded—the Infallible Word of God, to which the Civil Magistrate is responsible, by which he is required to regulate all his actions, and which he is no more entitled to disregard in his official capacity than in his conduct as a private Christian. There is, after all, a national conscience, a national responsibility, and national retribution, however much it may suit some shallow thinkers to blink that truth. As the Civil Magistrate represents the nation, its interests, temporal and spiritual, suffer from his delinquencies theoretical or practical. A question may present itself to some, Why have the duties of the Civil Magistrate been so overlooked or misunderstood by so many contemporary Dissenting divines of acknowledged eminence? At one time this question rather puzzled myself. I have, however, lived long enough to see many men of strong judgment and honest hearts misled by fallacies, which point to a foregone conclusion. As a matter of fact, I know that several United Presbyterian members of the Union Committee have seen cause to modify their untenable Voluntary opinions after they were duly enlightened by Dr Gibson, Dr Begg, and Mr Nixon. These gentlemen quitted the committee several years ago, but the United Presbyterian members have not forgotten, and did not regret their departure, seeing how the Committee was plied with wholesome, but sometime unpalatable truths. Indeed, it is asserted on good authority that the collisions on this subject and the Atonement have been so sharp and frequent, that a disruption has been averted mainly by the Joint-Convenor of the Free Church Committee, Dr Robert Buchanan, whose calm equable temper and long experience in adjusting dif-

ferences in committees, have been of great service as a pacificator. In this capacity he has been ably seconded by Dr Cairns, both having set their hearts on the speedy accomplishment of the Union. To form sound notions of the province of the civil magistrate in regard to religion, does not seem to be a very hazardous task. Laymen, unacquainted with the original language of the New Testament, might have been silenced if they had been told that some inaccuracy had been detected in the translation of certain texts generally quoted in the Voluntary controversy. No such inaccuracies were alleged to exist. Biblical critics have suggested amendments of other texts, which might be safely adopted. For instance, Saint Paul meant to say that money was *a* (not the) root* of all evil. The self-righteous Pharisee boasted of paying tithes of all that he *acquired*,† not “possessed.” Abraham is represented by Saint Paul to have looked not for “*a*” city, but for *the* city,‡ the New Jerusalem, which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. The Thessalonians are warned to abstain not from “all appearance,” but from *every kind*§ of evil, as the Genevan version has it. If the definite article had been retained in our translation of the 15th, 16th, and 17th verses of the fifth chapter of the Romans, some hurtful mistakes would, according to an eminent living theologian, have been happily prevented respecting partial reprobation and absolute reprobation. Saint John exhorts the Angel of the Sardian Church to strengthen the few and feeble believers in the Church over which he presides with the things|| which remain, that is, *the graces that remain in his own heart*. Much confusion, too, would have been prevented by substituting Jehovah for “Jesus” in the 8th verse of the fourth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews. Waterland, who fought the battle against the Arians in the English Church, maintained that the phrase “first-born of every creature”¶ applied to Christ, was virtually playing into their hands, and that the Scriptural meaning was *born* (or begotten) *before the whole creation*. In the 18th verse of the fifth chapter of St John’s gospel, the Jews are said to have been

* ρίζα (1 Tim. vi. 10).

† κτήνημα (Luke, xviii. 12).

‡ τὴν πόλιν (Heb. xi. 10).

§ ἴδιος (1 Thess. v. 12).

|| τὰ λοιπὰ—τοὺς λοιπούς (Rev. iii. 2).

¶ πρωτοτόκος πάσης κτίσεως (Col. i. 15.)

eager to kill Christ because he had said that God was his "Father." It ought to have been rendered, *own* Father*, showing that he claimed God as his Father, in a special sense, not common to him and all men. Various charges against our authorised English translation have been urged by Roman Catholics, Arians, Socinians, and Arminians, most of them baseless and unwarrantable. But the fact ought to be kept in view that, till the beginning of the present century, no Scottish Presbyterian theologian or commentator had grounded any objections to religious Establishments on any texts of Holy Scripture.

An intelligent Christian layman is perhaps in a better position to judge of National Ecclesiastical Establishments than a recluse pouring over the commentators. Certainly the wild and impracticable Voluntary speculations to which I have adverted were clerical creations. It is remarkable, too, that the more intelligent Dissenting laymen, who have held municipal offices, have generally shaken off the Voluntary theories in action. In the years 1869 and 1870, I heard the question of National Education debated at great length, and with much ability in the Edinburgh Town-Council, when the subject of religious instruction received the prominence due to its importance. By large majorities it was decided that the teaching of the Bible should form an integral portion of the school work, instead of coming before or after the regular school hours. The prime mover in this excellent scheme was a noted Voluntary. He was opposed by another brother Voluntary, who taunted him with inconsistency, and invoked the memories of Dr John Brown and Dr John Ritchie, to which the former replied that if Voluntaryism forbade the teaching of the Word of God to children in National Schools, he was prepared to abjure such a system. If I am reminded that the principle of Church Establishments has been losing its hold on the public mind as obsolete and effete, I readily admit the truth of the assertion. A large portion of the community has begun to set their objections on principles and practices which are antago-

* *ἴδιον* (John v. 18). See Archbishop Trench "On the Authorised Version of the New Testament." See also his acute and discriminating "New Testament Greek Synonyms," a little work very helpful to students of Scripture Greek, as well as of the English version.

nistic to the Scriptural doctrines and conduct inculcated by all the Presbyterian Churches. Other changes are also manifest. Scepticism is not only more rife, but more fashionable. Social morality, both in town and country, is decidedly on the wane. Education, instead of being regarded by every man as a duty and a privilege, has become so distasteful to large classes, that many intelligent persons speak of compulsion being needed to supply the lack of willingness. Commercial integrity, which was wont to be an honourable characteristic of Scottish mercantile society, can hardly be said to be on the increase. The filial respect which Englishmen used to admire and envy in Scotland generally seems to be ebbing away. Sabbath desecration is rising like a flood.

In connection with the history of the Scottish Church Establishment, there is one reflection which I would respectfully submit to such Protestant Voluntaries as believe that its overthrow would prove a national blessing. I am not vain enough to imagine that it is original, for the arguments on both sides of this question must have been long ago pretty well exhausted. My argument is drawn from Scottish ecclesiastical history. Few Voluntaries, even of the extreme type, will deny that the recognition of Protestantism in 1560 by the Scottish Parliament was beneficial to the country in every sense. That Act was consummated by the co-operation of the State with the Church. Could the Reformers, without such aid, have devised or achieved any instrumentality that could have coped with that Establishment in the diffusion of the Protestant religion, as well as in erecting bulwarks against civil and religious tyranny? Again, when the Protestant Constitution had been trampled under foot by James the Second, does any Voluntary deny that the Revolution of 1688 was a glorious deliverance from an ignoble thralldom? Yet, this was likewise wrought by the civil power in the person of a Sovereign, William of Orange? If the Jacobites had been successful in their rising of 1745, and if Prince Charles Stuart had repeated the duplicity and cruelty of his grandfather, James the Second, the oppressed Protestants might have supplicated the English Government for assistance, as their forefathers did under the regency of the crafty Mary of Guise? Who would have blamed

them for such an appeal in such a crisis? If it be observed that the circumstances of the country have so changed as to render a continuation of religious Establishments unnecessary, I ask, When did this change take place? Human nature is no less depraved than it was a century ago. Men are as dead as they ever were to persuasion in spiritual things. It has been explained, that when the seeds of modern Voluntariyism were some seventy years ago, the political excitement then prevalent was inimical to the formation of sound innovations, whether civil or spiritual.

I have frankly conceded, however, that the Seceders, the prime movers in that innovation, were men of eminent learning and piety, who, in their excessive dread of religion being supposed to lean upon the Civil Magistrate for support, modified the twenty-third chapter of the Confession of Faith, because it might be construed to sanction persecution. A few words in this supposed teaching of the Confession may not be amiss. In the Formula of the United Presbyterian Church there is found the following passage:—"It being always understood that we do not approve of anything that teaches, or may be supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion." "Thus," says the Rev. William Cousin, "the Confession of Faith is treated as a suspected document." When the United Presbyterian Church sanctioned this Formula, she was influenced doubtless by excellent intentions; but she did not then perceive to what evil purpose the Formula might be, and has been, perverted. Dr W. L. Alexander has briefly, yet cogently, disposed of the objection, that a National Church involves persecution. Has not the same cry been raised by other classes than Voluntaries? A civilized community must protect itself against the disturbers of its peace and freedom. Hence, laws are made, and taxes are imposed. Robust men, who are quite able to defend their lives and goods, submit to the impost, because many weaker individuals require the protection of policemen and soldiers. Or, take the case of betting agents, against whom stringent regulations, recently enforced by Mr Bruce, the Home Secretary, have driven into Scotland. These agents think themselves ill-used, and greatly persecuted. Betting on the

turf has, from time immemorial, been accounted an honourable, gentlemanly, and even useful sport. Senators, Premiers, and Royalty, have patronised the sports of the race-course. Tattersall's, the Betting Club of the aristocratic circles in London, was wont to be much frequented by them on Sabbath afternoons. The propriety of their proceedings was seldom questioned. Their reprehensible example was gradually imitated by their humbler admirers, most of whom being unable to attend race-courses, employed agents to act in their stead. Novices in betting schemes frequently found their money gone; nor did their reputation remain long behind. Confessions in Criminal Courts revealed embezzlements committed to enable the defaulters to indulge in their baneful adventures. Loud demands were made for the suppression of this nuisance. An Act of Parliament was passed, empowering the police to enter the betting agents' offices, to seize their betting books, and to impose a fine of £100, or to commit the agents to three months' imprisonment. Forthwith the agents raise a howl of persecution. "Why," they exclaim, "are we thus hunted out of London, where we drive a thriving business? Our clients engage in betting with their eyes open, and of their own accord. Whether they gain or lose, they injure nobody, and if they do, they are punished. You allow some men to speculate as villains, and others to madden themselves with intoxicating drinks, to beat their wives, and beggar their families, without indictment." Nevertheless, this reasoning failed to convince the Home Secretary or the Legislature. Perhaps it has never struck Lord Ardmillan, nor Sheriff Cleghorn, nor Sheriff Neil C. Campbell, nor other judicial Unionists, that Voluntaryism is applicable in another quarter. Why should judges be remunerated with fixed salaries? Their time and talents are mostly devoted to the adjudication of civil cases, in which the litigants elect and pay their own Advocates or Attorneys. Why should they not also pay the Judge? The community at large has only a remote interest in the decision. Not one man in a thousand is a party in a lawsuit during his whole life. Why should the nine hundred and ninety-nine be taxed to relieve the pocket of a single litigious individual, who probably rushes into Court without a valid plea? It may be answered that the

interests of the nation are protected by the endowment of learned and trustworthy masters of jurisprudence, but such an explanation may fail to satisfy the austere professors of the Voluntary principle in Church and State.

Or, to confine ourselves to Scotland: In 1858, an Act of Parliament, which we owe to Mr M'Laren, M.P., and Lord Kinnaid, was passed, to close the taverns at seasonable hours. The more respectable publicans heartily approve of the Act. But what a howl was raised by the lower class of publicans and by their patrons or victims, the soakers? "And this, forsooth," they protested, "is a free country? On secular nights the hypocrites turn us out of doors at 11 o'clock, whilst on Sunday, we find the doors shut altogether." What may well add to our astonishment was, that an influential journal,* for many years assailed and ridiculed the Act and its promoters, using every means to render it unpopular and inoperative. If the opponents of the Act had undertaken to pay the costs of watching and punishing the drunken brawlers whom it was intended to benefit, or to relieve the indigence entailed in desolate households, their remonstrance might have carried some weight. Gradually the complaint ceased. Facts, reason, and experience,

* The "Scotsman," which raved and ranted for many years against this Act, but all in vain. Starting with fallacies, he was compelled to tamper with facts—always a perilous experiment. This is too often the course taken by the "Scotsman." Shortly before Mr Cobden's death, he was drawn into a controversy with the "Scotsman," respecting a speech which he had delivered many years before at Holmfirth. He convicted the "Scotsman" of gross, if not wilful misstatement, yet the editor refused to retract. The "Scotsman's" opposition to the Tavern Act may be connected with his antipathy to Mr M'Laren, M.P., its author, who obtained £500 and costs from the "Scotsman" for a libel on his character. Since that trial, the mention of Mr M'Laren's name has acted on the "Scotsman" like a red cloak on a mad bull. I was present at that trial, when Mr Inglis, now Lord President, was counsel for Mr M'Laren, and Mr Moncreiff, now Lord Justice Clerk, for the "Scotsman." Mr Russel, the editor, who sat with his agent behind Mr Moncreiff, appeared very nervous, excited, and cowed, for he saw that he had got into a scrape. Mr M'Laren expended the £500 in benevolent purposes. Before Mr Russel's accession to the "Scotsman," Mr M'Laren was a frequent contributor to its columns. My friend, Mr James Hedderwick, the accomplished editor of the "Glasgow Citizen," was for several years sub-editor, and he has told me that, when the then editor was absent in the country, Mr M'Laren was left in charge of the paper. How times are changed! Mr Russel would do well to imitate the tact, discretion, forbearance, and gentlemanly feeling of Mr Hedderwick, who has edited the "Citizen" for 30 years, without causing pain to a single individual, while he has cheered and sustained merit in its upward struggles.

justified the wisdom of the Act, and the silly fallacies urged against its restrictions ceased to be repeated.

Or, to recur to the Sabbath Law. A considerable, and, I fear, increasing class of persons, heedless of Sabbath sanctity, and of the invaluable rest provided for man and beast, would gladly avail themselves of any secular amusements. At the outset, they might be content with a scientific or literary lecture, not very exact or profound, but spiced with a few stale, threadbare attacks on orthodoxy, or on the inconsistency of its professors. Satiated with this entertainment, they might conceive a passion for overtures, or dramatic representations. Now, in Edinburgh, there is a Mr Henry Levy, who owns a Concert Hall, sometimes converted into a Theatre: he is, I understand, a strict and consistent Jew, an attender in the synagogue, and, of course, a contemner of Scottish Christianity and the Christian Sabbath. Suppose that a sufficient number of secularists offered to patronise Mr Levy if he would open his Hall on Sabbath, that a company were willing to perform, and that the speculation promised to pay. Mr Levy knows that the law would prohibit his performance, and his regard to the feelings of the community generally might induce him not to risk the experiment. But he might choose a contrary course. "Why not?" he might say; "I am a Jew, and keep my own Sabbath, according to the traditions of my forefathers. Why should I be prohibited from the exercise of my vocation, on what is to me a secular day, particularly when a number of Christians, or, at all events, citizens of a Christian city, are ready to support me in my enterprize? My Concert Hall is removed by many yards from Nicolson Street, and very few neighbours would be disturbed by the noise." Voluntaries of the school of Dr Wardlaw, and the Rev. Mr Anderson of Montrose, might highly lament Mr Levy's opening his Hall on Sabbath; but, on their own principles, they could not justify the interference of the civil powers. The Joint Union Committee, indeed, has agreed to recognise the authority of the Civil Magistrate "in the swearing of oaths, the Sabbath, and the appointment of days of humiliation and thanksgiving." This concession seems so fair and reasonable as to satisfy the scruples of rigid Churchmen. But in what sense did the United Presbyterian members

of the committee admit the authority of the Civil Magistrate in respect of the Sabbath? Let the Rev. William Nixon of Montrose, a former Free Church member of the committee, answer :—“ Then, as regards the Sabbath, the outward national observance of which is so bound up with the intelligence, the virtue, the order, the industry, the prosperity, and the whole wellbeing of the country, our Church doctrine, as well as our individual opinion as Free Churchmen, is that the law of the land ought to forbid, and prevent or punish, its open desecration. But our U. P. brethren battled with us in the Union Committee for hours against any clause being inserted to that effect in the articles of agreement. They would not allow it to be said that open desecration of the Sabbath ought to be prevented by civil authority. They would not allow that even theatres and other places of amusement ought to be forcibly closed, except as annoying to peaceable Sabbath-keeping citizens. They would not allow that shops should be closed except on ‘ fiscal grounds’—that is, to prevent Sabbath-breaking shopkeepers from getting a seventh day’s profit from their business, while Sabbath-keeping shopkeepers got only six days’ profit from theirs. And though many of our ministers speak of the Sabbath clause in the articles as if it would secure all that we contend for, it is an unfounded and a fatal mistake. The clause contains no provision in favour of a national Sabbath at all. It only professes to provide protection from disturbance and annoyance to such as may wish to keep it as a day of religious instruction and worship, while it puts no legal obstacle whatever in the way of those who spend it in every kind of desecration of its sacredness. And that again is to be the entire length and breadth of the doctrine which, as a Church, we are to be permitted to hold and to act upon as a Church if we enter into the union.”*

To those who hold that persecution is implied in the expenses of our National Church, it is sufficient to answer, that the Teinds are not paid from the taxes, and were never secular property; that the landowners do not pay one farthing to the parish minister from their own pockets; and that the sum total of the teinds annually paid by the landowners, about £250,000, is

* Speech at the Edinburgh Anti-Union Meeting, Feb. 22, 1871.

less than the annual clear rental of some noblemen and bankers in Great Britain. With great felicity Dr Chalmers designated a body of faithful, efficient, national clergy, a cheap moral police. His comparison was much ridiculed by his Voluntary opponents, as the offspring of a heated imagination. Dr Chalmers, however, though an enthusiast, was no visionary. He was a thoroughly practical Christian philanthropist and reformer. What is more, he personally worked out his own schemes, and evinced rare discrimination in the selection of his fellow-workers, assigning to each the work for which he was best fitted. To represent Dr Chalmers as having inclined to Voluntaryism, is simply a libel on his character. Not only did he repudiate it as Moderator of the first Free General Assembly, in which any voice raised in its favour would have been indignantly hushed, but in his "Earnest Appeal to the Free Church of Scotland in 1846" he solemnly warned the Free Church of its inefficacy:—"My hopes of an extended Christianity from the efforts of Voluntaryism alone have *not* been brightened by my experience since the Disruption. . . . And ere I am satisfied that Voluntaryism will repair the mischief, I must first see the evidence of its success in making head against the fearfully increased heathenism, and increasing still, that accumulates at so fast a rate throughout the great bulk and body of the common people. We had better not say too much on the pretensions or the powers of Voluntaryism, till we have made some progress in reclaiming the wastes of ignorance, and irreligion, and profligacy, which so overspread our land; or till we see whether the congregational selfishness, which so predominates everywhere, can be prevailed on to make larger sacrifices for the Christian good of the world. . . . And so the argument for State Endowments, if only given on a right principle, will stand thus:—Are the thousands and the tens of thousands whom Voluntaryism, with all its efforts, and, we may well add, with all its high-sounding pretensions, has failed to overtake,—are they to be sacrificed to an impotent and most inoperative theory,—a theory tried in all its forms, and most palpably found wanting? We rejoice, therefore, in the testimony of the Free Church for the principle of a National Establishment, and most earnestly do we hope that she will never fall away from it."

In his evidence before the House of Commons' Sites' Committee, a few days before his death, he said :—" We of the Free Church are not Voluntaries, and I confess to you that I should look with a sigh to the demolition of the framework either of the Scotch or of the English Establishment. Grant an Establishment upon right principles, and, if well worked, it is the most efficient of all machinery for pervading the people with religion; and it marks the exceeding strength of our principle that we have dissented from the Establishment in Scotland, not *quasi* an Establishment, but from such an Establishment—a vitiating flaw having been inserted into it which we think fatal to its character, and fatal also to the efficacy of its ministrations; so that I believe there is not a body in Christendom who gives such a strong testimony in favour of the principle of an Establishment as the Free Church of Scotland. Here we are incurring the utmost dislike from the Voluntaries on the one hand, and from the friends of the actual Establishment on the other, and yet we will not let go the principle that it is the duty of the Government to provide for the religious education of the people."

After Dr Chalmers had delivered his protest against Voluntariyism in the General Assembly of 1843, Dr Candlish said :—" I cordially go along with the sentiments expressed by our reverend Moderator respecting the danger of our letting down our high testimony, in order to conciliate the powers of this world on the one hand, or to conciliate numbers on the other. I trust we shall be enabled, both in our Assemblies, and, if possible, in our outward and tangible acts, to maintain uncompromised our principle of a religious Establishment. I trust we shall resist every notion or proposal of an incorporating union with any Church that differs from us on that point. These are the principles for which we are called to testify; and they are not principles belonging to any particular place or time, but applicable to every Church, wherever situated, in whatever country or circumstances; and woe be to this Free Church if she ever be found even appearing to underrate the magnitude and importance of these principles. Most of all, woe to her if it be so in a crisis like that which now appears to be impending over Christendom; for surely to any one who

intelligently apprehends the principles of the Free Church as regards the freedom and independence of the Church of Christ, and the right relation between her and the Civil Government, it must be apparent that if ever these principles were important in the history of the world, they are important now, and likely to become more and more important as years run on."

Dr Charles J. Brown, also an Unionist, added:—"He did not regret that, in this Assembly, it had been intimated to their Voluntary brethren that we could not surrender to their view on that point of difference; because he was persuaded that nothing would more enable them to co-operate in other matters than the knowledge of each party that the other would make no surrender of their views in regard to that subject."

Comparatively few Voluntaries appear to be acquainted with the distribution of the Ferguson Bequest Fund in the six western Scottish counties interested in its grants. On applying for information to Mr S. M. Tait, the courteous secretary, regarding the recipients, he expressed his willingness to comply with my request, but delayed till he should obtain the authority of the trustees, who ultimately consented. For reasons which were not stated, but which may be quite satisfactory, they declined to give the names of the aid-receiving congregations, nor did I ask for them. Most of my readers will be astonished to read the subjoined returns, furnished by Mr Tait:—

"Congregations within the Six South-Western Counties belonging to the Churches interested in the Bequest, including Chapels as well as Quoad Sacra Churches of the Established Church.*

Established Church, . . .	86	congregations.
Free Church, . . .	203	"
United Presbyterian Church, . . .	160	"
Reformed Presbyterian Church, . . .	24	"
Congregational Union Church, . . .	21	"

The sums allotted to these six counties in 1866 were as follows:—

* Lanark, Dumbarton, Ayr, Dumfries, Wigton, Kirkcudbright.

Established Church, . . .	£3026	8	2
Free Church, . . .	4098	4	5
United Presbyterian Church, . . .	4022	16	6
Reformed do. do., . . .	1253	16	6
Congregational Union do., . . .	1525	4	5”

Now, I do not quote these grants in the spirit of reproach. That they are all duly earned, may be inferred from the intelligent vigilance of the secretary. They will cheer many mansees not overstocked with the comforts of civilised society, and will help to lighten the hearts of many faithful pastors who might be otherwise burdened with household cares.

I conclude this Tract with directing special attention to a source of revenue with which it is fit that all should be acquainted. Most persons to whom I have mentioned the subject, so far from knowing its amount, did not even suspect its existence. A Royal Commission ascertained, in 1836, that the unexhausted or unappropriated Scottish Teinds amounted to £153,928, 2s. 11d. Thus it appears that the landowners of Scotland are annually pocketing this sum, which belongs to the people of Scotland, and which ought to be devoted to instruction, secular or religious, or both. For it is undeniable that the Teinds are not the property of the landowners, who, to do them justice, have never preferred any such claim.*

* If space had permitted, I intended to enter fully into the history of the Teinds, that is, Tithes, and to explain how they had been diverted from their legitimate objects at different periods. Ample information will be found in Sir John Connell's treatise on the "Scottish Tithes" (3 vols.), and in Mr Buchanan's volume on the "Teinds." In the nine reports of the Scottish Commissioners there is presented an immense mass of curious details. I must again express my obligations to Mr M'Laren, M.P. for his prompt kindness in referring me to the authentic sources of information on the subject of the Scottish Teinds, which he has thoroughly mastered.

TRACT SIXTH.

Churches and Morals in Glasgow.

Mr Thomas Knox on the Moral Condition of Edinburgh—Glasgow : its Wealth, Enterprise, and Independence—Dr Norman Macleod's Testimony—Dr Charteris quoted—Rev. James Johnston's "Religious Destitution in Glasgow," and the "Rising Tide"—Rev. David Pirret's "Church and the Masses"—Mr William Logan's "Moral Statistics of Glasgow"—Glasgow Police Criminal Returns.

IN my "Future Church of Scotland" I dwelt at some length on the ignorance, immorality and crime so prevalent in the city of Edinburgh, in spite of her princely hospitals, her free schools, and her hundred and twenty churches, supplemented by seventy-seven missionaries. Those statements were not based on the testimony of Established Churchmen clamouring for the erection of additional places of worship for their own denomination. When such authorities as Bailie Lewis, an Evangelical Unionist,* and Mr Thomas Knox, J.P., an United Presbyterian, concur in their estimate of the moral and social condition of the city, their warning must command serious consideration. Both of these magistrates have bestowed much time and toil in the reformation of their degraded fellow-citizens. The following sentences convey Mr Knox's latest estimate of the baneful effects of drunkenness :—" Let facts again vindicate me in my endeavours to rouse my fellow-citizens to the social shame and danger which surround us—facts which may well make us inquire whether luxuries and liquors do not threaten to dig a pit for us quite as deep and ignominious as that into which unhappy France has so suddenly fallen. Edinburgh has planted down in her midst 855

* In my "Future Church of Scotland," I designated the Bailie an United Presbyterian. Like Mr Knox, he is a zealous member of the Total Abstinence Society, and a vigorous social reformer.

public-houses of all denominations. Were these placed side by side, they would extend from Portobello to Corstorphine, or a distance of five miles. The stone and lime value of the property in which the liquor traffic is conducted amounts to one million sterling. The rent derived from it amounts to £60,000 annually. The sum spent on the consumption of liquor in the city amounts to upwards of £500,000 annually. Last year, there were apprehended by the police some 9000 citizens, the half of whom were drunk when apprehended. 'Drunk,' says Captain Linton, 'when apprehended, 2167 males and 1335 females.' But shocking and shameful though these facts be as to the number of females, mothers and daughters, mingling in the police cells with the 'drunk and incapables' of this devout city, it must, nevertheless, be distinctly understood that the numbers who escape the police altogether must be at least ten times greater. Chiefly those fall into the hands of the police, and enter into the paradise of Bacchus called the 'cells,' who are flung out to the gutters after eleven o'clock at night. They are the periodic perquisites of degradation to the handy policeman on the beat. Any house but a public-house would take much kindlier care of their 'incapable' friends. The manly fellows of the force have my unfeigned sympathy for being so degraded as to have to do such nasty scavenger work 'all the year round.' Take an illustration of the working of the system, socially and evangelically, on a Saturday night; what I call the 'preparation' night of Edinburgh for 'remembering the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' From seven to eleven o'clock there entered into ten public-houses in High Street, Canongate, and Cowgate 3326 males, 2139 females, 591 boys and girls, and 52 soldiers, the average number to each being 610 individuals, graduating for the police barrow and the cells. I have seen in the police cells on a *Sunday morning* upwards of fifty human beings and fellow-citizens 'for both worlds' wallowing on the cell floors, like swine, in their drunken filth, and bellowing out blasphemies till I was made to shudder."

I invite the reader to accompany me in a similar investigation into the condition of Glasgow, the commercial metropolis of Scotland, the second city in the British empire, and the most

beautiful commercial city in Europe. For many reasons, Scotsmen are justly proud of Glasgow, of her commercial enterprise, of her practical intelligence, of her palatial warehouses, of her huge manufactories, of her spacious marts, of her sleepless furnaces, of her noble river, whose banks are lined with stately merchantmen, and of her busy shipyards, which build more ships than all the other shipyards of Great Britain combined. Glasgow, too, has some reason to congratulate herself on the munificence of her merchants, the enterprise of her shopkeepers, and the industry of her artisans. Many of her capitalists, conscious of the heavy responsibility entailed by the possession of vast wealth, as well as by their close relation to the thousands of working men in their employment, spend annually large sums of money in efforts to elevate their condition. Several of them devote a large portion of their time to visiting the lowest quarters of the city, cheering the hearts of the widow and the orphan, and striving, by every means in their power, to rescue the profligate from their physical and moral debasement. In respect of education, Glasgow is superior to Manchester, Liverpool, or Birmingham. Her ancient University has long enjoyed an honourable reputation, and her citizens have recently recognised their appreciation of her academic culture by their munificent contributions to the fund for erecting the stately University at Gilmorehill.* Everything in the city betokens activity, industry, perseverance, and expansion. Foreigners and travellers admire her busy thoroughfares, thronged with shrewd, sagacious, and practical tradesmen eager in their pursuit of wealth. And they boast, not without reason, that their mighty city has been erected and embellished by their own industry, with hardly any aid from the Imperial Exchequer. Glasgow does not depend on one or two sources of industry; the people "sow beside all waters;" hence she enjoys an immunity from that deep commercial depression found in towns in which one or two branches of trade are cultivated to the exclusion of others. Among the sources of her wealth are ship-building, iron-founding, iron-rolling, machine-making, construction of engines, both marine and land, dyeing, brewing, distilling, chemical manufacture, biscuit-baking, gutta percha manufactures, paper-

* The Messrs Baird of Gartaherrie subscribed £5,000.

staining, paper-making, pottery manufacture, soap manufacture, glass manufacture, carpet manufacture.*

Etymologically, Glasgow means the dark valley, and, in a moral point of view, she has many dark aspects. Having resided there for twelve years, having been attached to several of her prominent educational institutions, and enjoyed large intercourse with many of her townsmen who were engaged in social reforms, I am enabled to speak with some confidence. But it seems preferable to appeal to high authorities now living in that city. When Dr Robert Buchanan was settled in the Tron parish, he soon ascertained that in the city, which was not half of its present extent, 50,000 persons were living in neglect of Gospel ordinances. Since that year, the United Presbyterians have erected many chapels, and the Free Church has planted no less than sixty.

Let us overleap thirty-five years, and glance at the present religious state of this great city, keeping in mind that the population is increasing at the rate of 1000 a-month, the prospect is truly alarming. Probably few ministers are more intimately conversant with the present irreligion and profligacy of Glasgow than Dr Norman Macleod, whose Barony parish contains a population of nearly 200,000 souls. In the General Assembly of 1870, Dr Macleod delivered a very interesting and practical speech on the Home Mission. In that speech, which merits a repeated perusal, he told a numerous audience how the ranks of crime and sin in great cities are filled up by poor orphans and by illegitimate children, who never knew the loving name of father, while they had better never known that of mother—how his Kirk-Session and the friends of the Church of Scotland had built schools accommodating more than 2400 pupils—how they had built seven churches and endowed them—how he had founded penny savings-banks—how they had established social meetings and a concert room—how he was obliged to confess with sorrow that he had not succeeded in inducing the ill-clothed to attend regular Divine service—how the old

* For this list I am indebted to my very intelligent and obliging friend, Mr J. H. Banks, of the Inland Revenue, Glasgow. He has furnished me with many other interesting details of the enterprise of many Glasgow commercial firms. Yet, it is singular that the Inhabited House Duty in Glasgow is less than that of Edinburgh.

Scottish feeling about Sunday clothes, not indifference, was the cause of absenteeism of thousands—how in his first country parish for three winters, and in Glasgow for seven, he had filled his church with people in working-clothes only, all others being excluded—and how a duchess had been obliged to come with a shawl over her head instead of a bonnet. In the same speech, Dr Macleod stated that the number of non-church-going persons in Glasgow now equals the whole population when Dr Chalmers resided in the city.

To the same effect Dr Charteris,* whose ministry in Glasgow, brief and interrupted by sickness, was so laborious, detailed his experience of her religious condition :—“ I shall first take the parish of Townhead, in Glasgow, endowed by our liberal friends the Messrs Baird, Gartsherrie.† There are 7077 souls in it—1364 belonging to the Church of Scotland, 931 to the Church of England (many of these last very degraded), and upwards of 800 belonging to no Church in any sense. These 800 are about 1-8th of the population. This is a district inhabited by well-paid operatives, and most laboriously and successfully cultivated for several years by the indefatigable minister, Mr Turnbull. Take next St George-in-the-Fields, Glasgow. The last statistics show 2379 families, of whom between 1-5th and 1-6th belonged to no church. That also is not one of the poorest parts of Glasgow. Take the Port-Dundas district of the Barony Parish, where the Park Church conducts a successful mission : we found that of 772 families 205, or between 1-3d or 1-4th, were living in appalling neglect of religion. Take, again, the parish of Millin, to the endowment of which, a

* Dr Charteris, whom, Whig as I am of the school of 1688, I thank the Conservative Government for nominating to the Chair of Biblical Criticism in Edinburgh University, in preference to Dr Robert Wallace, of Old Greyfriars', is one of the most eminent young ministers of the Church of Scotland. Both in Glasgow and Edinburgh he has won the respect and attachment of all genuine Presbyterians. He is not blind to faults in his own Church, and duly appreciates worth in other denominations.

† The nephew of the Messrs Baird, and the managing partner of the firm, is Mr Alexander Whitelaw, a gentleman of great practical intelligence in Christian and philanthropic enterprise, an attached member of the Church of Scotland, yet no bigot, because he sees that all the Presbyterian Churches ought to unite in hearty Christian effort. He thoroughly comprehends the territorial principle on which Churches ought to be instituted—a principle of which many Presbyterian ministers of all denominations are strangely ignorant or oblivious.

year ago, Dr Phin alluded. A year ago, it was empty; now there are, I think, some 660 communicants, and the church is full. The excellent minister sends me some admirable statistics, showing that, from a total of 5110 souls there are 950, or between 1-5th and 1-6th, who belong to no church, and this although he and his helper have excavated a great many."

Shortly before the meeting of the General Assembly of 1870, there were published two remarkable pamphlets by nine Established Presbyterian ministers in Glasgow, the Rev. James Johnston,* of Free St James's Church, and the Rev. David Pirret, of the City Road United Presbyterian Church. Mr Johnston, who was compelled by ill-health to quit the Foreign Mission field in China, has been settled in Glasgow for more than twelve years, and is honourably known as a faithful, laborious, and efficient pastor. His pamphlet is entitled "Religious Destitution in Glasgow," and bears unmistakable evidence of Mr Johnston's acquaintance with the subject. Like Dr Macleod, he avoids all harsh and insulting language towards those persons who habitually neglect the house of prayer:—"I do not even call them the sunken masses—a name so apt to conceal the individuality of each member of that amorphous heap of which the mass consists—a name which tends to blunt the feelings—which cannot single out an object of personal interest or pity in such a huge agglomeration of living souls. I prefer to use awkward phrases and roundabout expressions, which may spoil my periods, but will not hurt the feelings of those of whom or to whom I write. No, they are not a *mass*. These neglecters of our sanctuaries and of their own souls are, very many of them, living men and women, and worthy of our love, if we knew them better. Many are poor and needy, the very class for whom God leaves the heavens and comes down—the class

* Mr Johnston, who is, I believe, a son-in-law of Mr Macfie, M.P., was educated at the University of Edinburgh and the English Presbyterian College, but his previous studies were directed and influenced by Dr Horatius Bonar and Dr James Hamilton. In addition to his widely circulated pamphlets on the moral condition of Glasgow, he has published a learned and ingenious little work, entitled "The Primitive Sabbath Restored by Christ: an Historical Argument, derived from Ancient Records of China, Egypt, and other Lands." London: James Nisbet & Co., 21, Berners Street; Glasgow: T. Murray & Son. 1868.

for whom the Gospel is designed and fitted. 'To the poor the Gospel is preached.' Many are manly and independent spirits; difficult to reach and hard to win, but if through grace subdued, the very best materials to form a type of vigorous piety. Very many are little children, with ways as sweet and winsome as those of our Christian homes; apt to learn either good or evil, as they may be trained; just such children as Jesus would take up in His arms and bless, if He were here, and perhaps who would be the first to raise the shout of 'Hosannah to the Son of David!' when many of our proud professors would stand aloof or scowl on the humble Saviour." Mr Johnston's statements and estimates have been carefully verified. Computing the Roman Catholic population of Glasgow at 100,000, he finds 416,000 Protestants. In 1868, the number of Protestant places of worship was 196. How many of the 416,000 Protestants ought to attend church? Dr Chalmers held that 5-8ths ought to be there, amounting to 260,000. Taking the lower estimate at 50 per cent., there remain "130,000 persons who habitually neglect God's ordinances." "What an idea of destitution," asks Mr Johnston, "would it give if we saw these 130,000 living by themselves, forming a town far larger than any in Scotland, with the exception of our own city and Edinburgh—larger than Dundee by 40,000 souls, and nearly twice as large as Aberdeen—a town larger by 20,000 than Greenock, Paisley, and Perth, in one—a town without a church, and without a Sabbath, where no spire pointed heavenward, and no soft music of Sabbath bells awoke holy thought—a town where no minister of Christ came with the message of life and peace, and where no altar was raised to the worship of Jehovah! There would be found in it not a few men of wealth, and literary taste, and much refinement. There would be, we doubt not, many a home of love and peace, and many warm hearts, generous spirits, and a large proportion of honest, industrious, and independent working men and women. But we cannot conceal from ourselves that there would be in it a fearfully large proportion of a very different class. Poverty, and wretchedness, and vice would make their haunts there. Its streets would swarm with our thousands of confirmed drunkards, and our two or three thousand of abandoned women, and many more thousands of their guilty

associates. The lawless classes, which make our city of half a million too notorious for its crimes, would, with rare exceptions, be found in that town of 130,000. Its name would be a by-word, and the Christian Church would arouse herself to send the Gospel to every street, and the messenger of mercy to every house of such a city. Some relief might be felt by the philanthropist if he were assured that there were any well-founded prospect of improvement; but then another asserts, "that in spite of many noble and generous efforts on the part of many ministers and merchants of late years, and notwithstanding many gracious manifestations of the influence of the Spirit of God, the destitution of our city goes on increasing." What of the City Missionaries, termed the Evangelical Agency? "We have hitherto acted, as a rule, on the supposition that it was enough to employ, as missionaries to the home heathen, as they have been called, a class of agents whom we would not have thought of sending to the heathen in India and China, or even the Hottentots of Africa. . . Why not set apart for home evangelistic work men of the highest gifts and the best education, free from the absorbing care of a pastor's duties?" Towards the conclusion of his appeal Mr Johnston says—"I speak of the Church as one, for in this work I ignore all narrow distinctions of denominationalism, and hail every earnest worker 'holding the Head' as a brother, and bid him 'God-speed;' and God will most highly honour that Church and that Christian who does the most for this outlying population of ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY THOUSAND SOULS."*

Scarcely had Mr Johnston's pamphlet appeared when the Rev. David Pirret† issued his "Church and the Masses: an Appeal." Mr Pirret's testimony is especially weighty and valuable. He has the pastoral oversight of a mission Church, in New City Road, Glasgow, situated within gunshot of the Normal Schools belonging to the Established and the Free Church.

* In 1871 Mr Johnston published another impressive pamphlet, entitled "The Rising Tide of Irreligion, Pauperism, Immorality, and Death in Glasgow, and how to Turn it: Facts and Suggestions."

† Mr Pirret's first charge was Sutton, Cheshire. At the outset of his ministry he published a work entitled "The Ethics of the Sabbath," partly controversial, and partly practical in its character. In both respects the subject is ably handled. Edinburgh: Thomas Constable & Co., 1855.

Like Mr Johnston, he is a most diligent and devoted minister; and although he is, I believe, a Voluntary, he has not shrunk from publishing the results of his toilsome experience in Scotland and England:—" 1. The careless and irreligious population of our country is increasing with fearful rapidity. The natural increase is swelled by numerous desertions from the Church, both of the old and young. 2. Crime is attaining in our country the coherence and the power of a great organization. Evidently this is felt by our statesmen, who are at their wits' end how to deal with and diminish it. They seem to be afraid that, unless something effectual can be done now, the criminal classes will become wholly unmanageable. 3. The professors of religion are not multiplying in anything like the ratio of the careless and the criminal classes; and we cannot be certain that any increase of profession is accompanied with a corresponding increase of vital godliness, seeing that in our day there exist so many worldly reasons for making a profession of religion. 4. The influence of the Church on the world in the way of reforming and regenerating the country is scarcely perceptible; while the evangelization of the masses is becoming a greater and more difficult problem every day." But have not the Free Churches combated the evils which he deprecates? "Some will be ready to remind us of the great and blessed results in our land of the Free Church Disruption, and of other revivals of religion. Most gladly and gratefully do we admit the mighty influence exerted on the Church by these great movements. But if, with such an exceptional and extraordinary experience, the position of the Church is such as it is, it seems very plain that the *ordinary* rate of progress cannot be satisfactory. And this is the point we have been attempting to prove; and in proving it, to show the urgent necessity of securing, without delay, something higher and better as the normal and ordinary condition of the Church." Finally, let Mr Pirret's opinion of the Glasgow City Mission be duly pondered, and be it remembered that many, if not a majority of the missionaries, are students of his own denomination:—"For example, take the Glasgow City Mission, which employs about fifty agents, who devote four hours each day to the visitation of the careless classes, and hold two meetings each week, besides having Bible classes and Sabbath

schools, and other appliances for interesting and improving all who choose to avail themselves of them. And how many do these fifty agents succeed in drafting into the fellowship of the Church during a year? About *fifty* represents the general average. Now, suppose we grant that the other evangelistic efforts made in our city are greatly more successful, and that *ten times* fifty members are added by them to the Christian Church, is not this a miserably small number in a city that contains half-a-million of souls, and whose population is increasing at an enormous rate? And we believe the gains of the Church from the world are not proportionately greater in other towns, and throughout our country districts. If, then, we sum up all these gains, and estimate them at the highest credible number, all will acknowledge they are small. ‘What are they among so many?’”

If any one should object that the foregoing testimonies are from ministers who are prone to contemplate the shady aspect of the city, I invite him to examine a volume of nearly 400 pages, entitled “Moral Statistics of Glasgow, by a Sabbath School Teacher. The author is Mr William Logan, who has had much experience as an evangelist in large towns, both Scottish and English. As a zealous and active member of the Total Abstinence Society, he has devoted much attention to the demoralizing influence of intoxicating liquors. The late Sir Archibald Alison is quoted to prove that the operative classes of Glasgow, who earn their livelihood by the sweat of their brow, annually spend in whisky about £1,000,000—a sum more than sufficient to maintain all the paupers in Scotland, and much larger than the total rental of all the dwelling-houses in the city, from the hovels of the poor to the princely mansions in the west-end terraces. Mr Logan calculates that about £1,000,000 is squandered on prostitution, while the sum raised for the support of all the churches is £103,000, and the paltry sum of £137,000 represents the united collections of nearly 40 societies instituted for benevolent and philanthropic purposes. Disease is the inseparable concomitant of vice and drunkenness. Dr Strang, the late City Chamberlain, who was a careful and accurate statist, proved that, of the total deaths within the Parliamentary boundaries, amounting to 10,932,

there were 5450 of infants under five years of age, and that one-half of the men and women are carried off in the prime of life by consumption. Alison is also quoted to prove that drunkenness is the cause of two-thirds of the crime, and one-half of the distress among the working classes. "The increase in our bastardy," continues Mr Logan, "from 1220 in the year 1860, to 1591 within the Parliamentary bounds of the city in 1865, being an addition of 371 illegitimate births in the short space of three years, is most portentous. We have now reached a point where infants are exposed in closes and stairs so frequently, that placards posted by our Parochial Board, offering a reward for the discovery of the unnatural parents, are never off our walls. Infanticide is so common that, at our Autumn Circuit Court in 1863, four women were tried for child murder." "In Mandamento," says a recent writer, "containing upwards of 4,000 souls, there have been but three illegitimate births within the last forty-one years; illicit intercourse among the peasants may be said to be unknown; there is not a woman of loose character in the whole country, nor would be suffered to live in it. In this Mandamento of St Remo, upon the coast, containing a population of about 14,000 souls, there is no memory or record of a murder having ever been committed. From Dr Strang's tables it is clearly demonstrated, what many intelligent persons deny, that these districts of Glasgow (and this is true of all our great cities), in which prostitution is much prevalent, are the very districts most infamous for illegitimacy; that the suburban or rural districts of Glasgow, where prostitution is rare, are the lowest in the scale of illegitimacy; and that the rural districts are freer of illegitimacy than the town districts."

I next turn to another gloomy document of an official character, which cannot fail to command attention, and to scatter any doubts lingering in the minds of the most sceptical readers. It is the "City of Glasgow Police Criminal Returns for the fifteen months ending 31st December, 1869. Presented to the Board of Police, and ordered to be printed, 17th January, 1870." The report is subscribed by the late Captain Smart, the able superintendent of police, to whose successor, the equally able and zealous successor, Captain M'Call, I am indebted for a copy. What facts are disclosed by this official

report? Let the following extracts suffice:—"OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.—The number of offences under this head is 112, some of which are very serious. Two cases of murder have occurred. . . . Five parties have been convicted of culpable homicide. . . . Assaults by stabbing have increased. No fewer than 26 persons have been apprehended for this crime, and 16 of them have been convicted. Four persons have been convicted of the crime of assault with intent to ravish.

OFFENCES AGAINST PROPERTY COMMITTED WITH VIOLENCE.—The reports for the fifteen months have been 592, and the convictions 175. Thirty-eight returned convicts, and 3 ticket-of-leave holders, have been tried at the Circuit Courts, principally for this class of crimes. . . .

OFFENCES AGAINST PROPERTY, COMMITTED WITHOUT VIOLENCE.—10,576 thefts have been reported, and 2861 persons convicted during the fifteen months. Of these thefts, 34 were committed by shopmen and clerks, 48 by domestic servants, 175 by lodgers, 149 of goods exposed for sale, 625 by prostitutes, 827 in brothels, 2648 by doors being left open and insecure, and 1062 from intoxicated persons—being 5568 cases over which the police have little control.

EDUCATION OF CRIMINAL PRISONERS TRIED BY THE MAGISTRATES OR REMITTED TO THE SHERIFF.—1108 could neither read nor write, 801 could read, and 2101 could read and write.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS.—482 youths, under 14 years of age, have been brought before the Magistrates charged with crime; 107 of these were sent to the Reformatory, and 23 to the Industrial Schools.

BEGGARS AND DESTITUTE CHILDREN.—557 have been brought before the Court—43 adult beggars were sent to prison, and 112 destitute children sent to the Industrial Schools.

PROTECTION.—10,087 persons, or a daily average of 22, have received protection in the various police offices; 127 of these parties were brought before the Court charged with vagrancy. . . . Besides the persons mentioned in these tables, there have been 7033 parties, or a daily average of about 15, in the police-office, charged with disorderly conduct, and 24,655, or a daily average of about 54, for being drunk and incapable. Many of these people are frequently in the offices during the year, some of them nearly 100 times. This dismal catalogue of crime and conviction prepares us for

the next paragraph. POLICE FORCE.—The force has been increased by 24 since last report, making the total strength 866.”*

These Police Reports have not been adduced for the purpose of disparaging the character or efficiency of the Glasgow police force. Policemen are employed more with the view of punishing crime than of preventing it. In the majority of cases arising from theft and housebreaking, it is notorious that neither the criminal nor the stolen property can be identified; hence, the action of the police is unavailing.

I conclude this Tract with a practical application. In 1835, Dr Buchanan attributed the religious indifference of Glasgow to the inadequate machinery of the Established Church:—“Twelve parish churches and ministers to 220,000 people; and these twelve, with one exception, obliged, by high seat-rents, to defray their own cost—*are not an Establishment at all;*” while “*Voluntaryism has been here under every possible advantage.*”† How stands the fact in 1871? The Established Churches have increased to fifty-one, the Free Churches to fifty-two, the United Presbyterian to forty-seven, and the Protestant Churches amount to two hundred and nine; whilst all have been more or less disregarding the Territorial system, which nobody understands better than Dr Buchanan.

* I should like to see the Police Reports of the Tron and St John’s Parishes when Dr Chalmers was their minister. Verily he was a cheap moral policeman. Fancy the great pulpit orator visiting, in one year, families containing ten thousand souls!

† See p. 13 of Dr Buchanan’s “Lecture on Church Establishments,” formerly quoted. The italics are Dr Buchanan’s, not mine, as I rarely seek to emphasise my meaning by typographical aids. The late Mr John Carmichael was wont happily to characterise a certain pretentious Edinburgh pedagogue as “speaking italics.” Dr Buchanan, however, is a good composer.

TRACT SEVENTH.

Conflicting Theories of Morals.

Importance of a True Standard of Morals—Greek Philosophers—The Ionic School—Theories of Democritus, Empedocles, Anaxagoras, Pythagoras—The Sophists—Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle—Pyrrho, the Sceptic—Epicureans and Stoics—The Academies—Roman Philosophy—Lucretius and Cicero—Alexandrian School—Neo-Platonists—Gnostics—Plotinus and Proclus—Boethius.

By many persons who do not understand the necessity of regulating national legislation, as well as private conduct, by the highest standard revealed to man—the Holy Scriptures, the following Tract may be pronounced inappropriate in a work on Scottish religion and education. Further reflection may serve to disabuse them of this notion. During recent years, there has been growing up a class of men who fancy that from modern science, or the “inner consciousness,” they can extract a system of Morals sufficiently pure and complete to justify the exclusion of revealed truth from their consultation. There are avowed Sceptics or Rationalists who shut their eyes to the fact, that to that very Book which they decry they owe their freedom of thought and expression. But my survey of ethical systems is designed more for that larger and more estimable class, which admits the paramount authority of its precepts for individual guidance, but which adopts another and lower standard in discussing public questions. No one versed in the history of philosophical and religious speculation can fail to recognise in the conjectures of ancient sages the origin of various modern theories, which have been paraded as original discoveries; whereas they are merely old foes with new faces.*

* If the reader is disinclined to glance at the moral doctrines of the Grecian philosophers, he may omit the reading of this Tract until he has perused that on Education.

A hasty retrospect of the philosophical systems of antiquity will show how eagerly they pushed their inquiries into profound and mysterious problems touching the creation of the world, the existence and attributes of the Deity, the intellectual and moral constitution of man, his relation to his Creator and to his fellow-men, his hope of reward or his dread of punishment in a future state of being and activity.

Contenting ourselves with the bare mention of the philosophic attempts of the Hindoos, Chinese, and Persians, let us briefly examine the ethical systems of the Greek philosophers, whose insatiable thirst after knowledge and marvellous subtlety of disquisition have found no parallel in succeeding ages.*

The famous seven Grecian sages bear the same relation to the after-history of Greece which the seven champions of Christendom bear to the history of the middle ages. The doctrines attributed to Thales concerning water as the origin of the world's soul, and all things, the world being full of demons, contain the germ of all the late Greek pantheism. He is considered the originator of the Dynamic philosophy. Anixamander referred all things to earth, and occupied himself in the explanation of the Infinite.† Anixamenes held that the air rules over all things, as the soul, being air, rules in man. Jove was said of old to rule in the air. Might not this be air? Heraclitus, the weeping and obscure philosopher, attached much sacredness and importance to the element of fire, which seemed to him the vital quickening power of the universe. These four speculators belonged to the Ionic school.

Democritus was the ardent expounder of Atomic theory. The soul he conceived to consist of globular atoms of fire, which impart movement to the body; and he accounted for the Deity, partly through an incapacity to understand fully the phenomena of which we are the witnesses. Happiness he maintained to consist in an amiability of temperament, whence he

* Much information on the doctrines of the Greek philosophers will be found in Tennemann's "History of Philosophy," Hampden's "Fathers of Greek Philosophy," Sir William Hamilton's "Lectures," Maurice's "Ancient Philosophy," Heeren's "Political History of Ancient Greece," Grote's "History of Greece," Lewes's "Biographical History of Philosophy," "Ritter and Preller's Greek and Latin Philosophy;" and De Quincey on the "Republic of Plato."

† *το ἄκρον.*

deduced his moral principles and prudential maxims. Empedocles, named the enchanter, at once a warrior, poet, and philosopher, by his curiously blending physics and ethics in his speculations, excited the displeasure of Aristotle, and the admiration of the Roman poet Lucretius. Anaxagoras, the instructor of Pericles, surpassed all his predecessors in pure physical contemplation, and he is conjectured to have anticipated modern discoveries respecting the laws of cohesion. He told the Athenians that "all things at first were in a heap, and that Nous, not Zeus, came in and set them in order. His teaching led to his ostracism, on the charge of Medism—a charge similar to that of *incivisme* in the French Revolution. Pythagoras is reported to have been the first who assumed the title of Philosopher, or lover of wisdom, in contrast to the Sophists, or pretenders to wisdom. Though a disciple of Anaximander, he rejected his theory regarding the Infinite. A great traveller and musician, he elaborated the theory of lines and numbers, and inculcated the doctrine of metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls, which he may have borrowed from the Egyptians. His extensive intercourse with mankind led him to attach much importance to the necessity of law, and to the perils which order underwent from the ambition of individuals. Hence resulted his desire to see men seeking for wisdom in silence, but not in solitude, for thus mystic harmony would be felt and acknowledged, and the idea of God would be felt as the foundation of social life. This feeling contributed to the formation of the famous societies or brotherhoods whose proceedings were transacted with the greatest secrecy, and the members engaged in a worship or mysteries sometimes called the Pythagorean orgies. Whilst these societies exercised a wholesome influence in the cities of southern Italy, their proneness to political intrigues was, like the machinations of the Jesuits, found to be at war with regular government. Whether the founder of this "order," as it is called by Grote and Thirlwall, forwarded its ambitious views, or was overborne by his disciples, cannot be now determined. His name remained sacred and venerable in Greece. Plato and Aristotle revered the master, but condemned the school. Xenophanes was not an Atheist, but an earnest negative Theist.

He asserted a "Being," but what Being he could not tell. The God of Xenophanes was transformed into the "One" of Parmenides. Zeno, of Elea, the scholar of Parmenides, is entitled to the gratitude of posterity for the organ or instrument which he presented to Philosophy. This was Logic, the science of proof, or inference, or the Laws of Thought. Mathematical science came from the East, but Logic belongs to Greece.

The Sophists were a class of extraordinary men who have been the subject of much controversy among scholars and historians. It is worthy of observation that the most celebrated of them came from many different parts of Greece; Gorgias, who begins the series, from Leontium, in Sicily; Protagoras, from Abdera, on the coast of Thrace; Hippias, from Colophon, in Asia Minor; not to mention a multitude of those who were less famous. This is a remarkable proof of the general desire for knowledge, which, after the Persian war, had begun to animate the Greeks. The Sophists confined their instruction to Philosophy and Rhetoric, and trained their pupils to confound opponents by Syllogisms and Sophisms. They disgusted Socrates by their vain pretensions of being masters of every science, and of imparting instructions in every subject. They even professed to teach virtue, not as a discipline or law, but as an external art or accomplishment. They were accused of arrogant pretensions, of sordid cunning, and of foul impiety. Hippias appears to have surpassed all in vanity and ostentation, boasting of his skill in every kind of composition in prose and verse. Travelling from town to town, the Sophists obtained admission into the houses of the wealthy, and received extravagant sums of money for rendering their sons adepts in philosophy and the art of government. Assuming all principles to be equally true, their whole teaching was relative to opinion,* and they never questioned its truth. "All opinions in morals," they alleged, "are true, but all are not good. We can lead men to such opinions as we know to be both good and wise." Like Carneades and Arcesilaüs, of the Academy, they argued that there was no sure test of truth, and denied the reality of moral distinctions. Hence the precepts and the very name of the Sophists become a reproach among the ancients. Yet some of their class were

* *ἅπασιν δόξαν*

men of great ability and various extensive acquirements, evincing a real love of that wisdom which was their ostensible pursuit. They rose rapidly, because they were closely connected with the wants of the times, and they roused Greece to the dignity and necessity of a liberal education. The Sophists set the example of giving instruction for pay, and of applying philosophy to political science. I may remark by the way that in Rome, no instruction of any kind received public endowment till the reign of Vespasian; that that Emperor conferred salaries on a few Greeks and Italians who gave instructions in literature and eloquence; and that the younger Pliny succeeded in establishing a school in his native town of Como, by promoting for its support one-third in addition to whatever sum the inhabitants should raise among themselves.

Socrates, "whom, well-inspired, the oracles pronounced wisest of men," is said to have brought philosophy from heaven to dwell upon the earth. He had no professed school—no "workshop of thought"*—as Aristophanes facetiously styles it; no regular place of meeting, like Plato in the Academy, and Aristotle in the Lyceum; yet he converted Athens into an University of Greece. Among the groups of his disciples were gathered around him, day by day, philosophers, statesmen, generals—the sons of the noblest citizens and of the humblest artisans—the resident foreigners and the visitors from distant commonwealths. His life, doctrines, and death, have been affectionately commemorated by his disciples, Xenophon and Plato. He playfully called his art a kind of intellectual midwifery;† he was the founder of the Moral and Logical Science of the schools of Athens; he may be accounted the father of the History of Philosophy; and he has the merit of reviving among his countrymen the forgotten theory of Natural Religion, in proof of which he first gave the argument from final causes an explicit and due importance. Repudiating the notion that mere external punishment was the only suffering undergone for offences committed, he pointed out that secret faults did not escape with impunity; that in the remorse of conscience the wrong-doer was surely, but invisibly, punished; and that in a future state each would receive the merited consequence of his actions—

* *Φροντιστήριον.*

† *μαίαια.*

thus verifying Saint Paul's assertion respecting the Gentiles possessing a "conscience bearing witness, and thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."* In the argument now known as the argument from final causes, and in the evidence of Almighty design in the fabric and course of Nature, Socrates provided his hearers with a valid defence of the being, providence, and moral government of the Deity. He also alludes to the sense of responsibility as an evidence of the existence of a Divine Power to bestow rewards and inflict punishments. Unlike his successors in the schools of the Stoics, he did not advocate suicide. But the moral philosophy of Socrates is obnoxious and open to several objections. It did not fix the due stigma of abomination on that debasing vice, which polluted Grecian society. Socrates conceived that, if men went astray in their conduct, it was only necessary to make them know the truth, and they would then act on their knowledge,—an error which must be treated with leniency, since it has been repeated in our own day by so many pretended moral and religious reformers. Convinced that the false theories of his predecessors and contemporaries were based on vacillating opinion rather than on certain knowledge, he traced human misconduct and unhappiness to erroneous judgment instead of moral perversion. Thus vice was, in no case, according to his view, an act of the will, but of the mistaken judgment, and was only folly,—an obvious fallacy, since the seat of vice is not in the understanding, but in the heart: men see the light, but love darkness rather than light. It need cause no surprise that Socrates enjoined the requital of evil to enemies,†—a maxim strongly inculcated by Demosthenes.

Plato was the most famous of the scholars of Socrates, and the earliest moral philosopher whose writings we possess. He developed his system in elaborate Dialogues, displaying great depth and elegance of thought, grace and propriety of expression, dramatic vivacity of representation, artistic beauty and wealth of illustration, exquisite musical rhythm of style, and wonderful subtlety of metaphysical distinction. He reared the structure of his philosophy on his theory of Ideas, which embraced his logical, physical, and ethical doctrines. His teach-

* Rom. ii. 15.

† Xen., *Mem.* iv. 2, 16; ii., 6, 25. Aristot., *Rhet.* ii. 23.

ing of philosophy being, like that of Socrates, colloquial and practical, was congenial to the Athenians, whose delight was in the Agora, or the Ecclesiæ, or the Courts of Law, or the Theatre. Like Socrates, too, he treated with supreme ridicule the arrogant pretensions and sordid cupidity of the Sophists. His method, which questioned and thoroughly investigated every subject of human inquiry, he styled Dialectic, the true Art of Discussion, Real Science, the Key to true Philosophy, and the knowledge of the truth, as contrasted with their pompous wisdom of opinion.* Whilst the Sophists boasted of their power to transform the characters of their disciples, on the principle that all opinions are equally true, Plato taught that there was a principle in man superior to instruction, the "God-measure,"† the immutable divine standard by which all moral reformation should be guided. In the "Phædo," he argues strongly in favour of the immortality of the soul. In the "Timæus" he speaks of the universe as the one work of "One Supreme Being," of the Father of all things. Vestiges of the inspired records may be recognised in the striking words addressed by the Father of the Universe to the generated gods respecting the formation of the bodies of man and other living creatures,‡ reminding us of that day "when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." To the same source may be traced the reference to earthly deluges and genealogies,|| to the representation of God as the Shepherd of his people,§ and to accounts of variations in the course of the rising and setting of the sun. Plato bears testimony both to the fact of the perfection of man at his creation and of his existing corruption, which, however, he takes to be rather physical than moral, and effected gradually rather than the effect of the first transgression of the positive Divine command. According to his system, philosophy, religion, and morality perfectly coincide.¶ The love of truth is also the love of good, and the love of good is the love of truth, and the chief good and the truth itself are the Deity. Temperance,** or more strictly speaking,

* *δοξασοφία*.

† *θεὸς μέτρον*.

‡ *Timæus*, p. 325.

|| *Polit.*, p. 290; *Leg.* 1.

§ *Polit.*, p. 35.

¶ *Philebus*, p. 285.

** *σωφροσύνη*.

sober-mindedness, regulates all moral conduct. In respect of education, his "Republic" contemplates the improvement of man, as he is an individual in the world; and in his "Laws" he regards his improvement as a member of a State. He emphatically recognises the great truth that the foundations of all government and law are laid in the unchanging nature of the Divine Being. He strove to realise his lofty idea of the beautiful, the appropriate feeling of which is love, and of virtue, which he represents as the harmony of the whole soul—as a peace between all its principles and desires; whilst vice was treated as the offspring of discord and disease. This state of disease is what is commonly called folly,* and it takes the form either of madness† or of mere ignorance.‡ With such exalted conceptions of the existence and government of God, and of man's dignity as a rational, his responsibility as a moral, and his destiny as an immortal being, we must not close our eyes to the weaker parts of Plato's system. He followed Socrates in maintaining that no one is willingly evil. To use his own expression, man is "a sort of plaything of the Deity,"§ having but little of truth or reality in his nature, and is scarcely worthy of any serious attention. We cannot determine how far he was guilty of the gross licentiousness imputed to him by Antisthenes and Aristippus, brother disciples in the school of Socrates. Unquestionably, certain epigrams and passages of his Dialogues betray a pruriency of allusion which a pure mind contemplates with pain, and which casts a shadow over the character of their author. But what shocks us as most repulsive in his philosophy is his supposed community of wives and children, his contempt of the characteristic proprieties of the sex,§ his denying to mothers the nursing and training of their

* ἄνοια.

† μανία.

‡ ἀμαθία.

§ Ὡς εἰς τὴν παίζουσαν.

§ I can hardly help referring to what appears to me the indefensible proposal to teach mixed medical classes of men and women in the University of Edinburgh. Even if I had not formed a decided opinion against it, I should have been largely influenced by the declarations of Professors Christison and Lister, that the adoption of the proposal would compel them to resign their chairs. It is strange that its advocates do not admit the propriety of educating young lads and young ladies in the same schools. Yet Professor Christison has been plentifully abused for censuring what he, as a veteran and pre-eminent expounder of medicine, knows to be a restriction conducive to science and modesty. No one who knows the serious consequences resulting from the mixture of male and female students in certain

children—thus anticipating the Socialism of Robert Owen. It is not surprising that one who had been guilty of such extravagances, should seek to extirpate the notion of private possessions, thus preparing the community for the maxim of Proudhon, that “all property was theft.”

Plato's Ideal theory was stoutly combated by his scholar, Aristotle, as opposed to all sound speculation; he likewise disputed the doctrine of Protagoras and Empedocles that there is no fixed standard of thought. He was the first philosopher to exhibit moral science in a systematic and didactic form. Anticipating Bacon, he pursued the inductive method of investigation; and he is the only political theorist who always kept in view the moral nature of man in his speculations. In his “Nicomachean Ethics,” on which his fame as a moral philosopher mainly depends, he attempts to discover the nature of the chief good. Moral virtue he determined to be conversant about affections and actions. When the perfect work of virtue has been performed, by adjusting the moral and intellectual principles to their objects, the highest pleasure of our nature has been attained. Prudence is the principle of moral obligation involved in his theory of virtue—not the prudence which calculates consequences, but a practical philosophy of the heart, resembling, in some measure, the supremacy of conscience, but feebler than that sovereign principle. If the affections are all habitually regulated by prudence, virtue is the result; so that in moderation consists the nature of virtue. Excess is, in every case, that to which we attribute mischief and derangement. There is an excess called timidity, and an excess called foolhardiness; an excess called prodigality, and an excess called narrowness or avarice. But the extremes suppose a mean. This is the end at which our habit aims. Virtue generally lies in the mean. Having settled the foundation, he next considers the particular ethical virtues which compose the perfect or moral character. Among these are justice,* a political virtue,

seminaries in Glasgow can shut his eyes to the perils of the system, especially if aggravated by bad discipline and defective superintendence. Certain irregularities in the Glasgow Established Normal Seminary were effectually checked by the late Dr Craik, Convener of the Committee. In England, the male and female Normal students are trained in separate colleges.

* *Δικαιοσύνη*, the “Justification by Faith” of Saint Paul.

applicable to the citizens of a common state; moderation,* a habit of mind not overcome by sensual desire; friendship, which he refers to a deeper and surer foundation,—not utility to ourselves, but involving virtue as a necessary condition, implying the abnegation of self-love; and pleasure, not as a means to an end, but something real and worthy in itself, the higher pleasures being derived from exertion of the higher energies, and “the energy of the soul, according to virtue,” being the highest pleasure to man. The pleasure attending an act is a test of a man’s having acquired a character corresponding to that act. The man who delights in musical energies has become a musician. The man who delights in just acts is a just man; and Aristotle agreed with Socrates and Plato that happiness was “unrepented pleasure.” Plato more habitually considered happiness as the natural fruit of virtue; Aristotle oftener viewed virtue as the means of attaining happiness; but as he did not attribute any real immortality to the nature of man, he could only draw his notion of perfect happiness from the view of the present life. Aristotle clearly affirms the voluntary nature both of virtue and vice. We do not greatly err in supposing that he opposed Plato’s doctrine of the origin of the universe, and of the immortality of the soul, whilst his theory of education excluded religion. Not only does he sanction slavery on abstract grounds, but realising his principle of perfect polity, he justifies infanticide and abortion; and the maimed, he thinks, ought not to live. Morality he inculcated, not as a law, but as a philosophy or art of life.

Pyrrho, the founder of the first Sceptic school, was a warm admirer of Democritus. To him the highest object of philosophy was tranquillity of mind, which was disturbed by the collisions of the rival schools. The aim of the Sceptics or Pyrrhonii was to overthrow all existing systems. True philosophy, however, teaches not to doubt merely, but to doubt well, as a step to knowledge. “We doubt,” says Sir William Hamilton, “that we may believe; we begin that we may not end with doubt. We doubt once that we may believe always; we renounce authority that we may follow reason; we surrender opinion that we may obtain knowledge. We must be Pro-

* *σωφροσύνη*, opposed to *απολασία*, but not synonymous with *ιγκράτεια*.

testants, not infidels, in philosophy." Constant doubting is an exhausting process, and frequently terminates not merely in despair, but in abject superstition. Credulity and scepticism react on one another. Hence we find that religious superstition and religious unbelief both flourish luxuriantly in the same country.

Nearly a century after the death of Plato, there arose a philosophical contest between the schools of the Epicureans and the Stoics. The personal character of Epicurus is involved in doubt, but his system, by making sensation too much the standard of happiness, may have ministered to sensuality; yet he strongly inculcated the connection of happiness and virtue, and he may be acquitted of any design to sap the foundations of human belief or human conduct. Of the doctrines of Zeno, the founder of the Stoics, little is known, since few of his writings have been preserved. Of the eight professors who taught in the Porch, from Zeno to Posidonius, every one either softened or exaggerated the doctrines of his predecessor. Chrysippus is said to have first given to the Stoical system its full development, and to have fixed its doctrines. To live according to nature, to conform that life to the nature of the whole of things, to despise pleasure and to be proof against pain, formed the standard of the stoical morality. But, though resting on a basis apparently sound, it latterly allowed its votaries to do nearly everything they liked. It invented a lower morality for mankind at large, and a higher for the ideal philosopher, and defended paradoxes by verbal quibbles. Greek philosophy was fast declining, and its representatives, no longer comprehending the reasoning of Plato and Aristotle, became Sophists and Rhetoricians. Such were the Academics. Protesting against the Epicureans and the Stoics, they taught no rival tenets, but tamely yielded to the spirit of the age. Arcesilaus founded the Middle Academy; and, after the lapse of a century, Carneades established the New. These later Academics, who borrowed their designations from the Academy of Plato, are compared by Sir James Mackintosh to "venomous animals who stung their victims to death, but also breathed their last into the wound." A Fourth Academy was instituted by Philo of Larissa—not the celebrated Platonic Jew—

and a Fifth, as some assert, by Antiochus of Ascala, his pupil and follower. Both endeavoured to reconcile the Dogmatics and the Sceptics. Latterly, Antiochus dissented from his master, striving to prove the identity of the Academic, Peripatetic, and Stoic doctrines with respect to morals, and maintaining that their differences were merely nominal.

To their contact with Greece the Romans owed their oratory, history, poetry, and philosophy. Lucretius, whose suicide rests on dubious authority, constructed his didactic poem "On the Nature of Things," after the model of Empedocles and of Hesiod. He fixed on the Atomic theory of Democritus and Leucippus as the central part of his philosophy, and was an ardent admirer of the moral doctrine of Epicurus. Materialism, and the denial of the existence of the Deity, lie at the root of his philosophy. He wanted a Moral Ruler, and not finding one, he became an Atheist. "There is through all his poem a pervading solemnity of tone, as of one awakening to the consciousness of a great invisible power in the world. Not only is the feeling of Lucretius more poetical, but his spirit is far more religious than that of his master Epicurus. His language in many places implies a latent sense of a truth inconsistent with the negative principles of his philosophy. This inconsistency between the doctrines and the spirit of Lucretius is, to some extent, to be accounted for by the fact, that he often leaves the beaten road of Epicureanism for the higher but less definite paths over which the adventurous genius and religious enthusiasm of Empedocles had borne him."* Cicero has the highest literary name of the ancient Roman world, and he was the first Roman who had read Aristotle's works, of which the manuscript lay neglected in Sylla's library. To regard him only as an expounder of the philosophy of Greece, where he had completed his education, is to disparage his own philosophical genius. Nominally, he was an Academic, and he borrowed two of Plato's titles—the "Laws," and the "Republic"—for his works. But his philosophy possesses a substantial value, inasmuch as he believed in a Divine power and Divine Govern-

* See Professor Sellar's "Roman Poets of the Republic" (p. 30), a work so spirited and discriminating that his readers are now impatient for his criticism of the Roman Poets of the Augustan Age.

ment, whilst he was more deeply impressed with the idea of Duty and Moral Obligation than most of his contemporaries, though his readers must be struck with a want of cohesion in his dissertations.

In Alexandria, the capital of Egypt, there was assembled, in the first century of the Christian era, a singular society of scholars, critics, grammarians, and philosophers,—Indians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, and Jews. There the Old Testament was translated into Greek by the Seventy, with the consent of Ptolemy. Egypt had been the cradle of civilisation. In the halls and libraries of Alexandria, the rival colonists engaged in earnest debates—the Egyptians pretending a fabulous antiquity, the Brahmins exalting the Bhavagad Gita, the Persians professing their faith in the Zendavesta, the Jews demanding implicit belief in Moses and the Prophets, the Greeks extolling their poets and philosophers and orators, whom their Roman conquerors had failed to rival. Philo, a learned and philosophical Jew, endeavoured to reconcile the Platonic philosophy with the Mosaic law and the sacred books of the Old Testament. He is reckoned by Bouterweck the first New Platonist. His books procured for him the title of the Theosopher. His Theosophy consisted in the notion that there could be no sympathy or intercourse between the Deity and His creatures without the intervention of a Logos, or Divine Word, as the reconciler. The philosopher, or lover of wisdom, ought, he contended, to be also a Theosopher, a seeker of God, but he failed in discovering a common centre where all religions might converge. About the end of the second century, there arose a new philosophical school, that of the Later Platonists, a mystical sect,* sometimes styled Gnostics, whose tenets exerted a strong influence on the later fathers of the Church. Its founder was Ammonius Saccas, probably an apostate from Christianity, but endowed with great talents, an ardent desire of knowledge, and an enthusiastic temper. The most eminent teacher of this school was Plotinus, one of the most mystical and confused writers in any language. The last Rector of this school was Proclus, who occupied himself

* For a lucid account of the doctrines of the Neo-Platonists, consult the Rev. Robert Alfred Vaughan's "Hours with the Mystics." The Alexandrian School is also sketched in the Rev. Charles Kingsley's romance, "Hypatia."

in commentaries on the older authors, and whose extreme propensity to allegory betrayed him into gross extravagance. Originally he was a man of vigorous understanding, but after a study of oriental systems on their native soil, he returned a dreamer, labouring to attain the comprehension of the Absolute by contemplation. The influence of Plotinus and Proclus has been perceptible in England among a school called the English Platonists, including Cadworth, Henry More, Norris, and Gale. With the Gnostics, or Pseudo-Christians, is allied the Eclectic Philosophy. The Gnostics professed to interpret the Scriptures by the aid of philosophy, and they rank among the corruptors, if not also the opponents of Christianity, which was sought to be transmuted into philosophical Theism. Their belief in the evil of matter led them to reject the doctrine of the resurrection. In his prison at Pavia, where he was in the fifth century beheaded by order of the Emperor Theodric, Boethius composed his "Consolations of Philosophy," which proves him to have been a Stoic rather than a Christian. The closing of the Athenian Schools by Justinian may be considered as the last event in the history of ancient philosophy.

An examination of Modern ethical systems will introduce the student to a great variety of Moral Standards, some of which are very vague, whilst all are more or less defective. They include—Hobbes' Will of a Despot, Clarke's Fitness of Things, Shaftesbury's Reflex Sense, Leibnitz's Disinterested Love, Malebranche's Love of Eternal Order, Edwards' Love of Eternal Being, Butler's Conscience, Hutcheson's Moral Sense, Berkeley's Rule for the Wellbeing of Mankind, Hume's Sceptical Utility, Smith's Sympathy, Hartley's Moral Association, Tucker's Principle of Translation, Paley's Expediency, Bentham's Utilitarianism, Thomas Brown's Moral Sense, Compté's Positivism, and Holyoake's Secularism.

TRACT EIGHTH.

Prospects of the Church of Scotland.

Basis of National Presbyterian Union—Dr Charteris quoted—"Glasgow Herald" on "Free Lance"—Dr Norman Macleod and Dr Pirie on Patronage—Hugh Miller quoted—Parties in the Church of Scotland—Abolition of Patronage, a safe measure—Desire for Presbyterian Union—Disruption of 1843—Obligation of Contracts—Lord Macaulay and Professor Blackie—Mr E. S. Gordon, M.P., and Lord Polwarth quoted—The Free Church in the Highlands.

IN my "Future Church of Scotland" I ventured to propose the following scheme for the reunion of the Scottish Presbyterian Churches:—"Let the Establishment retain her endowments, and let the Free Church and United Presbyterian continue to dispense their respective funds according to their pleasure, but let the three join hands and become one Church. The immediate consequence of the union would be the conviction that there are hundreds of churches quite superfluous. Within less than twenty years, the number of churches would be adjusted to the wants of the population. Adding together the churches in and belonging to the Established, Free, United Presbyterian, Reformed Presbyterian, and Original Secession denominations, we shall find the number to exceed 2700. Of these 800 might be easily spared. Estimating the annual cost of each of these at £300, we have an annual saving of £240,000. Computing the Presbyterian population of Scotland at 2,500,000, each of the remaining 1900 ministers would have the oversight of 1315 souls,—a burden by no means excessive for a competent and conscientious pastor. The surplus might be devoted to supplementing small stipends, to erecting new churches in poor and densely-populated districts, to furthering home missions, and to promoting the higher education."

If I were required to rewrite this paragraph, I should make

only one alteration, inasmuch as I am opposed to applying to the promotion of education the Teinds now appropriated to the Church. Whilst I do not pretend that the scheme is unassailable, none of my critics has proposed any other. I do not now allude to Voluntaries, who are opposed to any union comprehending the Established Church, but to Established Churchmen, who are honestly and zealously striving to hasten that consummation on equitable terms. "If patronage were abolished," remarks Dr Charteris, "I should deem it the duty both of the State and the Church to make any honourable concession to the Seceding brethren which was consistent with the preservation of existing legal rights, and especially to make any honourable reparation it may be in our power to make for the hardships some of them had to bear in consequence of the refusal of the Legislature to listen to their petitions before 1843. I believe that the great majority of the members and ministers of our Church are willing that all endowments should be shared, and the old territorial divisions revised, so that all the Presbyterian people of Scotland may be united in one Church." Nobody who has pondered over the subject can be insensible to the difficulties involved in such an adjustment as that contemplated by the friends of a National Church. But they are not insuperable. Let the people of Scotland be imbued with the conviction that such an union would prove useful, and even more popular than the fruitless rivalry of Presbyterian sects, and the difficulties will be greatly lessened. "Great changes," says Bacon, "are more easily achieved than small ones." For the accomplishment of a partial union, which threatens to rend asunder the largest of the negotiating Churches, the Joint Committee has sat for seven years, and issued numerous reports, without any corresponding measure of success. On the one hand, it has provoked in the Free Church an explosion of wrath and strife truly amazing to those who witnessed the united counsels, unflagging zeal, and honourable self-sacrifice of the party, both before and after the Disruption. On the other hand, it has revived the memory of rankling disputes between the Voluntaries and the minority in the Free Church; but that minority is not answerable for the revival of those unseemly encounters,

since it has been forced upon them by the inconsistent and impolitic action of the majority. Nor have the deliverances of the Joint Committee succeeded in kindling a general feeling in favour of the proposed union among the laity of any of the negotiating Churches. My position warrants me in making this statement advisedly. Considering the eminence and influence of the members of the Committee and its adherents, together with the other powerful agencies employed to influence public opinion, it is surprising that their efforts have been so unavailing. In the United Presbyterian Church the members are mostly hostile or apathetic; in the Free Church, the recent popular protests have alarmed even the leaders of the majority.

By one or more critics my scheme has been misrepresented, as merely involving the return of the Dissenters to the Established Church. What I did mean has been so succinctly and correctly stated by the "Glasgow Herald," that I quote the words:—"To some it would seem as if 'Free Lance' urged a mere return to the Establishment, and that whatever changes may be necessary in the constitution of other Churches to effect the desired union, there were none to be made in hers. But the reader will see that he proposes that the Establishment should make her concessions as well as others—concessions which might be as mortifying to the denominational vanity and prestige of her members as to the rest. Patronage, of course, must be abolished; the greater part of her endowments and glebes and manses in the Highlands must be transferred to the Free Church. Not a few of her city endowments would have to go to others, and some of her chapels must be shut. In the matter of readjustment, the chief difficulty might be to secure the consent of the majority of Established ministers. It will be seen, however, that this idea of union is based upon the principle of the Establishment—that is, a *territorially endowed* Church—the principle, in fact, which will ever be associated with its great founder, John Knox, and its ablest advocate in modern times, Dr Chalmers."

A glance at the position, principles, and tendencies of the Scottish Presbyterian Churches may enable the reader to understand their mutual relations.

First comes the Church of Scotland. In that Church Patronage has been condemned as a nuisance by overwhelming majorities in the General Assembly, the vote of that body in 1870 being four to one, and there is no likelihood of that vote being reversed. "Patronage is quite inconsistent with the genius of our Presbyterian Church of Scotland," as Dr Norman Macleod has justly observed, and "its removal is necessary that the Church may be brought into accordance with what we believe to be its old traditions and original constitution, and also with the just wishes of the people." Dr Pirie has given expression to similar convictions:—"Our impression is that the question is not between Patronage and popular election, but between popular election and an Establishment at all. Do not suppose I mean to argue that the Establishment is at this time in particular danger. The Church of Scotland is in many respects strong; and I believe the Church of Scotland, even though Patronage be maintained, will not be hurriedly taken away. But I say that if we are to trust the evidence of past times, it is impossible, if patronage remains, that the Church can fail virtually to die of inanition." Doubts have been expressed in some quarters respecting the genuineness of the condemnation of Patronage, so strongly declared by the leaders of the popular party in the Church of Scotland. This suspicion is not applicable to its younger members, but to a section composed of others who were ministers at the Disruption. That section contains two sub-divisions—the first embracing many men always opposed to patronage, but never quite reconciled to Dr Robert Buchanan's resolution of 1838 concerning Spiritual Independence, and strongly averse to a collision with the Civil Courts; the second consisting of members opposing any large modification of the law of Patronage, but now confessing their error, and asserting popular rights. To the former class belongs Dr Gillan, of Inchinnan. As far back as sixteen years ago, a deputation of influential merchants in Glasgow, headed by Sir James Campbell, went to the Presbytery of Glasgow to petition for a modification of Patronage. Dr Gillan, who was then minister of St John's Church, Glasgow, strenuously supported the petition, without producing any immediate

effect. As for Dr Pirie, he has manfully confessed his error, and expressed his wish to be reunited to his opponents of the Ante-Disruption period—maintaining, however, with some semblance of truth, that, as in all keen and protracted conflicts, there were faults on both sides. From Mr Peter Bayne's "Life of Hugh Miller" we gather that that powerful writer was somewhat of the same mind :—"I have a distinct recollection that, in earnest talk with me after the Disruption, he hinted a wish that the leaders of the majority had been somewhat less imperious in their dealings with clergymen who obeyed the civil law rather than the law of the Church—somewhat less fiery and impatient in urging the matter to an issue. . . . He lived and died, however, a believer in the soundness of his State Church theory."

Thirty years have wrought a marked change in the sentiments and Church policy as well as in the aspect of Dr Pirie, familiarly known in the old Assemblies as Mr Pirie, of Dyce, a steady supporter of Dr George Cook, and an ally of Dr Bisset, of Bourtie, who still adheres to his former principles. Dr Pirie now perceives that Patronage is untenable in the Church of Scotland, and is striving earnestly to procure its abolition legally and peaceably. No man knows better the fearful blow sustained by his Church at the Disruption. In his own city of Aberdeen, every Established minister cast in his lot with the Free Church,* including the eminent and popular Rev. (now Dr) A. D. Davidson, a man of rare endowments, fitted to reflect lustre on any Church, and now ranked among the opponents of the present Union proposals. The pulpits of the Establishment in Edinburgh were occupied by a body of men who, in point of ability, eminence, learning, accomplishment, piety, moral weight, and variety of gifts, had probably been unequalled since the Reformation, and may be unequalled for many future generations. Nearly all of these ministers joined the Free Church. For in truth the torrent of public opinion was so strong in that city as almost to deprive men of the power of forming an unbiassed judgment in matters of ecclesiastical belief and practice. It may be quite true

* No wonder, therefore, that the present agitation for the abolition of Patronage originated with the Aberdeen elders of the Established Church.

that some supporters of the anti-patronage movement in the Established Church are lukewarm in their zeal, and mainly desirous of winning a little Church popularity, though it is to be feared that such men are also too rife in other Churches. Ministers, however, are only fleeting and fugitive agents, whereas the Church is, or ought to be, perpetual.

Another class of Churchmen, both lay and clerical, is apprehensive of the introduction of popular suffrage. Practically, that suffrage is now enjoyed in the great majority of vacancies, with confessedly beneficial results. Why not legalise this suffrage, instead of trusting to the caprice of a patron, who may not possess an acre of land in the parish? Besides, the people of Scotland have begun to question the moral right of the patrons to exercise the right of presentation, and the patrons would act wisely and prudently in following the noble example of the Duke of Argyll, and confiding to the people the election of their own pastor. To those who fear that popular election might open the pulpits of the Church of Scotland to men of showy and superficial attractions, it seems sufficient to point to the results of that system in sister Churches. Many of our most valuable theological treatises are the production of Dissenters, who have been also highly acceptable preachers. For the truth of this assertion I may quote the names of Dr John Brown, Dr Balmer, Dr Eadie, Dr Leitch, Dr Wardlaw, Dr Alexander, Dr James Morison, Dr Symington, and Dr Binnie. It must be admitted that nearly the whole sterling authorship of the Free Church is due to ante-Disruption ministers; but men may preach good sermons, and earn the character of faithful pastors, without publishing books.

Such Churchmen as are afraid of popular election trust, I fear, too much to the protection of antiquity, to historical traditions, to Acts of Parliament, and to the aristocracy of the country. Let them not rely too confidently on these fancied buttresses. Antiquity counts for little in these times with some of our leading statesmen, who set little store by historic memories and triumphs. Accordingly, Acts of Parliament are promptly and easily repealed to suit the exigencies of political factions. The Scottish aristocracy are mostly Episcopalians of

the High Prelatic and Sacramentarian stamp, whose Bishops deny the validity of all Presbyterian orders; who regard the Church of Scotland with hostility, and some of whom have avowed their readiness to join the Voluntaries in accomplishing her overthrow. Other opulent members of the same Scottish aristocracy have relapsed into Popery, and are little likely to lend any countenance to a Church which has never swerved from the principles of John Knox and the great Protestant Reformation. The history of the Irish Established Church ought to prove a serious warning to all Scottish Churchmen slumbering in the complacent belief that their Church reposes in safety. Unless she can justify her existence, and demonstrate her utility, she is in imminent danger, which her more sagacious friends clearly foresee. When the Rev. F. L. Robertson, of Greenock, recently publicly declared he was not ashamed to own that the Church was in danger, he spoke words of truth and soberness, though his purblind brethren may account him an alarmist. Political power is now virtually vested in the hands of the common people, and this is the work of a Conservative Government. Naturally, the people will estimate the necessity and soundness of a Church from the sound doctrine, consistent character, and general efficiency of its ministers. Unless they can render a satisfactory answer to the question put by Dogberry to Verges, the ancient constable, and his watch, "Are ye good men and true?" they need not wonder if the verdict be unfavourable to their interests.

Closely related to the Anti-Patronage movement in the Church of Scotland is that of union with the other Presbyterian Churches. Here, again, the laity are generally in advance of their clerical overseers. This fact is undeniable, and admits of a simple explanation. Whilst the passions of the rival parties in the Established Church had been inflamed by the fierce debates in Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, followed by protests and interdicts of the Civil Courts, the minds of the laity were ruffled to a less degree. As far as my observation has extended, the clerical mind is mostly impatient of contradiction. A minister who lays down the law of doctrine and conduct every seventh day to his assenting congregation takes it greatly amiss to be told in open court by a

co-presbyter that his statements are inaccurate, his arguments illogical, and his advice pernicious, coupled with a remote hint that his motives are liable to suspicion. Before the Disruption, the clerical recriminations had risen to such a height that, when the Non-Intrusionists took their departure, the more obdurate Moderates felt really thankful. The majority of the laity cherished no such feeling. The seceding ministers might have seemed too impatient and violent, too hard on the Moderates and the Voluntaries, and too ready to fly in the face of the Court of Session; but many of them were admirable preachers, excellent men, and had been the bulwarks of the Establishment. Lay sympathies, therefore, followed such men into the Free Church. With regret, not unmixed with admiration, they witnessed them quitting substantial parish churches for mean, temporary erections, while their families were exchanging commodious, comfortable manses for cottages or lodgings ill-suited to their wants. Between them and their seceding pastor there had been no dispute or estrangement. In other quarters of the Church, there had been wars and rumours of wars, but they were contented to abide by their minister, if he could see it to be his duty to remain with them. Somewhat akin to this is the change which has recently been stealing over the ministers of the better portion of the Church of Scotland. Luckily, the clerical mind, though little disposed to brook opposition, is not implacable. Judah does not always vex Ephraim, nor Ephraim envy Judah.

Two small clerical sections must be excepted. One of these consists of a few Moderates retaining their hereditary dislike of Dissent; the other, comprises the new school, which threatens to inflict more injury on the Church than the Moderates, because it wars against truth and honesty. The men of this school take no pains to conceal their contempt for the Confession of Faith, which they have solemnly sworn to observe.* They ape the garb, style, and language of the Angli-

* As many of my readers may not be aware of the stringency of the nine questions which Church of Scotland licentiates must answer in the affirmative, prior to ordination, I request them to peruse attentively the following:—"1. Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and manners? 2. Do you sincerely own and believe the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith, approved by the General

can clergy, who heartily despise them. They prate of religion without a creed, and of morality without religion. Their own morality is utterly hollow, even to the extent of cancelling contracts and obligations. For if they, in assuming the oversight of souls, enter into a solemn contract with the Church and the State to respect the Standards which they subsequently seek to undermine, what guarantee do they give for their observing the other commandments of the Decalogue? What course, then, ought to be taken by ordained ministers who have begun to doubt the soundness of any doctrine of a Confession, which they had solemnly promised to abide by? I can understand and excuse their maintaining a brief silence on that doctrine, until they can decide whether he can conscientiously retain it as part of their creed. If they find an honest belief in the Confession to be an intolerable burden, they ought to resign their charges, and seek others in communions more congenial to their new illumination. But martyrdom, like honesty, is not to their taste. Or they might propose in their Presbyteries to overture the General Assembly to omit from the Confession the doctrines which they have discarded. But this, again, they decline to do. They would be required to assign reasons for their overture, and this might involve them in discussions which few of their number are able to maintain. A formal assault on the Confession in the presence of theologians competent to reply, is a more formidable task than that performed by shallow declaimers, regardless of ordination vows, and ambitious of earning the reputation of advanced liberal thinkers by appeals to the prejudices of ignorant congregations. It would be edifying to hear an apostate of this class remonstrating with a member convicted of a breach of the moral law, and to have to find the clerical remonstrant shut up with the mote-and-beam retort. Such hypocrites instinctively dread an union with other Churches, which would instantly take account

Assemblies of this Church, and ratified by law in the year 1690, to be founded upon the Word of God; and do you acknowledge the same as the confession of your faith; and will you firmly and constantly adhere thereto, and, to the utmost of your power, assert, maintain, and defend the same, and the purity of worship as presently practised in this National Church, and asserted in Act 15, Ass. 1707?

3. Do you disown all Popish, Arian, Socinian, Arminian, Bourignian, and other doctrines, tenets, and opinions whatsoever, contrary to, and inconsistent with the Confession of Faith?"

of their perversion. If any such incumbent can be proved to inculcate doctrines at direct variance with those which he vowed to observe, and if through indolence or connivance his Presbytery neglect to exercise discipline, I would justify the action of the Civil Courts in depriving him of his stipend. He has broken his vows, and forfeited his honour. He has been guilty of a flagrant breach of contract, which would brand him with disgrace in private, commercial, or political life. Even in the Church of England, which was presumed capable of allowing the utmost latitude of religious belief, the Privy Council has at last stripped the Rev. Mr Voysey of his license, and has put a stop to the offensive ritualism of the Rev. Mr Purchas. When the time shall arrive for revising the Confession of Faith, it is not likely that any deference will be paid to the wishes of clerical covenant-breakers, who, by their deliberate perjury, have perverted their ordination vows into a sacrament of infamy. And these are the men who are always pretending to insist so strongly on the necessity of inculcating integrity and truthfulness in practical conduct, in preference to descanting on the distinctive doctrines of evangelical Christianity. Compared with Dr Wallace,* of Old Greyfriars, Edinburgh, the Rev. George Gilfillan, of Dundee, would be set down as a bigot, who stated in his Presbytery, in 1870, that if he had changed his principles on the Divinity of Christ, he would have instantly quitted the United Presbyterian Church.

Contrast with such reverend, irreverent, and preposterous persons the conduct of two laymen. When Mr Macaulay was a subordinate member of Earl Grey's Administration, he, faithful to paternal authority and his own convictions, felt it to be his duty to dissent from one part of a Government measure on the subject of slavery. He did not merely stay away from the division, but voted with the opposition:—"I was in office, and office was then as important to me as it could be to any man. I put my resignation into the hands of Lord Spencer, and both spoke and voted against the Administration. To my surprise, Lord Grey and Lord Spencer refused to accept my resignation, and I remained in office; but during some days I

* Dr Wallace's false position in the Church of Scotland will be fully discussed in Tract Ninth, when he will receive ample justice.

considered myself as out of the service of the Crown.”* While he was member for Edinburgh, though he uniformly refused to pledge himself to any bill before it had been debated in Parliament, he assured the electors that, in the event of his changing his mind on any important question, he would resign his seat. Take the case of Professor Blackie. In 1841, he, when a comparatively young man, like Mr Macaulay, was nominated by the Crown, Professor of Latin in the Marischal College, Aberdeen. As the University Tests were then in force, the Established Presbytery of Aberdeen required him to subscribe the Confession of Faith. He consented to do so, but not as the confession of his faith, though he professed his attachment to the Presbyterian form of church government, and to the Established Church. This was frank and explicit. The Senatus of Marischal College was willing to induct him on such terms, but as the Presbytery objected, he raised an action in the Court of Session. As the Lord Ordinary, however, refused to allow the Presbytery to sist themselves as parties in the case, the Professor remained passive. Ultimately he obtained possession of the chair, contrary to public expectations; but the Disruption was impending, and he was thereby a gainer. Still, he ran a serious risk at a time when a Professor’s chair was as important to him as the Secretaryship of the Board of Control to Mr Macaulay.†

If the welfare of the Church of Scotland depended on such representatives, her shrift would be short and speedy. Fortunately, she possesses other wiser and weightier counselors, who see that her isolation from the other Churches is injurious to her and to them. It is not surprising, therefore, that they should have pronounced in favour of a comprehensive Presbyterian Union. In the General Assembly of 1870, the overtures presented in favour of such a Union by the Presbyteries of Forfar, Dunkeld, and Kirkcaldy, led to an instructive discussion, in which interesting addresses were delivered by the Rev. Mr Robertson, of Dunnichen; Mr George Seton, advocate; the Rev. Mr Runciman, of Leslie; the Rev. Mr Grant, of Ten-

* See Macaulay’s “Speeches.”

† As I taught Professor Blackie’s class in Aberdeen for some time during his serious illness, I am conversant with the facts of his case. He ascribed his speedy and complete recovery to the Water Cure at Dunoon, under the care of Dr Rowland East. He published a very clever pamphlet on Hydropathy.

andry; the Rev. Dr Smith, of North Leith; the Rev. Dr M'Combie, of Lumphanan; Mr E. S. Gordon, M.P.; Principal Campbell, of Aberdeen; Professor Pirie, of Aberdeen; the Rev. Mr Macdonald, of Inverbrothick; and Lord Polwarth. I quote from two of these speeches, both because the speakers occupy a high social position, and because they stand deservedly high as consistent elders of the Church. Mr Gordon said,—“ This is a question which has greatly interested me for a long time. I was one of those who saw, with great pain, the Disruption of our Church in 1843. I was then a young man, not entitled to take a lead in those matters; but from that time forward I have ever looked with great interest for the time arriving when there might be a reasonable expectation of some proposition being made with a view to re-union with our brethren who had left us. . . . I will candidly admit that it is a matter which lies very near my heart—in fact it is one of the great inducements which I have to remain in public life. I am doing so probably at some sacrifice to my own interests, but at the same time, if I thought I could promote this great, good, and national object, I would indeed consider that I had not done so in vain.” In the same thoughtful and unsectarian strain Lord Polwarth said :—“ For the sake of Union, he would support the apportionment, but not the abolition of endowments. Their abolition would not injure the Church, for it could stand alone, but the loss to the country would be great. The statesman knew that he could bring no power to bear upon the repression of crime and vice so great as that of religion. He trusted the day was not far distant when the Church, as it is in Jesus Christ, would meet together. He was sure that throughout our country, amongst the people, there was a hearty response to any proposal for a wide and comprehensive Union of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. He felt confident that whatever approbation it might meet with in the eyes of men, it would have the approbation of the God of Truth.” When men like Mr Gordon and Lord Polwarth lead the van, why should any Established minister, who is loyal to his Church, decline to bring up the rear? In corroboration of the statement that the hostile feeling between the Established Church and some portions of the Free Church is abating, I

may cite the Highlands and Islands. Until recently, that hostility was, on the part of the Free Church, deep and immovable. The Jews had no spiritual dealings with the Samaritans. As soon as the negotiations of the Free Church leaders were ascertained to include among open questions, what they had understood to be distinctive principles of the Free Church, the Highlanders began to relent in their enmity to the Church of their fathers. This feeling has been reciprocated by the living local representatives of that Church. In the General Assembly of 1870, the Rev. Mr Morrison, of Bracadale, in Skye, gave some indication of the altered relations between the Churches:—“He thought he might say, from the little experience he had had, that the wall of separation between them and many of their brethren in the Highlands had of late been considerably shaken and lowered; and though it had not as yet been passed over by many, that perhaps the day was not very far distant when the Highlanders would come back to them, not in small numbers, but in masses. There were circumstances in the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland that seemed to point to that as a not improbable result.” If Mr Morrison’s prophecy be verified, the Free Church leaders will have been instrumental in effecting the result.

TRACT NINTH.

Recent Tendencies in Old Greyfriars'.

Rev. Herbert Story's Life of Dr Robert Lee—Dr Lee's estimate of Dr Robertson and Dr Chalmers—His Doctrines—His Intimacy with Lord Murray and Mr George Combe—His Sectarianism, and indifference to the Interests of the Church of Scotland—Exhausted the forbearance of the Church Courts—Succeeded by Dr Robert Wallace—Grave Protests against Dr Wallace's Preaching in the "Edinburgh Daily Review," and "Edinburgh Courant"—Duty of Dr Wallace, and of the Church of Scotland.

IN any publication professing to give a just exhibition of recent Church tendencies in Scotland, it is proper to refer to the late Dr Robert Lee, of Old Greyfriars', Edinburgh. During the last ten years of his pastorate, he appeared very frequently in the Ecclesiastical Courts of his Church, generally as an appellant, to justify the use of an organ and a liturgy, which he had, in an unconstitutional manner, introduced into his place of worship, with the consent of his congregation. His procedure throughout the long and acrimonious discussions was closely scrutinised: he was sternly censured by the majority as a pretentious, reckless, and unscrupulous disturber of the Church's tranquillity; whilst a minority applauded his liberality of thought and his contempt of ancient ecclesiastical usages. On May 22, 1867, the day before the meeting of the General Assembly, he was struck by apoplexy, which unfitted him for further ministerial or professional duty: he died March 12, 1868, at Torquay, in Devonshire, whither he had gone in search of renewed health. In 1870, there was published his "Life and Remains," by the Rev. Herbert Story, of Roseneath,* with a

* In my "Future Church of Scotland," I quoted from Mr Story's Life of his father, the Rev. Robert Story, of Roseneath, which, though a smaller, is a far better and less offensive book than his Life of Dr Robert Lee. From his letter to Mr

Preface by Mrs Oliphant. The work consists of two thick volumes, containing 734 pages, the larger portion being in small type. The Remains are composed of Dr Lee's Speeches,* of his articles from the "Scotsman" newspaper, and of extracts from his curious Diary. Readers of biography must remember that Dr Cairns's Life of Dr John Brown—whose name, by the way, Dr Lee never mentions—was comprised in one small volume. Dr Brown and Dr Lee were Professors of Biblical Criticism; but whilst Dr Brown has bequeathed to the Universal Church the choicest monuments of his vast erudition and critical discernment, Dr Lee's name, as a scriptural expositor, does not rise above mediocrity. Professor Veitch has also restricted to one volume his excellent Life of Sir William Hamilton. That Mr Story deems Dr Lee a great and good divine, is abundantly manifest from many passages, but, at the end of his second volume, he reaches his climax :—" I do not think that, since the Reformation, there has been any Scottish clergyman suffered to end his course in the Church who has had such high and statesmanlike ideas of what the Church should be, and might be, as Dr Lee." I have read Mr Story's two volumes, which have fully confirmed my previous vague impressions of Dr Lee's character, derived from witnessing some of his public exhibitions, and from reading his speeches on public occasions. Mr Story need be under no apprehension that he has not " pictured him fairly." I am strongly disinclined to speak unpleasantly of Dr Lee, though he could insert in his Diary the following offensive estimate of a colleague, who was a great benefactor to his Church and country—Dr James Robertson, Professor of Ecclesiastical History :—" For many years before the Disruption (1843), he was a leading

James Baird, of Cambusdon, I perceive that Mr Story declines to take part in the Anti-Patronage movement, and that he prefers the mode of electing ministers proposed by Dr Wallace, who was almost unanimously hooted by the General Assembly of 1869, for expounding it in a ludicrous speech. What does Mr Story mean by " free thought," of which he is so enamoured?

* If the biographies of some clerical contemporaries are to contain their speeches, what formidable volumes must be in store! Think of Dr Candlish, Dr Begg, Dr Guthrie, and Dr Norman Macleod. At a recent meeting of the Edinburgh Free Presbytery, when Dr Candlish's old speeches were quoted against him, he jocularly hinted to the Anti-Unionists that they should reprint all his speeches, and present him with a copy.

debater on the Moderate side ; and even since, he has been the most frequent, lengthy, and, I may add, oppressive, speaker in the General Assembly. He had wonderful fluency, without any elegance of words ; his speaking wanted simplicity, point, and terseness. He had no wit, and wanted everything like elegance or grace in a remarkable degree, to which defects may be added the Doric tones of his Aberdonian voice and his very provincial pronunciation."* That Dr Lee had formed an overweening estimate of his own talents and acquirements, may be inferred from the astounding fact that, in 1841, when minister of Campsie, only eight years after his ordination, he had the boldness to offer himself as a candidate for the Theological Chair in Glasgow University, in opposition to his old Professor, Dr Chalmers ! During the life of Dr Chalmers, and still more, after his death, students of all denominations reverted with pride and affection to the hours they had been privileged to spend in his class-room, and to treasure even the eloquent sentences which fell from his lips. Dr Lee was a stranger to any such emotions. In 1856, he writes in his Diary :—" Thus, after having attended Dr Chalmers' classes at St Andrews, I have been always after unable to hear him with interest, or to read his books : it was like reading my own writings, or listening to myself"†[!]

That Dr Lee was a clever man, a respectable scholar, and amiable in his domestic relations, may be safely admitted. That he was a deep thinker, or a model pastor, will be conceded by none but weak and ignorant admirers. As a minister in Arbroath and in Campsie, he appears to have discharged his ministerial duties with fidelity and acceptance. His translation to Edinburgh was effected through that conscientious and exemplary man, the late Dr William Muir of St Stephens, whom he was afterwards wont to insult in the Church Courts, and at whom, now dead, Mr Story has had the bad taste to sneer. For several years after his settlement in Edinburgh, Dr Lee passed for a moderately orthodox preacher ; but his church was poorly filled. About the year 1854, he was gravely suspected

* This entry was made immediately after Dr Robertson's death.

† Of the many sermons preached at the death of Dr Chalmers, the best was that by Dr W. L. Alexander, one of his Saint Andrews students.

of holding, and even of preaching doctrines subversive of the Standards of the Scottish Church; and, as Mr Story remarks, he was "almost entirely isolated from the most of his fellow-clergymen in Edinburgh." And who were his new associates? "His most intimate friends were Lord Murray and Mr George Combe. He became also a frequent visitor at the 'Scotsman' office, a friend of Mr Russel, and a frequent contributor to its columns."* How the two Socinian lawyers pandered to his self-esteem may be gathered from a letter from Lord Murray, which Dr Lee preserved:—"Lady Murray and I were much delighted with your sermon yesterday: it was clear, concise, and well-reasoned, and, at the same time, went over a great deal of ground, defining every proposition you laid down, and making your conclusions almost self-evident." Mr George Combe does not seem to have honoured Dr Lee with his presence, but his spouse, a daughter of Mrs Siddons, and trained as a Roman Catholic, was a fervent admirer of Dr Lee's sermons; and her husband wrote:—"Mrs Combe reports to me that your whole service on Sunday, in manner and style, was the highest she has heard in Presbyterian Scotland." Again: "Mrs C. and Mr —— gave me a very interesting report of your concluding sermon yesterday. They say that it appeared to them to make a deep impression on the audience: it may form an epoch in preaching." Many of Dr Lee's sermons, doubtless, did form an epoch in Scottish Presbyterian preaching. He is said to have emptied the Socinian Chapel in Castle Terrace, not because its members espoused the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, but because, as they said, nothing was heard against their creed from Dr Lee's mouth.† In 1858, he thus laments the death of Mr Combe, who was really one of the vainest men of his time, at once a sceptic and a dogmatist:—

* Too frequent, I suspect. During the College session, when he had both pulpit and class duties to perform, I observe that he wrote four articles for the "Scotsman" in one fortnight. At his death, 'Old Greyfriars' Parish was in a state of deplorable spiritual destitution, as Councillor Colston stated in the Town Council. It includes some of the lowest districts in the city.

† Since I wrote this sentence, I have been informed that the Socinians who joined Dr Lee were looked upon as extreme rationalists in the Socinian Community. My informant is a Socinian. He informs me that Mr Drummond, the present minister of the Socinian Chapel, has caused much dissension in his congregation by ceasing to read the Bible to them, and by reciting passages from other books.

“ Poor Combe ! I knew him as an affectionate and persevering friend, as well as a philanthropist and man of science, in which character all the world knew him. Probably, he was the most famous man in Scotland at the period of his death ” [!] Shortly before Mr Combe’s death, Dr Lee had contributed to the “ Scotsman ” an article which must have been very gratifying to the sour phrenologist, who thus congratulates the author :— “ I have now read your notice of Dugald Stewart’s Philosophy, and was really refreshed by seeing so much sound sense, and accompanied by so much kindly feeling and critical acumen, applied to that huge, gilt, painted, and inflated India-rubber ball.”* In the same year in which Mr Combe died, Lord Murray was removed. “ In him,” says Dr Lee, “ I and my family have lost a kind and most valuable friend, of whom we should ever think with gratitude and affection. Almost all the people of consequence I know, I know through his means ; and his kindness in that and many other ways was uniform and great. . . I was induced, Feb. 13, to depart from my usual custom, and preach what may be considered a funeral sermon for our venerable and excellent friend.” †

Dr Lee’s admirers claim for him great liberality in thought and conduct ; but he was at heart a thorough sectarian. In 1865, only three years before his death, he opposed in the General Assembly the motion which was carried, to open the pulpits of the Church of Scotland to brethren of other Presbyterian denominations ; and Mr Story may be supposed to

* I met Mr Combe only once, immediately after his return from America, where his reception had not been quite so enthusiastic as he expected. I remember his wearisome talk about the “ organic laws,”—one of his stock phrases. In one of Dr Lee’s four sermons on the “ Laws of Nature,” there occurs the following exhortation :—“ Let us be washed in those waters of repentance and reformation, which at once cleanse and save the soul.”

† Another liberal friend was a Miss Napier, who presented his boy with a handsome pony. The following entry Mr Story copies from the Diary :—“ *Sunday, Sept. 24.*—This has been to us a dark day, for this morning Brunette, George’s pony, died. . . . All of us have shed tears over her untimely end.” Again, *July 1*, “ Not being able to keep one horse, I have bought two.” Dr Lee was for twenty years the only pluralist in the Church of Scotland ; his income was above £1200 a-year ; yet, after his death, Mr Gladstone’s Government granted his widow an annual pension of £100. Is there not a verse in Scripture concerning a man who provides not for his own household ? What valuable service did Dr Lee render to his country ? What a blessing to know “ people of consequence ! ”

approve of his vote when he adds, that "the admission to the national pulpit of men who were not licentiates of the Church was thereby permitted." How characteristic and appropriate was the repugnance of the former mechanic and mechanic's son to be confounded with Dissenters! Unbosoming his secret to his biographer, he writes:—"Undoubtedly the organ is a small matter compared with a ritual. We must have something to distinguish us from the Dissenters." With similar horror he deprecated the "reabsorption of the Free Seceders, believing that their return to the Church would be fatal to reform of worship, to a large and liberal theological culture, and to the peaceful progress of the Church." Yet Dr Lee offered the use of his pulpit to Professor Jowett, of Oxford, an Episcopalian of the Rationalist school, the author of the most offensive of the "Essays and Reviews."

How Dr Lee has been considered a friend of the Church of Scotland it is difficult to imagine. "He had grave doubts about the Scheme for the Conversion of the Jews." He did not like the "Endowment" Scheme, which was designed to secure £120 a-year to the poor incumbents of the newly-erected parishes. He was a lukewarm supporter of the Education Scheme, because the schoolmasters imparted religious instruction. "I confess," he owns, "I have little sympathy with their Schemes of Missions, Education, and Church Extension:" he preferred that the Church at home should set before the world a "pure example of high and united Christian life!" In other words, he wished that, whilst other Churches were earnestly striving to promote religion and education to the utmost of their power, the Church of Scotland should relapse into that stagnation from which she had been roused by the influence of Dr Andrew Thomson, Dr Inglis, Dr Chalmers, Dr Welsh, Dr Muir, and many worthy allies. Though Dr Lee held aloof from the unendowed Presbyterian Churches, he busied himself in an abortive attempt to accomplish a union between his Church and the Episcopal Church of Scotland; and he was a zealous advocate of the United Industrial Schools, in opposition to Dr Guthrie's Original Ragged Schools, which Mr Story is pleased to designate a "sectarian enterprise." It only remains to touch on the effort with which Dr Lee's

name will be linked in the remembrance of the present generation—his organ and liturgy scheme. In my former work I expressed a very qualified approval of both innovations in certain cases, though it is hard to answer the formidable scriptural objections raised by Dr Begg in his book on organs. An organ and a liturgy have been used for three hundred years in the Church of England, by many of the most exemplary and eminent divines that have adorned any communion.* But Dr Lee's procedure was open to grave censure, since he covertly disregarded the fact that he was a minister of a Presbyterian Church, which forbids individual ministers to deviate from the regular usages of public worship without the sanction of the Presbytery; so that he was introducing the principle of Independence. Add to this his disingenuous evasion and trickery in his transactions with the Church Courts. For the sake of peace and harmony, Dr Crawford and Dr William Smith for a time sanctioned his conduct. Their patience, however, was at last exhausted, for in 1870 they voted against him with the majority of the Edinburgh Presbytery; their decision was sustained by an overwhelming majority of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale;† and Mr Story admits there was no chance of its being reversed by the General Assembly of 1867, which was not troubled with the appeal on account of Dr Lee's severe illness. Will it be credited that Dr Lee, who delibe-

* Some Scotsmen who have not resided in England are in danger of pronouncing too sweeping condemnations on her National Church. I resided for three years in Southport, on the sea-coast of Lancashire. Of the four Episcopal clergymen, three were laborious, efficient, and exemplary evangelicals, the fourth being a respectable man, but too Ritualistic to my tastes. All were incumbents of Chapels of Ease. Southport, which is a beautiful town of recent growth, is in the parish of North Meols, the parish church of which is more than a mile from the town. The Rector, a man of large patrimony, and descended from an ancient county family, was a diligent, faithful, and humble clergyman, much respected by all classes, and heartily opposed to High Churchism, Popery, and Mr Gladstone, his representative in Parliament. He is still living. He would have held Dr Lee in low estimation, for he is a real gentleman, though he keeps no carriage.

† It is painful to learn the feelings which actuated Dr Lee at this meeting. Having met the Rev. Mr Langwill, of Currie, they walked near the Synod Hall for a quarter of an hour, after which Dr Lee said—"I think I shan't look near the fellows at all." They then went to his house in George Square, and, after a short rest, Dr Lee exclaimed suddenly, "I'll go back: they shan't have to say that I showed the white feather." They went back, and that was Dr Lee's last appearance in a Church Court.

rately and doggedly entangled himself in a controversy with his ecclesiastical superiors about a matter of doubtful utility, was constantly bemoaning his fate as an ill-used and persecuted man, and that his biographer holds him up to admiration for his "dislike of feud and controversy," characterising as re-actionaries Dr Pirie, Dr Phin, Dr Crawford, Dr William Smith, and the Rev. Mr Stevenson, because they could not suffer a refractory brother to trifle with his obligations?*

It was fondly hoped that with the removal of Dr Robert Lee would cease the annoyance caused to the Church of Scotland by the proceedings in Old Greyfriars'. This hope, however, has been delusive. Among "the foremost of those younger allies who had gathered round Dr Lee" in his contentions with the Church Courts was his former student, Dr Robert Wallace, of Trinity Church, Edinburgh. Such is the statement of the Rev. Mr Story. This zealous ally, who had been translated to Edinburgh from Newton-on-Ayr, as "a model parish minister,"† and a promoter of "social and religious improvements," was understood to sympathise with the theological tendencies of his Professor, in whose footsteps he was treading. Like Dr Lee, he had qualified himself for this honourable vocation by writing

* Among those co-Presbyters who deemed themselves morally bound to censure Dr Lee, was Dr William Muir, the late venerated minister of St Stephen's, whose long and eminently-faithful pastorate will long be gratefully remembered in Edinburgh. If Dr Lee had possessed one tithe of Dr Muir's fervour and conscientiousness, he would have occupied a much higher place in ecclesiastical biography. It is a pity that Mr Story should have permitted himself to speak disrespectfully of that good man. At some meetings of Presbytery, Dr Lee deeply offended Mr Muir by using what Dr Wallace, his successor, would designate "turfy" language, which was meant to be very smart. Dr Wallace, whose language is somewhat slangy, is a competent judge of these unclerical styles of composition. Mr Story's sneers at Dr Phin are more excusable, for he is still living, and can defend himself. If Mr Story choose to cross swords with him in the General Assembly, I fear he will rue the encounter. During nearly the whole of his pastorate, Dr Muir was attacked in the "Scotsman," sharing the fate of Dr Candlish and Dr Andrew Thomson, of Broughton Place Church. All three were neither ashamed nor afraid to combat the "Scotsman's" lax and unpatriotic assaults on the decent observance of the Sabbath. What an intellectual and moral mode of observing that sacred day of repose and meditation it is for artisans and idlers to cross the Firth of Forth from Leith to Aberdour, armed with bottles of whisky wherewith to intoxicate and brutalise themselves in the beautiful woods around that village!

* Such was the certificate of character pronounced by Mr Robert Anderson, Head Master of the Edinburgh Normal School, and an elder in Trinity Church. What does Mr Anderson now think of his "model parish minister?"

anonymous attacks on his more conscientious brethren in the ministry, and by sneering at the vulgarity of Dissenters;* he had learned to jest on sacred themes in the irreverent style and tone which none but an apostate priest can assume; he had favoured the General Assembly with an appeal in favour of ecclesiastical trimming. Dr Wallace was, therefore, elected by the congregation as Dr Lee's successor. The Town Council, knowing something of his propensities, presented Dr Gloag, of Blantyre, who declined the offer; and, after some delay, the Presbytery, into whose hands the "jus devolutum" had fallen, presented Dr Wallace, who observed at his induction dinner that, as both friends and foes had fixed on him as a fit successor, he was surely the appropriate occupant of Old Greyfriars' pulpit. No sooner had he begun his ministry than he proved his adaptability to the peculiar people who composed his new flock. The sheep of that pasture had found an indulgent, willing, and obliging shepherd. In Newton-on-Ayr, where Dr Wallace was ordained, he had passed for a rather promising preacher, with a tincture of Broad Churchism, which became rather more observable after his translation to Edinburgh Trinity Church in 1860; but, since his introduction to Old Greyfriars in 1868, the whole drift of his teaching has been to assail and ridicule the fundamental doctrines of every Scottish Presbyterian denomination. Yet he subscribed the same Confession of Faith in 1857, 1860, and 1868! How elastic are the consciences of some eulogists of truth, integrity, honour, and manliness! How they can afford to pity the simplicity of others who retain some sense of the obligation of civil contracts and ordination vows:†

Fortunately, Edinburgh still enjoys a free press. Strange rumours concerning the infidel character of Dr Wallace's preaching had excited deep indignation in the breasts both of consistent Churchmen and Evangelical Dissenters. At length the

* Dr Wallace's own parentage happens to be rather plebeian, like Dr Lee's. Does my reader remember Hazlitt's description of the flunkey standing behind his master's carriage, and grinning at the crowd!

† Does Dr Wallace still count these persons "geese and idiots?" What a choice phrase for an ordained man of culture! In his second sermon on the text, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon," instead of attacking dishonest tradesmen, he had better reflect on his own "divided duty." Customers will mind the tradesman.

"Edinburgh Daily Review," the organ of the Free Church and the United Presbyterians, gave insertion to several reports and criticisms of Dr Wallace's speculations. After a brief interval, another series of similar complaints appeared in the "Edinburgh Courant,"* the representative of the Church of Scotland, of the Free Church minority, and of the Scottish Episcopalians. Never have such damaging accusations been openly laid against the teaching of a Church of Scotland minister. Never has a deadlier weapon been put into the hands of the enemies of that Church. Never have the Voluntaries constructed so cogent an argument for her disestablishment and disendowment. Dr Wallace might have pleaded that he was not bound to answer anonymous newspaper complaints. But this plea is now of no avail. He did, indeed, deny the accuracy of one report in the "Daily Review," though he declined to comply with the editor's challenge to point out the in-

* My provincial readers, as well as many of those resident in Edinburgh, may be ignorant of the relations subsisting between Old Greyfriars' Church and the "Scotsman" newspaper. Shortly after the Disruption, Mr Charles Maclaren, then editor of the "Scotsman," who was an avowed Socinian, connected himself with Dr Lee's congregation. His example was followed by the late Mr John Ritchie, the chief proprietor; by the grand-nephew, Mr John Ritchie Findlay, his heir; by Mr Alexander Russel, the present editor; and by Mr Law, another proprietor. Mr John Ritchie Findlay, Mr Russel, and Mr Law, who are now sole proprietors of the "Scotsman," belong to the congregation of Dr Wallace, Dr Lee's successor in his church, but not in his Chair. Thus there are many links between Old Greyfriars' and the "Scotsman." Dr Wallace is known to write for that journal the leading articles on ecclesiastical questions and cases, such as those of Dundee, Coupar-Angus, Dalkeith, Dunse, Queensferry, and several Anglican cases. The drift of his articles is to abet all deviations from the standards of the Churches. Dr Wallace was evidently chagrined by the suspension of the Rationalist, the Rev. Mr Voysey, and by the censure of the Ritualist, Rev. Mr Purchas. Is it not a deplorable fact that Dr Wallace, who receives £600 from the citizens of Edinburgh for preaching orthodoxy, should be hired for writing articles apologising for every phase of heresy? Such traffic is most discreditable to Dr Wallace, who, under this mask, has misrepresented and ridiculed the most eminent ministers of all the evangelical denominations. Because they may not see, or do not choose to answer his articles, the public, who are not in the secret, are apt to think that they are true. Meanwhile, Dr Wallace, while thus amusing and enriching himself, neglects the spiritual concerns of his parish. His pastoral office he seems to consider a pastime. It is time, however, that his game should be exposed. Chancing to recently meet a young man who was speaking somewhat lightly of sacred themes, I inquired what church he attended—a question I very rarely put to any one—when he answered, "I go to Old Greyfriars', a capital church for young men with little religion." Such is the effect of "furthering the Divine idea," as Dr Wallace says.

accuracy.* But on the other far graver charges he maintained an absolute silence!

The following extract contains the conclusion of the first protest against Dr Wallace's teaching by an attached member of the Church of Scotland:—"Therefore, the reverend gentleman said, It is well that we should suspend our belief in the miracles of Jesus Christ, and more particularly in the greatest of all, His resurrection, until such time as the further investigation of learned men shall succeed in setting the question at rest. I do not pretend to give a full account of this very remarkable sermon, but I state with perfect accuracy the conclusion he came to and the doctrine he preached. If I am wrong in any respect, the proof is in his own hands, as his sermon was written out in full, and clearly read to a large congregation,† attracted possibly by the very excellent music, which may help the digestion of his hearers, if last Sunday's discourse is a true specimen of the food which he offers for their edification. It is no part of my design to make any remarks upon the sermon of the Rev. Dr Wallace; that is a matter which might better be inquired into by other and abler hands; but, as an adherent of the Church of Scotland, I feel justified in asking if any man can preach that the truth of the resurrection of Jesus Christ is an open question, and still remain a minister of that Church? And I would ask him how long I must wait in suspense? Life is uncertain. I am an old man besides. Does he really mean that I am to live in doubt as to our Saviour's resurrection from the dead, practising in the meantime the teaching of that Jesus Christ whom David Hume called an impostor, and who, after

* The said report is not one of those which I have quoted.

† Like the writer, I once thought the congregation larger than it really is. The area of the building is large, but it is only seated for 750 persons. Dr Lee's Prayers are read by Dr Wallace in a rude, surly tone, and part of the congregation mumbles responses. What a shocking contrast to the solemn and impressive ritual of the Church of England! In the forenoons, Dr Wallace's lecture consists of a few extemporaneous comments on a chapter or two of the Bible, disfigured by slovenly diction, and the perpetual reiteration of such redundant phrases as "reacting back again on itself," and others equally offensive to good taste. In the afternoons his audience is larger, and his compositions are more elaborate. The sceptics and scoffers then muster in considerable force, and when the preacher has made what is thought a telling onslaught against orthodoxy, a smile or grin is observable on their countenances. Females occasionally join in this offensive exhibition. On this site Dr Inglis and Dr Guthrie preached!

the patient and learned investigation of such men as Dr Wallace, may turn out to have been such. I will not, sir, apologise to you for asking space in your independent paper for these lines. The subject is of grave importance, and it is well that the Christian world should know to what the Church tendencies in Scotland may lead under the guidance of ministers who have solemnly given in their adhesion to our Confession of Faith."*

Imagining probably that Dr Wallace would retract or modify such painful utterances, the "Stranger" revisited Old Greyfriars' on the following Sabbath. The following words contain his second judgment:—"I am a member—an unworthy member, perhaps—of the Church of Scotland as by law established in this realm, and twice, on two consecutive Sundays, here, in the capital of Scotland, I, a stranger, have heard two sermons preached in my own church, by a clergyman of that Church, subversive of the truth of our common religion. My accusation is plain—downright—positive. The witnesses in support of my indictment are the hundreds of his congregation who heard him preach on the 4th and on the 11th days of this month, together with, the best of all proof, his written sermons—*litera scripta manet*—and I now ask, Can these things be? There are hundreds of good men and true who from the pulpits of Scotland weekly proclaim the truths of our religion; it is not known to them, I trust, that one of their number preaches such sermons as I have just described; but through the columns of your paper I publish to all the world that the incumbent of Old Greyfriars' Church has ta'en a fee from the enemy, and soweth tares in the Lord's vineyard; and if, after such publication as your paper shall spread over the length and breadth of Scotland, the sower be permitted to continue his work, then all men, your enemies (and you have many), your friends (thank God! you have yet many and most faithful), will cry shame to the sleeping watchman of Zion; and we, in the emphatic words of the Psalmist, shall 'become a reproach to our neighbours, a scorn and derision to them that are round about us.'" †

* See a Letter by "Stranger," in "Daily Review," December 9, 1870.

† See "Daily Review," December 14, 1870. "Stranger" remarks on Dr Wallace's coarseness and vulgarity, comparing him to an actor at a minor theatre. I have heard from one of his friends that Dr Wallace recently took lessons in elocution, not from an actor, but an actress! His Culross pronunciation,

Another hearer, who had listened to the first of these discourses, annexes to his report this pertinent question:—"After listening to the discourse, the question forced itself upon me, Why should Dr Wallace, with a doubt in his mind on the great question of the resurrection, ever have found himself in a Presbyterian pulpit as a preacher of its truth, and why should he use the place of the Christian minister to disturb the Christian faith in the hearts of a Christian congregation by telling them that the biblical critics and the men of science have yet to solve the question of miracles?"*

In 1865, a correspondent had published in the "Daily Review" an account of certain doings of Dr Robert Lee in Old Greyfriars', which were quoted by Professor Pirie in the General Assembly of that year. Dr Lee denounced that journal as "living by abusing the Church, and by denouncing everybody who is believed to be doing any good service to the Church." Though Dr Wallace or his allies may repeat this complaint, they cannot suspect the "Edinburgh Courant" of any such hostility, however strongly it may have challenged the pretensions and condemned the policy of Dr Lee.

In the Conservative "Edinburgh Courant," a "Broad Churchman" thus expresses his astonishment at a subsequent discourse of Dr Wallace:—"If I had shut my eyes, I could have fancied myself sometimes in the lecture-hall of a secularist of the school of Holyoake† or Bradlaugh. Instead of trying to excite longings after spiritual things, or to raise his hearers from the contemplation of objects of sense and time to the thought of the Eternal, Dr Wallace's whole design seemed to be to show how impossible it was for any reasonable man to believe in any of the supra-natural doctrines of the Bible and of Christianity." . . . "The impression left on the mind at formerly boorish and offensive, is now ludicrous. He is too old a man to remedy this defect in his early education. Two Edinburgh gentlemen, perhaps unrivalled as metaphysicians and theologians, assure me that he deals freely in plagiarisms, borrowing largely at second-hand, and that he resembles the ivy more than the oak.

* See Letter by "Questioner," in "Daily Review," December 15, 1870.

† During the summer of 1870, Dr Wallace preached in the High Church, Glasgow. A friend of mine, who was present, assured me that he had heard a more Christian discourse from Mr Holyoake. Would Mr Holyoake subscribe the Confession of Faith? Would Dr Wallace consent to a twelvemonth's imprisonment in Cheltenham jail, like Mr Holyoake, for the proclamation of his opinions!

the close was, that Dr Wallace had, to his own satisfaction, quite demolished the Christian evidences, and left no ground on which any reasonable man could believe or be certain about anything whatever of a supra-natural character. He was inconsistent enough, indeed, to say that such a passage as "God is Love" was self-evidently true, though how *he* can be sure of that, unless he trusts to his own nature—faith in the declarations of which he had previously characterised as only faith in what was agreeable to one's feelings—I cannot say. But if a minister of a Christian Church makes his pulpit a rostrum from which to denounce the evidences usually brought in support of Christianity; if he declaims against speculative orthodoxy (or idealising the ordinary doctrines) as dishonest, and yet sneers at ordinary orthodoxy as stupid, what possible ground does he leave on which to rest belief in any doctrine of Christianity? Dr Wallace sweeps away the argument from the adaptedness of Revelation to human wants; he demolishes the ordinary external evidences, and will allow no force to the internal ones. What, then, does he allow to remain? To me there seems to be nothing but blank secularism; and the sermon of last Sunday appeared to ignore altogether the existence of any higher platform than the law of kindness as practised among men of ordinary morality and common sense."*

A second correspondent confirms the suspicion that Dr Wallace has been violating his ordination vows for at least two years:—"I have observed two letters recently in the 'Courant,' calling attention to, and expressing much surprise on account of, the style of preaching to be heard in Old Greyfriars'. Both your correspondents speak of sermons or lectures in a special course purporting to deal with the history and development of Rationalism; and the characteristic on which they both remark is the preacher's seeming purpose to bring into contempt the ordinary doctrines of Christianity, for which he is paid, and has received a certain social status and position that he may expound and defend. If I mistake not, however, this is no new feature in the preaching, or teaching, to be heard in Old Greyfriars' from the present incumbent. It is, I am sure, fully two years since I happened to be in that church, and heard from him

* See "Edinburgh Courant," March 16, 1871.

a discourse which was as much a vindication of what is usually termed free-thinking, or scepticism, as either of those of which your correspondents speak. The strangeness of the doctrine in a Christian church, more than any particular ability on the part of the preacher, struck me at the time, and thereby fixed it in my memory." . . . "If Dr Wallace were merely doing what he could to diffuse a more tolerant and liberal mode of dealing with the Christian verities, I for one would wish him God-speed in his work. But if, as to me and to others seems much rather to be the case, he is, while professing to do this, employing the liberty he thus claims and exercises to undermine all faith in Christ and Christianity (apart from the ethical teaching of Christ), and all reasonable conviction of the reality of the supra-natural sphere, surely it is time he were checked or called to account."*

An impartial perusal of the previous correspondence must suggest two questions—the duty of Dr Wallace, and the duty of the Presbytery of Edinburgh. As a salaried State teacher of the Confession of Faith, Dr Wallace has come under a solemn contract which he is publicly asserted to have repeatedly violated. Unless the impeachment is false, what is his present and urgent duty? To resign his charge instantly, as the Rev. James Cranbrook did, though he had never subscribed any Confession. Mr Cranbrook—whatever his faults may have been—was a man of a far higher stamp than Dr Wallace, intellectually and morally, and to the last remained a gentleman. Dr Wallace is at perfect liberty to hire a hall, like Mr Cranbrook and Dr Page. His admirers can pay the cost, as they possess ample means. If they groan under Presbyterian order or State restrictions; they will have ample scope for their "Church ten-

* See "Edinburgh Courant," March 30, 1871. In the "Daily Review," Dec. 22, I published a report of a sermon which I heard Dr Wallace deliver in his own church, October 22, 1870, avowing Socinianism. I also furnished him with my name and address in Elm Row, very near his house in Gayfield Square. The distance between them is so small that, without being Stentors, we could almost hold a Cretan *τηλελαλία*, or "conversation from a distance." When my friends inquire why I do not publish my real name, I give them this answer, that I have been confounded with another gentleman, whose Christian name and surname are the same as mine, that we were both students of Edinburgh University, and long resident in the same county. I never saw him, and, for aught I know, he may object to be mistaken for me; but the confusion has led to some awkward mistakes.

dencies," and will enjoy the luxury of belonging to a sect which, as has been said, would be "without a creed, and almost without a Bible." Dr Wallace is playing into the hands of the Voluntaries, and hampering the movements of the honourable, upright, and patriotic ministers and members of the Church of Scotland, who are striving to strengthen her by agitating for the abolition of Patronage. If, as a distinguished United Presbyterian minister has publicly asserted, "Dr Wallace is the leader of a small but increasing party in the Church of Scotland," it behoves her Courts to do their duty by him, the Church, and the nation: * — "We do not expect or wish to be beyond the cognisance of the State so long as we are an Established Church; but what the State has a right to ask of us is, that we shall maintain our Presbyterian Church Government and our Confession of Faith." †

If I were to compare these clerical covenant-breakers to the Jesuits, who have been so chastised with such incomparable wit and ridicule by Pascal, I might be charged with undue severity. But in both cases there is painfully exemplified what is, by a euphemism, called mental reservation, or what might with propriety be styled falsehood or perjury. Mark how this tampering with truth and honesty gradually betrayed the Jesuit professors into the avowal of the most odious crimes. Filutius, a Jesuit Father, suggests the following method of avoiding this sin:—"After saying aloud, '*I swear that I have not done that,*' to add, in a loud voice, '*to-day;*' or after saying aloud, '*I swear,*' to interpose, in a whisper, '*that I say,*' and then continue aloud, '*that I have done that.*' This, you perceive, is telling the truth." After the duty of veracity had been thus abrogated, the path was smoothed to other Jesuitical violations of the moral law. Father Petain tempted society by "obliging and accommodating conduct." Father Cellot,

* A few years ago, the Rev. Mr Wallace, of Portobello, a younger brother of Dr Wallace, and like him a married man, resigned his charge abruptly, declining to face certain charges preferred against him. They were not charges of heresy.

† See speech by Professor Charteris at Glasgow, February 2, 1871. I strongly recommend his excellent Lecture on "Present-Day Attacks on Religion," containing a very intelligible and satisfactory representation of German theology during the present century, particularly of the theories of Paulus, Strauss, Renan, Schenkel, and Baur.

the Jesuit Provincial, denied the obligation to restore stolen property. Father Baurly framed an ingenious apology for paramours, and for resorting to profligate houses. Father Tanner devised a similar plea for simony. Father Castro Palmao discovered that a judge might decide righteously against the dictates of his conscience. Father Lessius defended fraudulent bankruptcy. Father Molina could see nothing wrong in hiring a man to perpetrate a wicked action. Father Caramuel thought that a priest might kill a slanderer. Father Escolcar, who compiled his "Moral Theology" from twenty-four Jesuit Fathers, vindicated insidious homicide. Father Sanchez justified drunkenness and duelling. Father Layman gave permission to men to kill in defence of their property or honour, even if their lives were free from danger.

This dismal record of consecrated sin prepares us for Father Le Moine's book on "Devotion Made Easy," and Father Barry's guide to "Paradise Opened, by a hundred devotions easily practised." Considering how many pretexts have been devised to palliate wrongs done to man, we cannot be surprised at the laxity of their notions respecting our relations to God. The ancient schoolmen taught that contrition for sin was necessary immediately after its commission, but the Jesuit Fathers Fagundez, Granados, and Escobar, decided that contrition was not necessary, even at death. Father Escobar reports different opinions in his "Practice of the Love of God, according to our Society;" Suarez says it is enough to love Him at the point of death. Some fix their time after baptism; others on festival days. Hunta de Mendoza thought it sufficient to perform this duty once a-year; Father Coninck, once in three or four years; Father Henriquez, once in five years; and Father Filutius would allow even a longer interval. Such are a few of the criminal extravagances traceable to a disregard of truthfulness in thought, word, and action; and the men who deliberately commit perjury in the violation of ordination vows, have little reason to complain if their veracity be suspected in less solemn transactions.

TRACT TENTH.

Causes of Free Church Disunion.

Cause of Disunion—Inference of Party Names—Dr Samuel Miller and the Rev. Thomas Clark—Policy and Inconsistency of the Unionists—Treatment of the Minority—Dr Begg's Public Services—His dislike to rash Ecclesiastical Innovations—Free Church Voluntary Elders—The Wheat and the Chaff—Imputation of Pre-Establishment Leanings—Approximation of the Established Church and the Free Church Minority—Dr Charteris quoted.

ALLUSION has been made to the discord now raging in the Free Church. Is it not strange that this discord should have sprung from proposals for union? Here, again, we see the vantage-ground gained by a party assuming an endearing name. The majority, which has avowed its readiness to discard the distinctive principles of the Free Church, and which might be truly named Disunionists or Revolutionists, are known as Unionists: the minority, which clings conscientiously to these principles, and which might be as truly named Constitution-*alists*, are nicknamed Anti-Unionists—a term which Dr Gibson and, I believe, Dr Samuel Miller,* have repudiated. Look at the

* Dr Miller's name reminds me of another, that of the Rev. Thomas Clark, of Lethendy, who was vetoed in 1840, but inducted by the Presbytery of Dunkeld. After the Disruption, he was deposed for intemperance, and removed to Edinburgh, where he joined the literary staff of the Messrs Chambers. Latterly he settled in Glasgow as a reporter for the "Bulletin," the first penny daily newspaper published in Scotland. He was a quiet, well-read, inoffensive, obliging man, and exceedingly popular with the members of the Glasgow press. At the University of St Andrews he had been a genial, witty, and jolly student, much liked by his companions, possessed of excellent talents, but of somewhat indolent habits. One of his fellow-students was Dr Miller. They had attended the same classes for eight years, and were licensed to preach on the same day by the Presbytery of Dundee, in 1832. Their clerical career presented a sad contrast. Mr Clark's disputed settlement at Lethendy, and subsequent deprivation of his charge, are recorded in the history of the Church of Scotland. Dr Miller, after a ministry of some years in his father's church of Monikie, near Dundee, was translated,

use made of these names in appeals to the persons possessing more amiable sentimentalism than logical discrimination. "Of what exclusive, narrow-minded bigots," they exclaim, "must this minority be composed! What folly to attach so much importance to one or two dogmas of non-essential importance! What a want of charity and brotherly love they display! Why not march with the times, rather than pursue this reactionary course? They are Anti-Unionists!" Perhaps it has not occurred to persons employing this language that it can be turned against themselves. If union is so very desirable, and if small ecclesiastical differences are of so little account, why did they rend the Established Church? If the principles for which they contended, and for which they made so noble a sacrifice, are now to be renounced, the men who agitated in their favour must have been mere disturbers of the peace of the Church of Scotland. The minority, in resisting the Union, are simply holding fast by the principles which distinguished the Free Church from the Established Church, on the one hand, and the United Presbyterians, on the other. Both of these Churches might think that the basis adopted by the Free Church was too narrow to justify them in setting up a rival ecclesiastical organisation. That, however, is beside the question. The Free Church Seceders from the Establishment were unanimous in their adoption of that basis; and because the minority have consistently refused to fall away from their testimony, like Dr M'Crie in the beginning of this century, they are held up to public scorn as narrow-minded obstructives! Lord Ardmillan wrote

shortly after the Disruption, to Free St Matthew's, Glasgow, where he speedily attracted the most influential Free Church congregation in that city. Many years afterwards, he was followed by his poor, penniless, disgraced friend, Thomas Clark, to whom he showed no little kindness, as far as his conscience would allow, for Clark had not quite abandoned the weakness which had proved his ruin. His residence in Glasgow was not long, and he died in an obscure lodging in Renfrew Lane. There Dr Miller saw him on his deathbed, and was asked by him to repeat his visits, which he did as long as life lasted. Mr Clark always spoke of Dr Miller's uniform kindness very gratefully, as something unexpected, perhaps unmerited. No reader of this note will blame Dr Miller for remembering an old college chum, and I daresay he will not repent of any attention paid to him in health or at death. I can assure him that the Glasgow press very warmly appreciated his kindness to their friend. In passing Dr Miller's elegant church or Renfrew Lane, my thoughts involuntarily revert to Dr Samuel Miller and to poor Tom Clark.

to the late Union meeting in Glasgow, that they form a "strenuous opposition, eagerly stimulated, and carefully and dexterously organised." The Rev. Peter Mearns, United Presbyterian minister of Coldstream, meekly observes that they "deserve rather to be cast forth from their own Church than received into the United Presbyterian!" Observe the policy pursued by some of the leading Free Church Unionists. They attempted to plead that, as Free Churchmen, they are not committed to the Establishment principle, as though the Confession of Faith and the Claim and Protest did not, beyond all dispute, prove the reverse. Suppose that, after the conclusion of Dr Chalmers's speech in the first Free Church General Assembly, containing an emphatic disavowal of Voluntaryism and desire to return to a pure Establishment, some member had risen to express sentiments uttered in recent Assemblies by Dr Buchanan,* Dr Candlish, Dr Adam, Dr Rainy, Dr Wylie, Dr Douglas, and the Rev. James Smith Candlish, what amazement would have been created! If, what is very improbable, the speaker had been permitted to finish his speech, one member distinguished by his logical acuteness, his declamatory force, and his keen scathing invective, would probably have started to his feet, and indignantly demanded that the speaker be placed at the bar of the Assembly. That member would have been Dr Candlish. Another member might have expressed his astonishment in more polished, but hardly less cutting rebukes, reminding the unfortunate offender that his mental faculties must have undergone some inexplicable eclipse when he uttered sentiments so "outrageously bad;" and hinting that he would exercise a wise discretion in beating a speedy retreat from Canonmills Hall, and inquiring for the directest road to the Synod Hall of the United Secession (now Presby-

* Dr Buchanan possesses several valuable gifts, natural and acquired; he is patient and perspicacious; can easily master facts and figures, as well as take the measure of the men who are his allies or opponents. He is, besides, fond of miscellaneous work, of which he can dispose with despatch. On the other hand, he is too much addicted to circumlocution and intrigues; hence he is partly distrusted even by his own brethren who seem to sanction his policy. It is notorious that he has, of late years, listened too readily to the suggestions of satellites. Dr Douglas, Professor of Hebrew in the Glasgow Free Church College, has been fitly termed his man Friday. Dr Douglas, who was once the unacceptable minister of Bridge-of-Weir, evidently overrates his own importance in the Free Church Courts.

terian) Church. That member would have been Dr Robert Buchanan. A crowded and angry audience, too, would have greeted his departure with loud valedictory hisses and other unmistakable tokens of sympathy with the clerical leaders.

That the minority in the Free Church should have resented the treatment they have received at the hands of the leaders of the majority, is quite intelligible. They complain that they were led into negotiations under the belief that the integrity of their constitution would be respected by those who were its prime authors, and they regard themselves as betrayed. Hence, even men like Professor Macgregor and the Rev. Mr Cousin, of Melrose, though once cordial friends of the Union, have recently retraced their steps, knowing well that, if it be found unobjectionable on the ground of principle, it will not be long retarded by considerations of expediency. It is undeniable that among the minority are ranked many ministers of the highest reputation for sincere piety, moral weight, and pastoral fidelity, though hitherto almost unknown in Church Courts as disputants or debaters. Take Dr Samuel Miller, Dr Horatius Bonar, Dr A. D. Davidson, the Rev. Moody Stuart, and the Rev. John Kennedy, of Dingwall. Are the scruples of such loyal men to be treated as the relics of bigotry and intolerance? Or take some others, prominent in the active transaction of Church business. Of this class the best-abused man is Dr Begg. It may suit the purpose of the extreme Unionists of all the negotiating Churches to load him with abuse. In the Free Church, however, his character and services ought to be remembered and appreciated. When the Voluntary Controversy was raging in 1832, he, while yet a very recently-ordained minister, took the field in defence of the Church of Scotland, when Dr Buchanan and Dr Candlish were silent or obscure. He signalled his first appearance in the General Assembly of that year by asserting the rights of the Christian people "anent Calls," in a spirited reply to Lord Justice-Clerk Boyle. A parish minister has described to me the astonishment of the members when they saw the tall, slender, fair-haired, comely young man from Paisley dare to dispute the decision of the head of the Second Division of the Court of Session, accustomed to rule, in his judicial character, with undisputed authority.

In the Church Extension movement, Dr Begg was the zealous fellow-worker of Dr Chalmers, who duly prized his talents and activity.* During the Non-Intrusion Controversy, at its outset in 1834, he raised his voice for the abolition of Patronage, while Dr Candlish and Dr Buchanan stuck to the Veto Act, for they voted against the abolition of Patronage till 1841, when the Disruption was imminent. In the Establishment, Dr Begg strongly condemned the levying of seat-rents; and since the Disruption, he has levied none in his own place of worship. His unflagging vigilance in exposing the insidious encroachments of Popery have entitled him to the gratitude of every intelligent Protestant. Many years ago, he strenuously advocated a National System of Education, when Dr Candlish was as strenuously prosecuting his scheme for multiplying Free Church denominational schools. Convinced from his large acquaintance with the labouring population, both urban and rural, that their intellectual and religious elevation depends so materially on their physical comfort, he has applied himself with characteristic energy to provide them with better dwellings and happier hearths—an enterprise in which he received little clerical aid from any Church, but the homes of thousands of the working classes have been improved and gladdened. In every measure relating to physical or sanitary improvements, Dr Begg is a most progressive reformer.† But he draws a

* Dr Begg must possess a very robust constitution. On the evening of April 10, 1871, I heard him address an immense meeting in the Music Hall for two hours, with great effect. Next day, he appeared in the Free Presbytery, speaking with his wonted vigour. Like Dr Buchanan, he is a patient and vigilant listener, which is more than could ever be said of Dr Candlish. Dr Begg's command of his temper stands him in good stead as a debater. Here he is rather superior to Dr Buchanan.

† Mr James Dodds, in his "Thomas Chalmers, a Biographical Study," speaks of Dr Begg's "wonderfully-observant and penetrating mind" in his treatment of social questions. Dr Begg and Dr Candlish are, perhaps, the only Scottish ministers who, while devoting much time and attention to ecclesiastical and other public questions, have retained their popularity as preachers. Their example has been followed by many others, but unsuccessfully. Dr Andrew Thomson, of St George's Church, Edinburgh, united the same gifts. If I mistake not, Mr Dodds was a member of the Dialectic Society in my time. Even then he was a forcible debater. Established in London as a Parliamentary Solicitor, he occasionally revisits Scotland as a popular lecturer. He is a great admirer of the Covenanters. It has, I fear, become too much the fashion to sneer at the Covenanters, and undervalue the invaluable services which they rendered to the emancipation of Scotland from a grinding tyranny. The Rev. George Gilfillan's little work on the Cove-

distinction between things human and things divine. Theological doctrines, like forms of prayer and praise, he regards as too sacred to be lightly changed, and he is jealous of the prevailing tendency to substitute the deductions of human reason or the suggestions of idle caprice for the positive and unalterable enactments of Holy Scripture. He may hold with Macaulay that, whilst progress is made in the inductive sciences by the constant additions to the stock of human knowledge, neither natural religion nor revealed religion is a progressive science, since the same reasoning employed by Paley in his "Natural Theology" had been anticipated by Socrates in refuting the Atheist Aristodemus; and since the Christian of the nineteenth century does not derive his doctrines from the same Bible with more certainty than the Christian of the fifth, both being supposed to possess learning, acuteness, and candour. Hence philosophers like Newton, not to mention eminent scientific men of a later era, have fallen into grosser errors in religion than the simple peasant of a secluded village. Dr Begg may further agree with Bacon that religion, such as alone is worthy of the name, is not based upon natural knowledge; that a scientific knowledge of religious truths is impossible; that, in this sense, there is no such a thing as a philosophy of religion; and that, to pass from philosophy to religion, we must step out of the boat of science, in which we have circumnavigated the old world and the new, into the ship of the Church, and there receive the divine revelations as positively as they are given.

A rather ingenious device of the Free Church Unionist leaders deserves to be stated. Baffled in their attempts to prove that the Free Church is not committed to the Establishment prin-

nanters is an eloquent vindication of their character from the inconsiderate attacks of Sir Walter Scott, whose recent biography by Mr Gilfillan is a very genial and delightful work, for he can appreciate the priceless work of the heroes and martyrs without harbouring any irrational prejudice against the novelist. I may be allowed to express an opinion that literature is far more congenial to Mr Gilfillan's taste and capacity than ecclesiastical controversy. He is known to be a man of kindly and indulgent nature, especially in the case of young poets, whose manuscripts he has revised with conscientious care, making valuable corrections and suggestions for the benefit of their author. To his hearty encouragement the late Mr Alexander Smith, the poet, was much indebted in the beginning of his literary career.

ciple, they have induced some Unionist elders to avow their conversion to undiluted Voluntarism, and they ask, Why do the ministers not move their deposition? Few men of discernment will be at a loss to answer this question. To punish with ecclesiastical censure elders chargeable with inconsistency in professing Voluntarism, might savour of persecution, and on these elders devolves the responsibility of their position. For a Church to lend its sanction to such principles, by entering into an incorporative union with another denomination holding them, is a more serious matter. Every Church contains members holding opinions or engaging in practices which the Church, through its representatives, would condemn.* There is, however, one curious feature in the history of these negotiations. As far back as 1857, Dr Begg and others were prepared for union with the United Presbyterians, on the condition, however, of retaining intact their Free Church principles. What encouragement did they receive from the new leaders of the present Union movement? Why, Dr Cairns has informed us that they narrowly escaped Church censure. And because a large minority will not sacrifice their convictions to the dictation of these same leaders, they are reproached with being the enemies of union!

At the Disruption, a small section of ministers, generally ranked as Non-Intrusionists, and expected to secede, deemed it compatible with their duty to remain in the Establishment. For this act they were nicknamed the "forty thieves," and in a pamphlet, termed the "Wheat and the Chaff," now very rare, their former professions were quoted to put them to the blush. Several of these so-called recreants are still alive, and occupy honourable positions in the Established Church. They can now reply very effectively to the taunts so profusely hurled against them. The Free Church was constituted as a barrier against Erastianism and Voluntarism. If the "forty" inclined to one extreme, the leaders of the Union movement are rushing towards the other. "How," they may ask, "can you taunt us with abandonment of principle or dereliction of

* An illustration will explain my meaning. Some Free Church Unionist elders occasionally frequent the theatre, without incurring Church censure. But would the Free General Assembly formally sanction dramatic entertainments?

duty? Though we partly agreed with you in the measures agitated in the Non-Intrusion controversy, we disapproved of many of the steps employed to obtain them. We were irritated by the dictation of two or three Non-Intrusion chiefs, who engrossed by far the largest share in the negotiations pending for the adjustment of the unhappy disputes then raging in the Church. After the failure of those negotiations, you precipitated the Disruption. Great success crowned your efforts. Your brethren confided in your professions of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Money flowed abundantly into your coffers. Your Free Church was to combine all the order of the Establishment with the spontaneity of Dissent. For a short period, this sanguine expectation promised to be realised. In 1847, your great teacher and legislator was suddenly removed. After his death, your Church became the prey of fresh dissensions. Secresy and centralisation began to undermine the foundations of genuine Presbyterianism. Intrigue and jobbery followed in their wake. The same two or three leaders who had been so prominent before the Disruption, again usurped the reins, and directed the policy of your Church. Still, we were wholly unprepared for your latest and most inconsistent proceedings, by which, had we joined in your Disruption, we might have been handed over to that Voluntaryism which you taught us to dread with pious horror. Where now is the Wheat, and where is the Chaff?''*

Another means employed by the majority to bring discredit on the consistent and conscientious minority consists in their insinuations about the loaves and fishes and pro-Establishment leanings. Such charges come with very bad grace from some of the Free Church leaders, who have been very zealous in this movement. Sir Henry Moncreiff, for example, remained in the parish church of East Kilbride for about two months after the Disruption of May 18, 1843; and, if I am rightly informed, he joined the Free Church on a Sabbath evening, when Dr Gibson went out from Glasgow to preach to the seceding

* After the Disruption, Dr Begg went on a lecturing tour in England to collect funds for the Free Church. Among the subscribers was Mr John Bright, M.P., who gave him a very handsome sum. In the city of York, Dr Begg addressed a large meeting in the open air, close by the Minster. I was then residing near York. While in America, Dr Begg preached before the Congress.

congregation on the Green.* Yet Dr Gibson, admitted by all who knew him to be an able, learned, honourable, and upright man, is the object of sneers and misrepresentations, because he, the editor of the "Church of Scotland Magazine," and a leader in the Non-Intrusion struggle, is thoroughly persuaded in his own mind that the principles which he deliberately adopted and unflinchingly maintained during that eventful period are as true and important in 1871 as they were in 1843. As for the flesh-pots of the Establishment, that is the Teinds, the phrase was unworthy of Dr Maclauchlan, the author of a learned history of the "Early Scottish Church," tracing with a skilful hand the labours of the Culdees of Iona, and the gradual corruption of their successors. To share these flesh-pots the consistent Free Churchman has a most feasible right.

If the majority of that Church persist in consummating the Union, and the minority resolve also to unite with some existing Church, whether would it possess more affinity to the Establishment, freed from patronage, or to another heterogeneous Church containing Professors proclaiming doctrines so repugnant to their judgment as are to be found in the pamphlet of the Rev. Mr Anderson, of Montrose? Why, even Dr Marshall, of Coupar-Angus, a staunch member of the Joint Committee, and in former days a fierce Voluntary, lately attended a meeting in his own town, convened to hear a lecture by an agent of the Liberation Society. There, regardless of his Articles of agreement, he held forth to his Voluntary audience that he was an advocate of free trade in religion and in corn, as if Dr Chalmers had not, nearly half-a-century ago, exploded that miserable and mischievous fallacy. A hungry man desires food in proportion to the keenness of his appetite, whereas an ignorant man has often little relish for knowledge, and a bad man positively hates religious instruction or moral reproof. Applying the free trade axiom to the supply of religious ordinances, both home and foreign missions are impolitic and unnecessary. I can hardly conceive such men as

* I do not greatly censure Sir Henry Moncreiff for this step, for the Moncreiffs opposed the abolition of Patronage. However, he has no cause to complain of his lot. He enjoys his stipend and the interest of £2000, with a house; his Salary as Secretary to the Bible Board is £600 a-year; and his Clerkship to the Free General Assembly is worth £75 annually.

compose the minority of the Free Church working harmoniously with the extreme Voluntaries. Their relations to the Establishment would be closer and stronger. On almost every question Dr Begg, Dr Bonar, and Dr Thomas Smith, might agree with Dr Nicholson, Dr Crawford, Dr Robertson, Dr Charteris, and Dr William Smith; whilst in Glasgow, Dr Miller, Dr Gibson, and Dr A. S. Paterson, would work in harmony with Dr Jamieson, Dr Runciman, and Dr Norman Macleod. Besides, these Free Church ministers have all been officiating ministers in an Established Church; they are familiar with its usages and traditions, as well as versed in the procedure of its Church Courts; and they would render yeoman's service in stopping that proneness to lax construction of ordination vows now creeping into a certain section of the Established ministers.

Or take two men of provincial reputation. There was a time when Dr John Cook, of Haddington, and the Rev. Mr Nixon, of Montrose, differed on several ecclesiastical questions, such as Patronage, the Right of "Quoad Sacra" Ministers to sit in Church Courts, the Claim of Spiritual Independence, and other collateral issues. Dr Cook was a silent member of the Ante-Disruption General Assemblies, acquiescing probably in the policy so ably advocated by his father, Dr G. Cook, and by his cousin, the Rev. John Cook, of Laurencekirk, subsequently Dr Cook, of St Andrews. Mr Nixon was then a steady follower of Dr Candlish and Dr Buchanan, whose authority he has now discarded. Differing, however, as Dr Cook and Mr Nixon may still do, though perhaps less than formerly, on questions laid to rest, they agree most cordially in one common cause of vital interest to the people of Scotland—the maintenance of scriptural Education in the National Schools. At the meeting of the Commissions of the Established and Free General Assemblies, March 1, 1871, Dr Cook and Mr Nixon spoke out boldly and heartily in defence of the Parish School system, which had proved so cheap a national blessing for three hundred years; arguing that these schools were thoroughly unsectarian; that the people of Scotland ought to give forth no uncertain sound for the maintenance of a system established by John Knox and his coadjutors; that the Bible was the basis

of the Statute Book of England; that the Constitution was still Protestant, and required a Protestant to sit on the Throne. And a comparison of their speeches has convinced me that Mr Nixon's recognition of the Establishment principle was even more emphatic than that of Dr Cook.* The following wise and seasonable words of Dr Charteris, delivered at the Glasgow Anti-Patronage Meeting, will commend themselves to all who are not blinded by sectarian spleen:—"In spite of all that some implacable foes are doing, Christians of every creed, but especially Scottish Presbyterians of every name, are drawing more closely together, and seeing clearly that not by strife but by harmony is the best strength of every portion of Christ's Church to be promoted. The day seems to us to be coming nearer, and coming very fast, when all this great city, when all our native land, shall be divided anew for ecclesiastical and religious purposes; when endowments of religion shall be found attached to every Church as the poor man's patrimony, and when, with the endowment, shall be joined the generous voluntary contributions of the congregation, making a bond between minister and people that is a blessing to both. (Applause.) For my own part, I can only say again, what I have often said before, that to secure an Endowed Territorial Church, which I believe to be the only efficient home mission, I would gladly see the old parishes subdivided, the old Teind endowments shared, not for the benefit of the present Church of Scotland, but on terms fair and equal to all our brethren, so that all the branches of the Presbyterian Church should be joined together again in unity, activity, and power. Everything for union; not that union may secure political ascendancy, but that it may secure efficiency in those home missions which, amid the strifes of Churches, have been so fearfully neglected. Then would Christ be proclaimed in word and deed as King of the Nations and

* The same hearty and useful co-operation was manifested in my hearing, at a meeting convened in Queen Street Hall to promote the retention of religious instruction in the National Schools. Lord Polwarth was chairman. Dr Maxwell Nicholson delivered a forcible and high-toned speech, and Dr Begg spoke to the same effect. At a former meeting, held in the same hall, Dr Nicholson and Dr Thomas Smith strenuously espoused the same side. I was strongly reminded of the times when I had heard Dr Candlish descending so energetically on his favourite theory of the "Godly upbringing of the youth."

Head of the Church! Then would we be able to point to a revived Church and a religious people as witnessing for Christ's Crown and Covenant. This is our ultimate aim, and I think we shall reach it; we are fighting no party battle, we raise no political war-cry!"*

* See Speech at the Anti-Patronage meeting in Glasgow, Feb. 2, 1871. Dr Charteris and Dr Macduff were among the first Church of Scotland ministers to introduce organs into Glasgow, and their example was speedily followed by others. Is it not curious that in Edinburgh, where the Presbyterians are as æsthetical as their brethren in Glasgow, the only Church organ is in Old Greyfriars'? How can this be explained? Simply and satisfactorily by the fact that a Presbyterian organ was associated with the evasion and trickery of Dr Robert Lee, whereas Dr Charteris, Dr Macduff, Dr Runciman, and the Rev. James Macgregor, though sanctioning organs, were recognised as diligent and valuable ministers of the Church of Scotland; so that there is no necessary enmity between organs and orthodoxy. When I resided in England, I frequently attended the Church of England, and I always remarked that the ritual was plain in those churches where the ministers were distinguished by their superior preaching and parochial efficiency.

TRACT ELEVENTH.

Position of the United Presbyterians.

Rev. Dr Ker quoted—Open Questions—Dr Cairns and Dr Begg—Liberation Society and State Connection—National Church a Popular Principle—Mr James Baird, Dr Norman Macleod, and the Rev. Mr Divorty quoted—Presbyterian Union in Victoria—Dr William Smith quoted—Causes of Dissent—Clerical Efficiency and Remuneration—Fifeshire Dissent—Dr Macewan's Speech—Counsel to the United Presbyterians.

I AM now to treat of the United Presbyterian Church, to whose principles I have so fully referred in my Tract on Voluntaryism. It has been shown that this Church allows great latitude of doctrine on this question. The Rev. Dr Ker, a man of superior talents, and a high authority, states:—"Our position lies, not in holding one view, but in according liberty to hold any. Practically, the immense majority are Voluntaries, but the principle of this Church is not Voluntary—it is the broader one of forbearance." Thus the question of endowments is an open question. Liberty is granted to justify or condemn them. This is the theoretical view. What is the practical one? Supposing that, by some arrangement, certain United Presbyterian ministers holding the theory of the lawfulness of endowments were to obtain a grant from the Teinds, would they be called to account by their ecclesiastical superiors? If so, what becomes of this vaunted forbearance? Dr Cairns has asserted that Dr Begg will enjoy as much liberty to advocate the National Endowments in the United Church as in the Free. Would he be allowed to accept them? If not, this open question is practically closed, and the phrase is an empty misnomer. Who ever heard of any other open question admitting only one solution? Some candid, but not very reflective critics, have expressed their inability to comprehend how any Church

receiving State assistance can be incorporated with another Church dispensing with it. Extreme Voluntaries are apt to descant on this difficulty more copiously than logically. "Imagine," they tell us, "the absurdity of Voluntaries coalescing with a Church trammelled by State connexion." This is the stock phraseology of the Liberation Society—the new designation of the Anti-State Church Society—which, not finding its operations so speedy or successful as it expected, adopted a name suggesting release from bondage and oppression. Confining our attention to the Church of Scotland, where are the alleged fetters? The Liberation Society agitators speak as if a foreign ruthless despot called the State, had framed some horrible creed, and imposed it by pains and penalties on the Church; whereas the Confession of Faith was the production of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, representing all the Protestant Churches of the land. As regards the State control proposed to be removed from the Church, what control does the State exercise over the Church of Scotland? Does it even seek to interfere with her preaching or discipline? It does not even retain the right to inquire whether the preaching of her ministers be in harmony with the Confession it has sanctioned, unless the question is raised by disputes touching property; and the ecclesiastical history of Scotland has fully demonstrated that, in this respect, Dissenters have been more ready than Churchmen to invoke the aid of the Civil Courts. The fact is, that many persons clamouring for the downfall of Established Churches seem to be smitten with a horror for the very name of Establishments. They have been born and reared in a Voluntary society. All their teachings and traditions have confirmed them against a State or National Church. Thus they have acquired a strong denominational bias, which limits their vision and fosters their prejudices. Accustomed to confine their attention solely or mainly to the furtherance of their own denominational progress, they have never realised the power and completeness of the Establishment principle, nor felt the weight of national responsibility. By some fallacious process of reasoning, they have harboured the conviction that an endowed territorial National Church is a contrivance of the State, or of the richer classes,

to maintain their own superiority; forgetful of the fact that it is essentially a popular principle, as Dr Chalmers so forcibly argued, and that the endowments of the Church belong to the nation, which ought to see that they should be turned to the best account in the religious instruction of the people of Scotland. As Mr James Baird, of Cambusdoon, shrewdly reminded the Established General Assembly of 1870, "He looked on all endowments of the Established Church as sums held in trust for procuring permanently the religious instruction of the people, and if even that endowment were withdrawn, it would necessarily come out of the pockets of the people." To the same effect Dr Norman Macleod has warned his fellow-countrymen:—"The people did not belong to the clergy, but the clergy belonged to the people; and therefore it was a great practical question, and one in which the people should take the deepest interest, how these their own funds, and how these their own clergy, should be turned to the best possible account as instruments of good. Would the people of Scotland cast away or utilise seven or eight millions of capital, secured for them by the great Reformers out of the clutches of the aristocracy or the State, and secured, after many a hard battle and many a bloody sacrifice, for the religious good of the nation? Let the working classes especially think twice, or even thrice, before they were done out of this money by the sectarian or political agitators—for this money was theirs."*

One of the inducements commonly quoted in favour of the proposed union is the example of the union effected in the province of Victoria. Being desirous of learning the facts relating to that union, I applied to the Rev. P. Divorty, M.A., formerly a Free Church minister in Victoria, now Secretary of the Scottish Reformation Society, who took an active part in that transaction. I received the following communication, showing that the United Church of that colony is constituted on the basis so loudly condemned by our Voluntaries at home:—"A clause in the constitution of the colony, provides that £50,000 be given towards 'the support of the Christian religion,' divided, according to the census, among all the bodies claiming their share. Prior to the Presbyterian Union, the

* See Speech at the Anti-Patronage meeting in Glasgow, Feb. 2, 1871.

Free and Established parties were in receipt of it; they still retained it—the United Presbyterians declining to participate, though these, in several cases, occupy churches built on Government land, and built partly with Government money. £6000 fell to the Presbyterian Church, one-half for building, the other for stipends, which latter is divided equally every year among all the ministers wishing a share. One or two who were of the Free Church declined participating before and since the union. The only condition attached by Government is that, when the grant is accepted, there shall be 40 free sittings in the church.”*

From this statement of Mr Divorty it appears that the Presbyterian Church of Victoria contains United Presbyterian ministers who do not participate in the Government grants. The Church of Scotland is now constituted on similar principles. Extension chapels have been erected without receiving a farthing from the Teinds or the national exchequer; and the scanty annual stipend of £120, secured by endowment, has been raised by private liberality, the incumbent trusting for his supplementary income to the further liberality of his congregation. It was on the faith of such an arrangement that Glasgow procured the ministrations of such men as Dr Macduff, Dr Caird, Dr Charteris, and the Rev. Donald Macleod, all of whom had resigned well-endowed provincial parochial churches. Yet they retained their full status as Church of Scotland ministers, occupying seats in her ecclesiastical courts. Will any Scottish United Presbyterian explain why he cannot, consistently with his own profession of “open questions,” consent to the incor-

* A lively and instructive record of Australian life will be found in Mr Joseph Gordon's recent work, entitled the “Emigrant's Barque, and Life in New South Wales,” exposing the petty tyranny of local authorities in the early history of the colony, and testifying to the great value of the Rev. Dr Lang's labours for the benefit of the colonists. While these sheets are passing through the press, I observe that at an influential meeting held in Sydney, December 14, 1870, and composed of gentlemen of the principal religious denominations, a resolution was passed to open subscriptions for a testimonial to be presented to Dr Lang, who has been a Presbyterian minister in Sydney for about half-a-century. At that meeting, the various speakers fully confirmed the testimony of Mr Gordon, who was formerly resident in Bathurst and Sydney. Like his friend Dr Lang, Mr Gordon felt the necessity of chastising the misrule and corruption of venal officials, and both incurred much temporary ill-will.

porative union which his brethren in Victoria contributed to accomplish? The sophism that the wholesome influence of competition in rival Presbyterian denominations will enable them to overtake their common work, was clearly exposed at the Edinburgh Anti-Patronage meeting by Dr William Smith, from whose speech I make a few extracts:—"He remarked that the evil consequences of the present unhappy state of things in Scotland were very obvious. They were varied, and they were most malign in their influence. The ecclesiastical relations of the people of this country—the relations of the Churches of Scotland more particularly—made it utterly impossible for any one of those Churches, or for all of them, while they existed separately and apart from each other, to overtake the vast religious destitution which existed, and to check or diminish, to any material extent, what he feared must be accepted as an acknowledged fact—the great irreligion of the country. It must be known to all who had anything to do with carrying out the laws of the Church—with acting up to the spirit of the constitution of any of the Churches with which they were connected—that, practically, for all good purposes, discipline was positively at an end in their churches—that they could not bring the arresting and restoring influence of the Church to bear for good upon any of the lapsed or erring members of those families who were most devotedly attached to their particular communions. That was a great evil, and the source of other evils in many points of view. Then there was in Scotland the great evil of pauperism. He could not understand how the inhabitants of this country were sitting so still under the rapid growth of that evil, which was eating like a canker into our vitals. Since 1846, the money expended upon the support of the poor in Scotland had risen from under £300,000 to close upon £900,000, and it was increasing every year.* The poor were formerly supported by the Church; and, he made bold to say, better supported than under the present system.†

* A polite correspondent in West Kilbride, Ayrshire, has written to me disputing the accuracy of a speech by Mr Crawford, M.P., regarding the Poor-rates in that parish. I am not responsible for the contents of the speech, which I copied from the Parliamentary report.

† Dr Smith is a good financier, as I well remember. When I was a student in Professor Pillans's class, Mr Smith was Censor, and as such he levied the fines for

There was the difficulty, too, as to religious education, as to which so many were now stumbling. He agreed with Dr Nicholson in thinking that, but for unhappy religious divisions and separations, that difficulty could be settled, most satisfactorily to the great majority of the people of Scotland, at one sitting of a committee in the forenoon of any day. . . . The overture for reconciliation and reunion might possibly be rejected. All he could say was that, if it was cast back in their teeth with scorn, the responsibility of rejection, and of the disastrous consequences which might ensue, would rest solely and entirely upon those who so rejected it. But he did not think that eventually it would be rejected. He augured a better issue, and perhaps speedily, to the movement.”*

Unless I am greatly mistaken, some passages in these Tracts are likely to prove the reverse of acceptable to various individuals or sections of the three Scottish Presbyterian Churches. The Church of Scotland might have been better pleased if the theological tendencies and unquestionable duplicity of some of her ministers had been criticised more leniently. The clerical leaders of the Free Church may feel some irritation at being reminded of their former adhesion to the Establishment principle. The United Presbyterians may take offence at my failure to perceive in exclusive Voluntaryism a sovereign remedy for all the evils that affect the Church and the State. What I am now to propose will, I fear, provoke the hostility of the great bulk of the ministers of all these Churches. In the eyes of very many Voluntaries, the great practical objection to an Established Church does not apply so much to the Teinds, nor to the authority of the Civil Magistrate, nor to the alleged absence of Spiritual Independence. What, then, is the objection? Every careful reader of the foregoing Tracts will have anticipated the answer in Patronage, which is doubtless a great stumbling-block.

Another remains to be narrowly examined. If all probationers were to fulfil the hopes which had won for them the favourable opinion of the Patrons or congregations, further

lateness, absence, and other class offences. The Professor was then a rigid disciplinarian, and he was ably seconded by his Censor, for he was inexorable.

* See speech at the Anti-Patronage meeting in Edinburgh, Dec. 28, 1870.

safeguards would be superfluous. Unfortunately they are necessary, and can hardly be said at present to exist. Has not the Presbyterian system of Church Government provided sufficient guarantees for the proper administration of her affairs? Certainly, gross clerical immorality has, in the main, been exposed and punished. Flagrant heresy, too, has been visited with censure or deprivation of office.* Is nothing else needed? Restricting our observations to endowed incumbents whose income, though variable, can never fall below a competency, is the standard of pastoral diligence and fidelity not apt to undergo a culpable declension? Has this not operated most powerfully in estranging multitudes from the National Church? For it is beyond all question, that in the rural districts especially, ministers are allowed to retain their offices, who are not animated by a lively sense of their high vocation. They are not immoral; they are not heretics; they do not violate the social conventions; they may be men of some learning, fair scholars, agreeable companions, or obliging neighbours; but withal they are indolent and inefficient spiritual overseers. When I was arranging the plan of these Tracts, I was forcibly impressed with the importance of this view. Before the Disruption, the Secession was, perhaps, relatively stronger in Fifeshire than in any other Scottish county. What was the explanation? First, the Presbyteries had licensed young men who were destitute of the requisite qualifications, intellectual or moral. Next, the patrons had presented these "sons of the feeble" to parishes where the people were unable to exclude them. Thirdly, the parish might be burdened for half a cen-

* On April 17, 1871, I heard the Rev. Charles Voysey, late Vicar of Healaugh, rehearse in the Edinburgh Music Hall his twenty-five years' experience in the Church of England, whence he was righteously cast forth by the decision of Lord Chancellor Hatherley and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Mr Voysey is evidently a man of a restless, inquisitive, and ill-balanced intellect, coupled with an obtuse sense of the obligation of clerical subscription to standards of doctrine. "I thank God," he exclaimed, "that I am now a sceptic!" The only Edinburgh clergyman present was Dr Wallace, of Old Greyfriars', whose theology is as lax as Mr Voysey's. Did not Dr Wallace attack Lord Hatherley's judgment in the "Scotsman"? Did he not express a wish for a new Lord Chancellor to reverse it? Might he not resign his charge and become Mr Voysey's colleague in London? Mr Voysey possesses a seared conscience, but his elocution is quiet, polished, and effective, so that, compared with Dr Wallace, he is "Hyperion to a Satyr."

tury not only with such incapables, but with many others originally more hopeful, who, after their ordination, had become indolent, and had ceased to command public respect or confidence.* Now, is it not fair that clerical remuneration should bear some proportion to clerical labour? If it be objected that this scheme contains too mercenary an element, does the objector not see that a paid ministry is also mercenary? Take the case of two ministers of nearly equal capacity for work, settled in adjoining parishes with the same stipend. One of them tasks his energies to the utmost in promoting the spiritual welfare of all classes, instructing the ignorant, warning the careless, consoling the sorrowful, caring for the widow and the orphan, visiting the sick, and incurring the risk of fatal disease. The other restricts himself to the bare performance of his statutory duties. Does it not stand to reason that the idler should feel through his purse the merited penalty? A well-adjusted scale of remuneration would combine all the advantages of Endowments and Voluntaryism, without their drawbacks.†

In my Tract on the "Phases and Defects of Voluntaryism," I cited the leading events of Scottish history in confirmation of my theory of the recognition by the Civil Magistrate of the principles of revealed religion. A kindred illustration, drawn from experience, may serve to expose a fallacy which confounded two classes of teachers in the estimation of the Scottish people. Thus, the Moderates and the Evangelicals were supposed to entertain and inculcate different systems of theology; the former as Arminians, and the latter as Calvinists. In point of theology, the distinction was often shadowy, but there was frequently a

* I had prepared a Tract on the comparative strength of Dissent in certain Fifeshire parishes with which I was familiar in my boyhood. I am obliged to omit it for want of space. My list included Falkland, my native parish, Auchtermuchty, Strathmiglo, Kettle, Collessie, Monimail, Ceres, Cults, Kennoway, and Markinch. Any one may pursue the same enquiry in his own county with similar results.

† Such a scheme has been framed by Mr Alexander Whitelaw, 168 West George Street, Glasgow, who will, I believe, forward copies to applicants. Both he and his uncle, Mr James Baird, of Cambusdoon, are liberal friends of the Church of Scotland, but opposed to drones remaining in her ministry. The scheme propounded by Mr Whitelaw is very practicable. It would recognise and reward conscientious and meritorious pastors, but would show little compassion to men who neglect their duty.

real difference in regard to pastoral zeal, diligence, and efficiency, in which the Evangelicals mostly excelled. If, as has been often asserted, the Moderates were wont to insist so strongly in their sermons on the necessity of good works, it was certainly unfortunate that their own performances in that respect did not harmonise with their precepts. What was termed Moderatism really indicated jealousy of popular influence and a low standard of pastoral usefulness. The Wesleyan Methodists, though Arminians, are rarely charged with frigid ministrations.

As to the likelihood of our realising the scheme of a National Presbyterian Church, it is not for me to utter any rash or presumptuous prophecy. In the United Presbyterian Synod of 1870, I heard Dr Alexander MacEwen,* of Claremont Church, Glasgow, read a speech on the Union question. The speech itself was, in point of conception and expression, not above mediocrity; and the only sentence which it contained worthy of remark was the following:—"Any attempt to reconstruct the Church of Scotland is only a pleasant dream." Dr MacEwen, however, knows, or ought to know, that visions are sometimes realised after a strange and unaccountable fashion. In the course of his speech, Dr MacEwen informed his audience that he had been a student and correspondent of the erudite Jew, Neander, of Berlin. Dr MacEwen is now in the prime of matured manhood, and has not been an inattentive observer of passing events. While he was a student of Neander, was it more than a pleasant vision that the numerous petty States of Germany, which rendered the map of Europe a chaotic jumble, as Thomas Carlyle styles it, would be absorbed by Prussia, then staggering from the battle of Jena, which levelled her in the dust at the feet of Napoleon Bonaparte? When the homeless and almost penniless exile, Louis Napoleon, was regarded with derision in the gambling-rooms of London and New York as a crazy young imbecile, who ever harboured the pleasant vision that he should ascend the throne of the banished Corsican, wield imperial and despotic power over France by the universal suffrage of the French nation, confiscate the estates of the Orleans family, humble the pride and dismember the

* Dr MacEwen's stipend is, I am told, £800 a-year, with a free house; and his uncle, Mr John Henderson, of Park, left him a legacy of about £40,000.

dominions of the haughtiest European sovereigns, and hold the destiny of Europe in his hands? Passing over twenty years, could the victims of his rule, Louis Blanc, in London, and Victor Hugo, in Jersey, have indulged the pleasant vision that two short months of 1870 should witness the inglorious defeat, captivity, and dispersion of the vaunted armies of France, her Emperor a prisoner in the territory of his victorious foe, whom he had, on the flimsiest of pretexts, challenged to the ruinous encounter? Could any political or military prophet have dreamt that a German host would, in a few months, overspread the fairest provinces of France, march into her proudest towns, parade in her splendid capital, and there dictate an inglorious peace? Or could any political dreamer have imagined that within five years the Pope would lose the protection of Austria, Spain, and France, ever so prompt to shield his pretensions and to redress his wrongs? To come nearer home, did Dr MacEwen ever imagine that Mr Gladstone, the inexorable champion of Church and State, would become the Premier of a Radical Cabinet? or that Mr Disraeli, then supposed to be a visionary and eccentric novelist, would ever aspire to lead the House of Commons and prevail on the House of Lords to legalise House Suffrage, the fond vision of the Quaker, Joseph Sturge, of Birmingham?

Reverting to ecclesiastical questions and parties in Scotland, did Mr MacEwen ever imagine the probability that the fiercest and most pertinacious champions of the Church of Scotland would ever forsake her charges, leaving the breaches to be filled by lukewarm colleagues? Stranger still, did it ever occur to him as at all likely in the chapter of accidents that those same implacable champions of Establishment should be straining every muscle to effect an incorporative union with the Voluntaries, whom they had branded as the allies of infidels, subverters of the Divine law, disloyal citizens, and practical Atheists? How Dr MacEwen would have stared, or laughed, or mocked, thirty years ago, had he been told that Dr Buchanan would have quitted his former trusty ally, Dr Gibson, to embrace that uncompromising Voluntary, Dr William Anderson, or that Dr Candlish, who was wont to hold schism and Voluntarism in equal abhorrence—would rush into the arms of Dr James

Harper ! Or to come to still closer quarters, could any sane man have dreamt that Dr MacEwen, the son of the Anti-Burgher minister of Howgate, should have concurred with a new United Presbyterian congregation in the west end of Glasgow to place in their church an organ, and should have appeared in the United Presbyterian Synod to advocate the use of that instrument which his Anti-Burgher forefathers would have joined with their Burgher foes in execrating as a relic of Prelacy and Popery, taking care to suspend or admonish the daring innovator, the disciple of the Hebrew Neander ? I take leave to direct the attention of Dr MacEwen to a practice which, within the last quarter of a century, seemed quite as much a vision to him as the reconstruction of the Scottish National Church. When he was ordained minister of Helensburgh United Secession Church in 1844, the use of manuscript was strictly forbidden to practitioners and ministers of his denomination, for it was not an "open question." Such was the insuperable aversion of her congregations to the practice, that neither Dr Chalmers nor Dr Wardlaw would have procured a settlement in her communion. Dr MacEwen now reads not only sermons in his pulpit, but speeches in his Synod. Did not the Anti-Burghers proscribe paraphrases, hymns, and gowns as incompatible with the exercise of the pastorate ? Dr MacEwen uses them all.

I conclude this Tract with a few words to the United Presbyterians, taking no account of the Episcopalians, Congregationalists, and other Dissenters. That the United Presbyterians are an intelligent, energetic, and prosperous Church, may be safely conceded, though they will be surprised to receive from the Voluntary author of the "Scotch Kirk" an admission "that of late years the Church of Scotland may have been gaining ground."* What Mr John Bright, M.P., said many years ago of the Church of England is partly applicable to the Scottish Church : her chief dangers are to be apprehended from internal dissen-

* See "The Scotch Kirk : her History and Present Position" (p. 106), a vigorous little work, abounding in pertinent information, and demanding the disestablishment of the Kirk. Whilst I thank the unknown author for the flattering terms applied to my "Future Church of Scotland," I cannot, of course, assent to his conclusions. The book is issued by the Liberation Society. It was brought under my notice by a distinguished minister of the Church of Scotland.

sions as much as from external assaults. A foreigner would infer from their designation that the United Presbyterians embraced all the divisions of the Presbyterian Church, whereas they are the smallest of the three large denominations bearing that common name. How were they enabled to accomplish petty unions? Was it not by agreeing to exercise a wise forbearance on points of difference so petty as to be unintelligible except to those persons who, like myself, by an accident of birth, have made them the subjects of special study? Nobody will grudge to the United Presbyterians some measure of congratulation on the apparent acceptance of Voluntaryism by the Free Church leaders. What value is really attachable to this late acceptance? Is it not fully as suspicious as the Anti-Patronage professions of Dr Pirie and Dr Norman Macleod?

Nor let the United Presbyterians plume themselves on their assumed adherence to the principles of the Erskines. If they distrust my authority, let them consult Dr King, Dr John Taylor, Dr Finlayson, Dr Eadie, Dr William Johnston, Dr Andrew Thomson, or Dr William Peddie. I stake my reputation for historical fidelity on the response which these able and eminent men will give with an unanimous voice, that the ecclesiastical position of the Erskines was that now occupied by the Anti-Patronage majority in the Church of Scotland, by the Free Church minority, by the Constitutional Seceders, and by a very small section of the United Presbyterians. That position is national, constitutional, secure, and intelligible. Nor let the United Presbyterians point with triumph to the disestablishment of the Irish Church. Is Popish Ireland to be taken as a precedent for Presbyterian Scotland? When was the "Habeas Corpus Act" last suspended in Scotland? How much has Scotland suffered by the influx of lawless Irishmen among her peaceable, moral, and orderly population? * Are the United Presbyterians aware that the Irish Church still retains a

* I recently conversed with a very intelligent and well-educated elder of the United Presbyterian Church, who is manager of a large cotton mill near Glasgow, where he has many Irish in his employment. Prior to his appointment, he sympathised largely with the alleged wrongs of Ireland. He has now greatly modified his sentiments on that subject. His minister, a very learned and accomplished man, who was formerly settled in Fifeshire, where he was a leading Voluntary, has, I suspect, come to the same conclusion as his elder on the Irish grievance, and

decent provision for her clergy, who receive an annual stipend of £250 a-year, and that the landowners pocket several millions of pounds sterling by the disestablishment of the Church? If the United Presbyterian Voluntaries desire to confer some signal blessing on Scotland, let them strive to restore to useful purposes the Unappropriated Teinds, the legitimate property of the Church and the nation, rather than plunge into an agitation for the alienation of the present revenue from the Established Church, or from a more comprehensive Church to which it may give place. In a pamphlet on "Comprehensive Presbyterian Union in Scotland," the Rev. Donald Fraser, M.A., of the Free High Church, Inverness, now of Marylebone Presbyterian Church, London, puts the case very fairly thus:—"But on what reasonable ground can objection be taken to the endowment of Parish Churches in Scotland? Here is no parson's tithe exacted, or Church-rate levied on indignant Dissenters. A part of the ancient church property—and but a part—has been happily preserved for pious uses. Why should it not be so employed? Would you relieve heritors of their payments—in other words—present to them what does not belong to them, and enrich them at the expense of the Church, to carry out a theory of Voluntaryism? It is absurd to talk of obnoxious taxation in favour of a particular Church. There is no taxation, except that miserable Annuity-Tax which has so long served as a political grievance for the Radicals of Edinburgh, and which seems to be waning away. And we should really like to know how it is sinful to employ old church property for church use, and not at all sinful to apply to such use other old endowments bequeathed by individuals or founded by trading companies?

the Session are of the same opinion. Mr David Macrae, in his "Americans at Home," and in his "Home and Abroad," both very clever, amusing, and instructive books, states that the coloured population in the United States were treated most cruelly by the Irish, who were always clamouring about Saxon tyranny in Ireland. Mr Macrae, though reared in Oban, was, I believe, born at Kilconquhar, in Fifeshire. His sketches of the General Assemblies, in the "Glasgow Herald," are very racy, though rather caustic in some cases. He is no respecter of dignities.

† Mr Fraser's pamphlet was published in 1867. He is now one of the most popular preachers in London. He succeeded my friend, Dr William Chalmers.

TRACT TWELFTH.

Scottish National Education.

Scottish Education Bills—English Ecclesiastical Sects—Alleged Religious Difficulty—Voluntaries—Secularists—School Morality—Falsehood and Profane Swearing—Sir Daniel Sandford and the Rev. Henry Renton, M.A.—Bishop Newman and Archbishop Whately quoted—Testimony of Mr Andrew Young and Mr Edmund Boyd—Lord Advocate Young's Experience—Edinburgh Secularists—Privy Council and Education—Condemned by a Committee of the House of Commons—Mr Lingen and "My Lords"—School Inspectors—Opinions of Scottish Members of Parliament—Qualifications of Scottish Schoolmasters—Pretensions and Defects of Normal Training Colleges—Remuneration of Schoolmasters—Professor Kelland quoted.

I HAVE deemed it expedient to address this Tract to the Right Honourable George Young, Lord Advocate for Scotland. As the holder of that important office, he has undertaken to frame, and, if possible, carry through Parliament, a Bill for the settlement of the National Education question. Mr Young has been till very recently so much engaged in his extensive forensic practice, that he cannot have devoted much attention to those ecclesiastical differences with which Scottish National Education has been so inextricably involved. He has repeatedly avowed his desire to consider with particular attention any representations embodying relevant facts; and it is surely fair to assume that he will listen with equal candour to sound arguments. Few men at the Bar or in Parliament display more acuteness in detecting and refuting fallacies. He has not forgotten that during the last sixteen years six efforts made by the Lord Advocate Moncreiff to carry Education Bills ended in failure. The retrospect is not pleasant, yet it may be turned to good account by his Whig successor. Whilst successive Bills have miscarried, partly through their faulty construction, and partly, it may be, to a want of tact or firmness

in the official to whom they were entrusted, the evils which they were designed to check have been growing apace, and public expectation has been sorely disappointed. Still the fact of such repeated failures ought to lighten the difficulties of the present Lord Advocate. The people of Scotland are heartily sick of so much contention and so long delay. Sectarian jealousy has sensibly abated. No ecclesiastical denomination can longer hope to maintain or regain its ascendancy. Compromises once treated with scorn would be now gladly accepted. On the other hand, some new difficulties have sprung up. The Churches had been asserting their respective pretensions so acrimoniously in a field where a strife was unseemly and needless, that a decisive battle must be fought to preserve the integrity of that happy union of intellectual and religious instruction, which has rendered the parish schools a priceless blessing to the children of the land.

In devoting a few pages to the expression of my views on this theme, I may be allowed to speak with some confidence. As a practical educator for a quarter of a century, chiefly in Scotland, but for eight years in various towns in England, mingling with distinguished educators and educationists, and encountering many persons differing from myself in politics and religion, I must have profited little by such intercourse, if I have been unable to grasp the scholastic problems demanding solution. Although I have not taken a prominent part in elementary schools, I claim to understand the wants which they ought to satisfy. At the same time, I frankly acknowledge the formidable difficulties besetting any attempt to frame a National Education Bill for England. These can hardly be realised in all their magnitude by any Scotsman who has not analysed the complexity and diversity of English ecclesiastical society. In England, there are thirty-six religious sects. In the Church of England, there are reckoned nine parties, ranging from the High Church claimant of Apostolic succession, verging on Romanism, to the Low Church Evangelicals, nearly akin to Dissent. Between the Church and Dissenters generally there is a wide gulf. Among the chief Protestant Dissenters, too, there are many points of divergence, and even of hostility. The Wesleyan Methodists, whose organization is the

compactest in England, cultivate few friendly relations with the Dissenters, for the Methodists object to be known by that designation. These antagonisms in the Churches find their counterparts in the Schools. Of the Dissenters, again, many sections are wedded to crude and impracticable crotchets based on prejudice and imperfect information. One kind of confidence springs from perfect knowledge; the other, from absolute ignorance.

In approaching the all-important subject of a system of National Education organised and supported by the State, the first question which demands our attention concerns religious instruction. Until a comparatively recent period, the teaching of the Word of God was deemed an essential element in common school education. Whatever differences of opinion might exist among parents touching the election and payment of ministers, there was an entire unanimity in the nature and amount of the religious training required by their children. Churchmen and Dissenters might wrangle on other subjects involving issues of real or fancied moment, but the schools were exempted from the evil consequences of their strife. Dissenters might object to the exclusive control of the parish schools exercised by the Established Presbytery, and conscientious heritors might regret that the respectable parents were powerless to remove schoolmasters convicted of open immorality or gross inefficiency, which frequently compelled them to build subscription schools to prevent their children from perishing for lack of knowledge. Their objections, however, rarely extended to the constituent elements of the school course; and the teacher who omitted to impart religious instruction would have forfeited public esteem and credit, in spite of his dexterity in imparting the other branches of knowledge. Gradually, a few educational speculators began to suggest the propriety of restricting the teacher to what is now termed the secular department of his profession, leaving the sacred element to the parents or the Church. For this divorce of secular and religious education the Voluntary Controversy was partly responsible. So strongly had the Voluntaries set their faces against any State provision for the religious instruction of the parents, that they speedily condemned any similar provision for the religious training of the children.

It would be utterly wrong to describe the Voluntaries as indifferent to such training, but their so-called Voluntary principle seemed to require them to look upon the State-endowed teacher as a purely civil functionary, whose province did not extend to sacred themes. A more extreme section pushed their doctrines to the extent of denying the power of the State to interfere in any way with public education, maintaining that State Schools are as opposed to civil and religious liberty as State Churches. Mr Edward Miall, M.P., was wont to hold this view, but was compelled to abandon it to regain his seat in the House of Commons. In Scotland, though it was professed by such Voluntaries as Dr Robson, Dr J. B. Johnston, Dr Edmond, and Dr Ker, it has never found much favour in the United Presbyterian Church.

Another class of objectors to religious instruction is less entitled to respect, since it consists of persons more or less hostile to the doctrines of the Christian faith. To this class belong what are now called the secularists, a very vague and indefinite designation, which has never been properly explained. They are a very small, pragmatical, and intolerant sect. Their own experiments in education have afforded them little cause for congratulation, since they have been preceded by much pretension, and followed by sorry performance. Destitute of a sound theory of education, and of practical experience in scholastic management, they arrogate the power of dictating to the overwhelming majority what course of instruction the people of Scotland shall adopt. It is to be regretted that the Dissenters should endeavour to preserve their consistency by substituting the conflicting decisions of local Boards for the higher and preferable authority of a national legislative enactment in regulating religious instruction. If ninety-nine parents out of a hundred desire the Bible to be taught to their families, what grievance is inflicted on the hundredth objector, provided the lessons are not forced on his child? That any attempt has ever been made by a parish schoolmaster to proselytise, has never been asserted. It is common to hear the secularists enlarge on the attractions of a national, unsectarian education. Is the Bible a sectarian book? Is the nation not Christian, with very insignificant exceptions? With many persons who propose to

restrict the National Schools to secular branches, it has become a stock argument to speak of the school as too secular a place for imparting religious knowledge, and the schoolmaster as unfit to be entrusted with so solemn and responsible a duty. In corroboration of this view, they sometimes quote their own experience of school-life as a proof of the truth of their opinions. No doubt, occasional instances may be found of perfunctory religious instruction, just as there are in all our Churches, some ministers whose sermons are not models of soundness, clearness, illustration, or persuasiveness. Instead, therefore, of banishing the Bible from the schools, it is surely more advisable to procure and educate schoolmasters able to teach it with due knowledge, judgment, and discretion. In my experience of the professedly scrupulous lay objectors in question, I have seldom found them more attentive to the careful domestic religious training of their families than their less-protesting neighbours. At the risk, too, of giving offence to some prominent agitators among the Dissenting ministers, who deem the schoolmaster an incompetent expositor of Scriptural truth, I have not found them more regular or zealous in supplying the deficiency than their less noisy brethren, who are willing that the schoolmaster should explain to children from his desk the doctrines which their minister proclaims and enforces to their parents from the pulpit. Nevertheless, it must be evident to all attentive observers of the wants and tendencies of the age, that the time has come when ministers must devote more of their energy to the catechetical instruction of the young persons connected with their congregations or parishes. This would be no innovation, but a revival of the good old Scottish practice, productive of so much mutual benefit.

At all times, a minister who is more intent on promoting the spiritual edification of his hearers than of displaying his own attainments, or of broaching his own favourite theories, must be at a loss how to adapt his pulpit instructions to their average understanding and intelligence. How can this be accomplished without coming into close contact with their ductile minds and hearts at that critical stage intervening between the conclusion of their school education and their entrance into that great world of competition and conflict, where they will see

a perplexing mixture of good and evil; where their principles will be tested and perhaps undermined; where they will encounter fiery trials from without and from within; and where the moral lessons of their childhood will incur such danger of being forgotten amid the temptations of youthful passion or the allurements of sordid gain? By all persons who have listened to the pulpit instructions in a variety of religious denominations, it must have been remarked that a considerable portion of the didactic discourses is spent in elucidations of biblical geography and history, which can be better explained in school on secular days, by means of good maps and historical charts, than by a clerical speaker in a rostrum on the Lord's Day. Though advocating strongly the retention of the Bible as a standard book of reference and instruction, I am no great admirer of sermonising schoolmasters, some of whom are rather prone to trench on the province of the clergy. No book can be rendered so attractive to a school class as the Bible, when expounded in a becoming spirit by a competent master. But a Bible lesson, to be useful and impressive must be thoroughly studied and digested. It is highly desirable that he should be well acquainted with the Greek language, especially New Testament Greek, as well as possess a Concordance, a good commentary, a New Testament Greek Lexicon, a Manual of New Testament Greek Synonyms, and a Biblical Cyclopædia.*

The relevancy of my Tract on the "Conflicting Theories of Morals" will now be more apparent. In the school and the world, in the Church and the State, there is an obvious necessity for the rule of a divine and immutable law, as opposed to mere arbitrary caprice or overpowering physical force. Hence we find that, in countries like ancient Greece or modern France, where the religious belief of the great bulk of the people rests on no sure basis, peace and order are precarious, whilst anarchy, spoliation, and bloodshed recur periodically. Without the shield of divine authority paramount to all human speculations,

* May I be allowed to state what course I followed in teaching a Bible class preparing for the Oxford and Cambridge Middle Class Examination? Remembering how Dr Chalmers had, when a Professor at Saint Andrews, carefully prepared himself for teaching a Bible Class, I often spent five or six hours in mastering the subjects to be embraced in one hour's lesson. The more I had prepared myself, I found my pupils the more interested and better inclined to learn.

devices, and institutions, social progress, enlightened civilisation, and national stability can never be attained. This truth is observable in the family circle. As soon as the child can discern the distinction between right and wrong, he is taught by a religious parent to eschew sin and follow righteousness. And why? Not because such is the will of an exacting father, but because "Thus saith the Lord." Such, too, ought to be the moral discipline of a National School, supported by the nation for the training of good citizens. No moral delinquency is more frequent in schools than falsehood, which is mostly employed to screen some minor fault. How ought it to be visited? By a sound whipping? This used to be the favourite punishment, which certainly induced a little more caution on the part of the offender. What says the philosophical theorist? A writer of this school argues against falsehood, from its tendency to diminish mutual confidence, and to disturb the conventions of civilised life. The butcher, he says, who has neglected to send the joint of meat which has been ordered, subjects a whole family to much inconvenience, and perhaps to a compulsory Fast; therefore, falsehood is inexpedient, and ought to be avoided. No doubt, this is true. All violations of the divine law lead to evil consequences, proximate or remote. But is this circuitous demonstration of the inconvenience of falsehood to be substituted for the brief and solemn interdiction of the decalogue? Besides, there are many occasions, both in the school and in the world, where an untruth seems to injure nobody, but rather to carry with it some temporary benefit. The child and the man who are imbued with a due sense of the divine hatred of deceit because it is essentially sinful, stop not to calculate results, and detest the very name of "white lies."

Another very common school offence is profane swearing, learned too frequently, I fear, from fathers, who do not choose, however, that their example should be imitated by their children. How is this offence to be visited? I could name an eminent instructor, who dissuaded his pupils from swearing because it was ungentlemanly! Is it not condemnable on higher grounds? Is a teacher of poor young children to initiate them in the nice distinctions of refined society? Is he

not to appeal to the divine command which forbids teacher and pupil, young and old, gentle and simple, to take the name of their Lord in vain, for He will not hold them guiltless that take the name of their Lord in vain? It would be easy to multiply kindred instances, but these will suffice. By substituting for the highest law revealed to man a lower and less authoritative standard, the hands of a schoolmaster are weakened, whilst there will always be captious individuals who will object even to the lower code of morality. Secularists will rebel as much against Paley's Natural Theology, as extreme Voluntary Dissenters against the teaching of the Bible at whatever hours the teacher thinks advisable. One of the most prominent opponents of the present system is the Rev. Henry Renton, M.A., of Kelso, respecting whom there is a floating tradition in the University of Glasgow. Though he had been a pupil of Professor Pillans in the High School of Edinburgh, where his father resided, he was sent to the University of Glasgow, partly for the sake of receiving the benefit of Sir Daniel Sandford's prelections. That energetic and enthusiastic Grecian, of whom all his students still speak with gratitude and admiration, had, as the story goes, translated some passages of Aristophanes into coarse vernacular English, spiced with profanity. This was too much for the Seceder boy-student, who protested against so questionable a practice. Sir Daniel was somewhat ruffled by the protest, but yielding to the counsel of a wise and experienced colleague—Professor Jardine, I believe—he desisted from the practice. Mr Renton's conduct was justifiable, on grounds which hardly warrant his recent proposals for remodelling our National Schools.

Why secularists and Popish priests should wish to expel the Bible from the schools is easily understood. The secularist hates it because it frowns on his unbelief and presumption: the Romish priest fears it because it condemns his superstition and intolerance. Let all true evangelical Protestants, whether Churchmen or Dissenters, "read, mark, and inwardly digest" the following beautiful testimony of the Rev. John Henry Newman, formerly a clergyman of the Church of England, and now a Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, whose authority he has repeatedly challenged:—"Who will not say that the

uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on the ear, like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness. . . . The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments, and all that there has been about him of soft and gentle and pure and penitent and good speaks to him for ever out of his English Bible. . . . It is his sacred thing, which doubt has never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. In the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant with one spark of religiousness about him whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible.”* That great judgment and discretion are demanded of the schoolmaster in teaching the Bible is freely acknowledged, but this is no reason why it should be discontinued as a book for study and reference, or why the teacher should not be paid by the State for efficiently imparting its truths to children, whose future fortunes depend so much on their honesty and integrity of character. To such theorists as are too prone to carp at details, may be addressed the apposite remark of Archbishop Whately:—“Similar to this case is that which may be called the Fallacy of objections—*i.e.*, showing that there are objections against some plan, theory, or system, and thence inferring that it should be rejected; when that which ought to have been proved is, that there are more or stronger objections against the receiving than the rejecting of it. This is the main and almost universal Fallacy of infidels, and is that of which men should be first and principally warned. . . . ‘There are objections,’ said Dr Johnson, ‘against a plenum, and objections against a vacuum; but one of them must be true.’”†

Aristotle ranks the various kinds of argument under three heads,—Antecedent Probability,‡ Signs,§ and Example,|| to the

* See Trench's "English Past and Present."

† See "Whately's Logic."

‡ *σινός.*

§ *σημείον*

|| *παράδειγμα.*

second of which belongs Testimony. My previous observations have been chiefly devoted to the elucidation of the first class; but as, before arriving at a final conclusion, it is always a safe course to collect reliable evidence from trustworthy sources, I have applied to two friends, one of whom was my fellow-student in the class of Professor Pillans and Professor Dunbar, whilst the other was my colleague in an institution in Glasgow. Mr Andrew Young, who has taught for thirty-five years, was for twelve years Head Master of Edinburgh Niddry Street School, which was then unrivalled in the City for the excellence of its discipline and instruction. He gained Professor Wilson's prize for the class poems on "Parthia," and the "Highlands;" and among the high authorities who bore the strongest testimony to his admirable methods were Bishop Russell, Dr Robert Gordon, Dr Henry Grey, Dr David Dickson, Dr John Hunter, Dr Archibald Bennie, Dr William Glover, Dr Thomas Guthrie, Dr James Julius Wood, Dr Thomas Monro, Dr Charles J. Brown, and Mr Gordon, H.M. Inspector of Schools. Mr Young writes:—"It affords me much pleasure, in complying with your request, to state, in writing, my experience of the so-called religious difficulty in the vexed question of National Education. During my long professional career, both in Niddry Street school in this city, and in Madras College, St Andrews, I never had any difficulty whatever in the teaching of the Bible.* It was a daily text-book in all the classes, both public and private, excepting the very youngest pupils, who were taught Dr Watts' Hymns and Catechism. And although the scholars in both cities consisted of the children of parents of all denominations, not one ever objected to either the reading of, or committing to memory, by their children, the records of Divine Truth, as set forth in the Bible. Nor was even the Shorter Catechism objected to, except in one instance, by an Episcopal Minister,

* I am sorry to be compelled to chastise Dr Robert Wallace again in this Tract on Education. One of his occasional hearers informs me that his shepherd had preached a sermon recommending that the Bible should be read, but not explained, in the Schools! What an original proposal! Has Dr Wallace learned to see through a milestone, or to extract milk from a male tiger? I have heard him quote in a sermon a passage from Holy Scripture for the purpose of exciting derision. This was subsequently served up as a hash in a "Scotsman" article. Will Dr Wallace try his hand on the famous problem—"Given the name of the captain, to determine the longitude and latitude of the ship"?

who requested that *it* might not be demanded from the young people connected with his congregation.

“The above statements are all the more gratifying, because, as I have already stated, the parents of the scholars were of all denominations, including even Roman Catholics, and whose children were among the very best of my pupils, both as to conduct and to the preparation of their religious and other lessons. I am strongly of opinion that the Bible ought ever to maintain a pre-eminent place in every school, because, apart altogether from its most sacred and interesting information, the reading and explanation of such a volume confers upon the teacher a moral power and influence which no other kind of teaching can do, and is in the teacher’s hands—at least I have ever found it so—a very powerful instrument for inciting the young mind to diligence in the acquisition of the various lessons, and also to the maintaining, without corporal punishment, the best discipline in his school. In my experience, such religious training ever formed a bond of affection and respect between master and pupil, which not only prompted to diligence and good conduct while scholars, but created a link of friendship between the parties long after their connection as master and pupil had ceased to exist. And I have the best means of knowing that the religious lessons thus taught in early life tend most materially to mould the character, and advantageously affect the interests of the scholars in their maturer years.”

The second witness is Mr Edmund Boyd, a Free Churchman, a gentleman of high authority and large experience in the West of Scotland. He is Master of Method, that is, of the Theory and Art of Teaching in the Glasgow Free Normal College, the convener of which is Dr Buchanan. Mr Boyd says:—“You ask my opinion on the question of religious teaching in elementary schools, derived from my own experience as a teacher. I answer, that if there is or was any difficulty in the matter, it never obtruded itself on me. For the last ten years, as you are aware, I have had almost nothing to do with elementary schools. Before this period, however, I had many years’ experience, both in country and in town schools; and I can only say, that neither at any time, nor in any circumstances, had I the shadow of difficulty in this matter. More than this,

I do not, in the wide range of my acquaintance of teachers, know of a single one who has. For a number of years I taught a pretty large and successful school in a manufacturing village in Ayrshire. The school was attended by the children of parents of all the religious denominations in the place, and also of those who were of no denomination at all.

“The school, though belonging to, and supported by the Free Church, was in no sense *sectarian*. I should suppose about one-fourth of the pupils were of parents in connection with the Established Church, more than a fourth were of those belonging to the United Presbyterian Church—a greater number than either of these were Free Church; besides, we had a good few Roman Catholic children, and a sprinkling of Morisonians. The religious instruction was given daily from the Bible and Shorter Catechism, and was regularly attended by all, and by all alike. The parents there, no matter of what religious sect, did not seem to be aware that ever the question of a religious difficulty in school teaching had been so much as mentioned.

“Then, again, in a very large school in Glasgow, attended by hundreds of pupils, the children of parents of every shade of religious persuasion, where, as in the former case, the children had their Bible lesson daily, and also instruction in the Shorter Catechism, I never heard of a single objection, or even a hint, leading one to suspect that this matter was otherwise than just as the parents wished.

“In fine, my candid opinion is that, if there be any, the least difficulty on the score of religious instruction in schools in *Scotland* (and I do not now mention any other country), such difficulty, at least speaking generally, exists neither with the parents nor among the teachers. In other words, I believe it to be a mere *theoretic* difficulty, not at all a practical one.

“In obtaining any national measure for education, I admit that there may be great difficulty in getting members of the Legislature to agree to any ‘specific prescription’ as to what and how much religious instruction shall be given. There ought however, to be no difficulty in getting them to agree that there shall be no ‘proscription’ of *any* subject hitherto taught in the common school system of Scotland.

“If, then, there be no ‘proscription’ in any Act of the

Legislature, all *nominal* (for it is only such) difficulty must speedily disappear, and the question would be thoroughly safe in the hands of *Scottish* parents. Of this I think there can be no doubt.

“The question is treated from an English view-point in the Report of the Committee of Council on Education for last year, 1869-70, by one of the Church of England Inspectors, Mr Moncreiff, at page 187; also by Mr Matthew Arnold, British and Protestant School Inspector, page 298.

“I have stated my opinion freely, because you asked me, rather than from the notion that it is of any value on the question, although I believe that it is shared in by nineteen out of every twenty teachers of the country.”

Quitting the schoolmasters, I enter the House of Commons, and find a witness of great authority and influence at the present crisis. In 1866, when Mr John Macmillan, M.A., was about to retire from the Classical Mastership of the High School,* he was invited to a public dinner by a company of old pupils and friends. The chairman, who had been a pupil of Mr Macmillan, in Dumfries Academy, thus recounted the obligations under which he lay to his old preceptor:—“There was one feature in his system of teaching which it would be unpardonable and ungrateful on my part to omit to notice. Every Saturday was devoted by my friend to teaching the principles, and not only the principles, but the spirit and the

* The citizens of Edinburgh will have reason for deep regret if they allow their venerable and noble High School to suffer from the rise of rival schools. Its architectural beauty, its fine class-rooms, its elegant approaches, and its picturesque prospects, render it a most attractive place of instruction. Its Rector, Dr Donaldson, is a man of profound and accurate classical and theological scholarship, whilst Mr Munn, the author of two very scientific and valuable treatises on “Analytical Geometry,” and “The Theory of Arithmetic,” is the best mathematical master I ever knew. His large classes exhibit rare order, concentration of thought, and enthusiasm for their studies. Although my Mathematical and Natural Philosophy education was protracted and costly, I never attained corresponding efficiency. Would that I had been taught by a man like Mr Munn! He gained the highest mathematical honours in the University of Glasgow, having been previously a student of Dr Laing, of the Andersonian University, a veteran, skilful, and acute Mathematician. Mr Munn is fitted to fill a Mathematical Chair in any of our Universities. Dr Donaldson, too, is surely destined for a similar post. No two such teachers as Dr Donaldson and Mr Munn can be found in any Scottish or, perhaps, English school, and I have seen many in both countries.

power, of our holy religion. There are those who think that religious and secular studies cannot in a public seminary be combined without the risk of offence; and I, for my part, never hear that opinion expressed without thinking of Mr Macmillan's Saturday teaching. (Applause.) For my own part, I shall only say, I bless him and thank him for the instruction which I then received. (Applause.) I believe, and I am sure that those who had the same privilege as I had of learning these principles, and that spirit of our religion at his hand, taught in no sectarian spirit, but in a spirit of Catholic and universal Christian piety, see reason with me to bless him for what he did for them. (Applause.)”*

These words were spoken by Mr George Young, M.P., then Solicitor-General, now Lord Advocate of Scotland. There is no reason to believe that his Lordship has changed his opinion, or that what was wise and proper in Dumfries in 1832 is the reverse in any part of Scotland in 1871. Unless the friends of religious education use vigilance and energy, they may find their hopes blasted. In point of religious conviction, the Secularists and the Voluntary Dissenters are fundamentally and irreconcilably at variance; yet the persistent opposition of this former and the groundless scruples of the latter might combine to lower the quality of religious instruction in the National Schools.†

* See “Edinburgh Courant,” July 28, 1866. Mr John Bright, M.P., was Mr Macmillan's pupil in York.

† An approach to the secular system of education was, as far as I remember, first broached in Scotland by Mr James Simpson in his book, called the “Philosophy of Education.” Mr Simpson was an advocate, and a close ally of Mr George Combe and Mr Charles Maclaren, who were keen phrenologists, and, I believe, Socinians or freethinkers. They were the nucleus of a Rationalistic clique, of which some members still survive. Most of their energy was devoted to thwarting the efforts of wiser and better men. Secular education has met with a vehement defender in the “Scotsman,” whose articles betray the same dogmatic persistency and self-evident blunders which marked his unsuccessful attacks on the Taverns' Act. Nothing is easier than to start objections to any system in usage, however salutary. The “Scotsman” was started in 1817. In the next year he attacked Wilberforce's “Practical View of Christianity,” a most unexceptionable book. Attacks on good books and good men have always found too easy admission into his columns. In connection with the subject of religious education in the schools, many sound arguments and illustrations will be found in the Bishop of Peterborough's speech at Leicester; in the “Foundations of National Prosperity,” by the Rev. Archibald Scott, Linlithgow; in “The Training of the Young,” by the Rev. P. Cameron

Among the other astonishing practical fallacies frequently committed regarding religious instruction, is that of supposing that it may be safely consigned to parents and Churches. I entreat my readers to ponder the following remarks, and to ask whether they are not founded on accurate observation :—First, Consider the position of parents on whom this arduous task is sought to be imposed. If all parents were sufficiently educated, and could command sufficient leisure to discharge this duty, there might be some force in the suggestion. But how stands the fact? Why, even in the case of highly-educated men, how few find time to impart instruction of any kind to their households? How many more lack the will? As regards artisans and labourers, the vast majority rarely see their children in secular days, except when asleep; and even if they were disposed to act as schoolmasters on the Sabbath, it ought to be remembered that a million of the inhabitants of Scotland live in houses with only one window. Then, again, reflect on the thousands of poor, helpless children who are orphans, or, perhaps, still worse, cursed with bad parents, callous to the intellectual or moral welfare of their offspring.

Whilst the justness of these strictures may be conceded by many persons professedly favourable to religious instruction, they still fancy that the deficiency will be supplied by the intervention of the Churches, and that the needful instruction will be conveyed by the ministers of the respective sects to which their parents belong. And this pre-eminently sectarian proposal is gravely broached by men who plume themselves on being the opponents of unsectarian education! How would it operate in large towns, where the pupils, strange to say, are most destitute of the requisite moral training? In a tolerably large school, the services of a dozen ministers would be demanded. Supposing, what is very improbable, that the half Black, Old Monkland; and in "National Education," by the Rev. William Fraser, Paisley. Two useful little works I also recommend—"Administrative Reform in the Church of Scotland," and "The Church and Education," by the Rev. Robert Milne, M.A., Towie, whom I thank for his favourable mention of my "Future Church of Scotland." "The Bible in the School" contains a report of excellent speeches delivered in 1870 at a meeting in the City Hall, Glasgow, by Dr Begg, Dr Massingham, Rev. Robert Stevenson, Sheriff Galbraith, Mr J. A. Campbell, Mr William Kidston, and Mr Touchstone. Mr Alexander Whitelaw's suggestions are full of good sense and practical utility.

of them could attend daily, at the hour assigned to them before or after the secular work of five or six hours, is any one so obtuse as not to perceive the scene of irretrievable confusion that would follow? In fact, the scheme is so ludicrous and impracticable that it contains its own condemnation. It is a just retribution that the propounder of absurd paradoxes which outrage reason and experience should be betrayed into self-evident absurdities. Thomas De Quincey truly observes that "a vast proportion of bad logic rests upon false and defective definition." Nowhere is this more glaringly exemplified than in discussing education, in which multitudes of superficial speakers and writers are wont to dogmatise. On the other hand, I appeal to the understanding and conscience of my readers, and invite them to say if I am treating the subject as a mere pedant or a pedagogue.

In my Sixth Tract I asked, What is Voluntaryism? I now ask, What is Secularism? I have never seen it defined, and I am tolerably certain that if the attempt were made to define it, we should see its advocates speedily involved in irreconcilable divisions. Though as an educationist I have been long eager to be enlightened on its limits, I have totally failed. As far as I can understand the so-called theory, it proposes to exclude the Bible from the schools during the usual school diet. In other words, it proscribes the highest and only infallible manual of revealed religion. And why? Because, as we are told, that Book has been interpreted differently by the founders of various denominations. But as National Schools have been established, not so much to qualify the pupils for occupations in life as to inculcate such moral principles as will render them good citizens, they must be subjected to a moral discipline and training. Now, this process must be regulated by some immutable moral criterion or standard. If the Bible has been excluded, we must descend to Natural Religion, or some other vague, variable, and defective ethical system. Will this vicious, shallow device prevent differences of interpretation? Have I not proved, by a survey of ethical speculations extending over more than two thousand years, that one defective theory has been supplanted by a worse in an infinite progression, whilst unanimity has become a vain imagination? In a school so constituted, the

teacher would be deprived of the most legitimate and authoritative source of his moral influence, and his moral discipline would be lowered to that of a mere policeman, without his power of resort to physical force. Yet many Voluntaries, rather than abandon an untenable theory, are content that the cause of sound moral education should be crippled and degraded. Not content with a theoretical sanction, they deliberately propose to force the secular system compulsorily on hundreds of thousands of religious parents who object to it as strongly and conscientiously as they ever did to an endowed National Church. What if some prominent United Presbyterian ministers or elders were compelled to attend the religious services of some sect which held defective or erroneous doctrines? What an outcry would follow about wounded consciences and invasions of civil and religious liberty! Yet an excuse might be framed for the ostensible violence. They might be thus consoled—"It is desirable and necessary that the whole adult population of the country should receive religious instruction, and join in religious worship during a portion of the Lord's Day. There may be defects in the creed taught in this conventicle, but in every creed tolerated by the civil power there is some portion of wholesome truth, and if this does not satisfy you, arrangements may be made for your meeting your own congregation separately, and proclaiming a purer and more perfect faith." In truth, there must be a compulsory element lurking somewhere in the human breast, though only manifested on critical emergencies. The Voluntaries ejected compulsoryism from their houses by the door, but it has been re-admitted by the window, and claims its indefeasible right of possession.

More than once in the course of this work I have taken occasion to express my surprise at the general ignorance respecting Churches. If the same or a more exaggerated form of ignorance prevails concerning the Privy Council management of Schools, it admits of a more admissible excuse. The following disclosures may not be without effect.

Although Scottish Churches and educationists are at variance regarding sundry provisions of the Lord Advocate Young's Scottish Education Bill, it is quite manifest that they are nearly unanimous in their warm approval of the appointment of a

Scottish National Board. The reasons of this unanimity are not far to seek, and they commend themselves to the common sense of the nation. It is well known that the whole machinery for the regulation of money grants, standards of teaching, and appointments of inspectors has been directed by the Privy Council Committee of Education, commonly styled "My Lords" in official communications. The nominal heads of this committee are the President and the Vice-President of the Council, who are members of the Government, and resign their posts whenever a change of Government occurs. The necessary result of this awkward arrangement is, that the real control of the machinery is mostly exercised by the secretary, who is a permanent official. The name of the gentleman who lately filled that office was Mr R. R. W. Lingen, and was for twenty years familiar to the managers of schools and others, who were obliged to transact business with him. His signature was long found to be illegible, and some of his correspondents, who chanced perhaps to be offended by the curt tone of his communications, were wont to print them in the newspapers as specimens of bad grammar.

The clergy also complained bitterly of the vexation caused by the delays, evasions, misunderstandings, caprices, and injustice of the committee and its secretary. Several years ago, Dr Norman Macleod, Moderator of the Established Church, when referring in his Presbytery to the constant changes of policy as developed in the annual minutes, asserted with truth that the toil needed to master the arrangements of one year was spent in vain, because the next was sure to bring about a revolution. About the same time, Dr Guthrie, of Edinburgh, proclaimed his wrongs and sorrows. It seems that his Ragged Schools, which have done so much to banish youthful crime and pauperism from the streets of Edinburgh, received a small grant from the Privy Council funds. It was suddenly withdrawn, on the miserable plea, if I remember rightly, that the poor outcasts received food from the school managers! The Doctor, provoked by this heartless step, proceeded to London to remonstrate with "My Lords," by whose sanction the grant had been stopped; but he returned to tell that, instead of seeing "My Lords," he had only seen a clerk in a chair! It is to be hoped that such anomalies will soon be swept away.

The Scottish Department, as proposed by the Bill, will be compelled to share its powers with the Privy Council, or, rather, it will possess the mere shadow of power. Now, this must be vigilantly guarded by the Scottish members if they wish to place the Education question on a sure, permanent, and satisfactory basis. The Privy Council system—instituted in 1839—was originally a mere makeshift, designed mainly for the large towns of England which had sprung up rapidly and outgrown the means of instruction. It was not popular in Scotland, and I believe that Dr Candlish, “acting brightly on the Establishment principle,” as he said, was mainly instrumental in introducing it into the Free Church. Some concessions were made by the Privy Council, who were then anxious to extend the system; but even to this day there are Free Church ministers who have refused to accept the grants, whilst the United Presbyterians, as a body, have sternly persisted in condemning them altogether. Nor are their objections ill-founded. The same rule which prescribed the teaching of the Church catechism in Anglican schools, and the Westminster Catechism in Presbyterian schools, sanctioned the inculcation of Roman Catholic dogmas in the schools of that communion. To secure this end, these denominations were empowered to reject any Government inspector of schools without assigning reasons, and this power has been exercised occasionally for very frivolous pretences.

A Scottish National Board, properly constituted, armed with full powers, and directly responsible to Parliament or to a Scottish Secretary of State, is indispensable to the efficiency and harmony of a national system. It is not singular that, in our recent discussions, reference has been made to the Irish National Board of Education, which meets in Dublin, and is quite independent of the English Privy Council. That dissensions have crept into that Board, and lessened its usefulness, is undeniable; but they are owing to the fierce antagonism of the Protestant and Catholic clergy, and could never arise in Scotland. Within the last six years, we have had no fewer than three Presidents of the Privy Council—Earl Granville, the Duke of Marlborough, and Earl De Grey—three Vice-Presidents—Mr Bruce, Lord Robert Montagu, and Mr W. E. Forster

—all estimable men, some of them of eminent ability, but none of them specially conversant with Scotland or Scottish education. It is a curious fact, fraught with much injury to educational interests, that neither the Presidents nor the Vice-Presidents remain long at their posts, and never return to them.

In common with the vast majority of my countrymen, I was till recently greatly impressed with the presumed collective wisdom of all communications issued by "My Lords" of the Privy Council Committee of Education. My faith has sustained a severe shock from the perusal of a Parliamentary Blue Book of 1866, containing the evidence taken by a Select Committee of the House of Commons in regard to the procedure of this same Privy Council Board. The House of Commons' Select Committee consisted of fifteen gentlemen, including Sir John Pakington, Mr Bruce, Lord Cranbourne (now Marquis of Salisbury), Mr Adderley, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr Walpole, Mr Shaw Lefevre, and Sir William Stirling-Maxwell.* An abler or more diligent committee never sat during the long period of two sessions of Parliament, as is proved by their instructive and elaborate report. Blue Books are proverbially dry reading. Yet there are some exceptions, and this Book presents one of them. The inquiry was obscure as well as important, and several of the committee gave evidence as witnesses. I beg leave to give some extracts from the evidence and the Report. The former is startling and contradictory; the latter raises grave questions for the future.

It has been already stated that the Privy Council grants in aid of education originated in 1839, when a committee of the Privy Council was formed under the presidency of the Marquis of Lansdowne. The members of the committee included the President, the Home Secretary, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and others. In 1856, a Vice-President was appointed to represent the committee in the House of Commons. In 1850, Mr Ralph Robert Wheeler Lingen took his place as perpetual Secretary, or, as he styled himself, "Chief Executive Officer"—

* To dislodge any suspicion that Conservatives were unduly represented in this Committee, I subjoin the names of all:—Sir John Pakington, Mr Bruce, Lord Cranbourne, Mr Buxton, Mr Howes, Mr Clay, Mr Adderley, Mr Henry Cowper, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Colman O'Loughlen, Mr Walpole, Mr Shaw Lefevre, Mr Morrison, Sir William Stirling-Maxwell.

a title amply merited by his summary execution on countless ill-fated victims. By permission of the House of Lords, several Peers who had been Presidents of the Council were examined. Perhaps the most prominent witness was Mr Lingen. He had been fourteen years in the "Privy Council Office of Education, Whitehall," and had transacted business with all the Presidents and Vice-Presidents. Of his relations to these officials mention will be made presently. The most important information touching this "Chief Executive Officer's" mode of conducting correspondence was elicited by Lord Cranbourne in a series of raking interrogations. Naturally enough, Mr Lingen's memory failed him in matters of minute detail, but he was compelled to admit one most damaging fact, which can be explained in one sentence. All communications from managers of schools and others must be directed to the Secretary. How did he answer them? After consulting his superiors, "My Lords?" Nothing of the sort. He used the name of "My Lords" to convey his own decisions. But the managers would remonstrate, and beg "My Lords" to reconsider their adverse decisions. With what result? Were "My Lords" then consulted? By no means. Mr Lingen again snubbed the managers, assuring them that "My Lords" had resolved to adhere to their decision, although "My Lords" had never heard of the correspondence.

In a board consisting of a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, and an occasional stray Cabinet Minister, it is desirable to know their mutual relations. Let the witnesses here speak for themselves, in estimating their responsibility, and the working of the system. I quote from the Report:—"This system is peculiar; and there is no precedent for it in any other part of our Government. There has been no settled uniform practice with respect to the action of the committee. Mr Low stated that the assistance of the committee was invoked only for purely legislative purposes. Mr Bruce thought the assistance of the committee had been useful on two occasions, but considered the constitution of the office exceptional. The opinion of Mr Adderley, founded on his experience as Vice-President, was, that the committee was useless, and worse than useless, and an encumbrance. Lord Granville stated that the Com-

mittee had absolutely no responsibility. Lord Russell differs in opinion from Lord Granville. There is the inconvenience that communications written from the Education Office are written in the name of 'My Lords,' whereby perplexity, if not ridicule, is caused; the majority of those who receive such communications have little idea who 'My Lords' are. Your committee have come to the conclusion that the agency of the Committee of Council is anomalous and unnecessary. The Lord President is theoretically Minister, but it seems doubtful whether in practice the Vice-President has not the better claim to be so regarded. With regard to the responsibility of the President and Vice-President, there is wide difference of opinion. Mr Lingen feels difficulty in deciding whether the Vice-President is a responsible Minister or not. Mr Lowe* confirmed the statement that the President did little of the work, and that he could easily have done it all himself. Mr Bruce took a different view. He considers himself, as Vice-President, to be a responsible Minister. Your committee would call attention to Mr Lingen's statement that the supplementary rules, which excited so much attention and dissatisfaction, were decided upon chiefly between the Secretary and Vice-President, and he was unable to state that the Lord President was even consulted about them. Your committee believe that the present system is partial, incomplete, and too highly centralised. Your committee recommend—1. That the Committee of Council on Education, as being no longer adapted to the purpose for which it was formed, should cease to exist. 2. That there should be a Minister of Public Instruction, with a seat in the Cabinet, who should be entrusted with the care and superintendence of all matters relating to the national encouragement of science and art, and popular education in every part of the country."

Opening another Blue-Book, containing estimates of the expenses of the Privy Council Office of Education, I note some curious facts. What is the annual value of a competent in-

* It will be remembered that Mr Lowe, when Vice-President of the Privy-Council Committee, was severely censured by the House of Commons for garbling the Reports of school inspectors, and resigned his post into the hands of Lord Palmerston, who is said to have distrusted him. Neither did Earl Russell offer him any official employment in the next Administration.

spector of schools as compared with that of the Secretary of the committee? One would fancy that a thoroughly qualified and experienced inspector, conversant with the principles and practice of his profession, is nearly as valuable a public servant as a "Chief Executive Officer," who is an adept in the language of official insolence. What says the Blue-Book? The salary of inspectors is now reduced to £200 a-year, with periodical additions until it reaches £600. The lower limit appears to be too low, but let that pass. The salary of Mr Lingen is put down at £1500* a-year? Nay more; the assistant secretaries begin with £700, which gradually rises to £1000! On these figures I make no comment; but as the estimates are voted annually by the House of Commons, they may be pondered with profit by the Scottish members of the House. From letters which I have seen, I know that many of them are ignorant of the transactions of the Privy Council authorities, and that others have censured them. Whilst it is possible that a Scottish department of the Privy Council might prove a faithful guardian of Scottish Education, it has appeared proper that I should make the people of Scotland acquainted with the results of Parliamentary investigation.

I proceed to give another sample of the Privy Council administration due to Mr Lowe and Mr Lingen, and to add to our stock of Facts and Fallacies.

When the Privy Council system of grants of money for education was introduced into Scotland more than twenty-nine years ago, it was deemed expedient to appoint an Inspector to visit the grant-receiving schools, and to see that the grants were rightly bestowed and earned. Accordingly, a gentleman was selected by Government, who, by his eminent services and success as a master in large and respectable schools, had won a high reputation—the late Mr Gibson, of Edinburgh Circus Place School and Saint Andrews Madras Academy. As the system gradually expanded, other Inspectors were needed, and the same care was exercised in looking out for men whose scholarship, experience, and acquaintance with the science and art of teaching qualified them for their arduous, delicate, and

* Sir Francis Sandford is now Secretary, Mr Lingen having been appointed by Mr Lowe to a Treasury office worth £2000 a-year.

responsible duties. This led to the appointment of the late Dr Woodford, of Saint Andrews Madras Academy, a ripe scholar and skilful teacher; of Dr Cumming, the late accomplished Rector of the Glasgow Academy; and of Mr Gordon, secretary of the Church of Scotland Education Committee.* Mr Gordon, indeed, had not been a professional teacher before he became Inspector, but his efficient services as secretary of the Edinburgh University, his high attainments, his knowledge of education generally, and his excellent business habits, amply warranted his nomination. On the same principle, the Free Church, prior to receiving the grants, appointed as Inspector of her schools the late Dr Reid, a teacher of great eminence in Dublin and Edinburgh, and the author of several excellent school manuals. All these gentlemen were imbued with the genuine educational spirit, sympathised with the teachers, and had earned distinction in the educational profession. Their advice and reports were read and respected by teachers and school managers, and the office of school Inspector was held up as a prize to young men of scholarship, energy, and enterprise, who were as yet holding subordinate places in the educational ranks.†

Years passed away, and new Inspectors were appointed by successive Governments, or rather by the Presidents of the Council in each Government. Within the last twelve years, a marked change has taken place in the class of men from whom Inspectors have been taken. It is not my wish to injure or affront any of those who have lately found favour in official circles. This much, however, I do assert, that in the recent arrangements affecting this question—as in many other questions pertaining to Scottish education—Scottish feelings and interests have been sacrificed to those of England. This is a great hardship, and one which calls for an effectual remedy. As if to justify its designation, the Privy Council works in secret, and the mischief is not known until it is too late to

* Mr Gordon is universally trusted and respected. His reports are models of clearness, method, and practical sagacity. He has been termed the inspector of inspectors, some of whom sadly need good counsel and careful supervision. If charity covereth a multitude of sins, "H.M.I." screens a mass of pomposity and pretension.

† These paragraphs on school inspectors are borrowed from an article of mine which appeared in the "Glasgow Herald" two years ago.

undo it. A striking instance of this fact has been furnished by a remarkable correspondence of recent date now before me. Within the last two years, two inspectorships have become vacant, and appointments have been made of two young men—aged respectively 25 and 23—said to be students fresh from the University, if not actually in attendance there. At all events, inquiries were made regarding the reason for such appointments, and it was rumoured that, by a Privy Council rule, inspectors must not be above 35 years of age at the date of their admission to office. This rule would have excluded most, if not all, the excellent Inspectors whom I have named. Boy-inspectors may suit some parts of England, where the teachers of grant-receiving schools are of low grade in all respects, and can teach only the merest elements. But in Scotland, where most of the teachers are University men, the Inspector ought to be of a very different stamp, as, indeed, he was wont to be.

After the Duke of Argyll had introduced his Bill into the House of Lords, a Scotch educationist* wrote to above a dozen of members of the House of Commons, calling their attention to the rule, and asking their opinion of its fairness. Special care was taken to select those members who had been known to take an interest in national education. Most of the letters were promptly answered. And what was the substance of the answers? First, with one or two doubtful exceptions, these dozen members had never heard of the rule. Secondly, with one doubtful exception, no one approved of it, a few reserved their judgment till the Bill should come before the Lower House, and the rest condemned it utterly. Some of the answers having been marked "Private," I am precluded from giving the names of the writers, who possess great and deserved weight respectively in the West and East of Scotland. Of the others, Mr Henry Campbell, M.P. for the Stirling Burghs, writes—"That he knows the rule has prevented good men from becoming candidates," and thinks "that young men fresh from the Universities are not likely to be well qualified for the post." Mr Miller, M.P. for Edinburgh, "disapproves of the rule laid down by the Privy Council, viewing it as a rule for all cases."

* That educationist was myself.

Sir David Wedderburn, M.P. for South Ayrshire, "believes that the office of an Inspector must require a man of experience, as well as of mature judgment, and would rather have expected that an inspector should be above than *under* the age of thirty-five."

It is needless to multiply quotations, yet I cannot forbear making an extract from the letter of a sage and honoured statesman, who has done more for the cause of education than any man now living, who was one of its foremost advocates when its advocacy brought not honour but reproach, and whose name is linked with the names of Charles Earl Grey and Henry Lord Brougham—I mean Earl Russell, whom we involuntarily recall to memory as the Lord John Russell of olden times. Earl Russell "thanks his correspondent very much for his remarks about the age of school Inspectors, and quite agrees with him as to the desirability of appointing men of considerable experience to the office, rather than young men fresh from the College, and would be glad to see some step taken in that direction."

Now, I ask if such a restriction of age, repugnant to reason and experience, would be tolerated in any other profession? Bishops are mere clerical inspectors or overseers. Has any clergyman in our day been elevated to an episcopal throne till he was forty years of age? We take the legal profession. A school inspector may be said to hold the same relation to the schoolmaster as a Judge to the Bar. Of the thirteen Judges now on the bench of the Court of Session, did one leave the Bar till he was forty-five years, or older? If the schoolmaster is to receive State payment for passing pupils in the higher branches, is it not an additional reason why the inspectors should, at the date of their appointment, be duly qualified for their work by education, accomplishments, and practical skill in the work of education? And who ever heard of these requisites being combined without long and fruitful experience? If the Burgh Schools come under inspection, as they ought to do, it is doubly important that the inspectors be recognised as men of distinction in their profession,* and the necessity for these inspectors arises from the fact, that in general parents

* Dr Harvey and Mr Sellar, Assistant Commissioners, in their able Report on the Burgh and Middle-Class Schools, recommend that the Inspectors be "thoroughly qualified for the performance of their duties."

are not able to judge of progress or proficiency in the subjects taught in Burgh Schools.

Having said so much of religious instruction, of the Privy Council administration, and of the qualifications of Inspectors, it seems needful to advert to the education and attainments of the schoolmaster. Long experience and mature reflection have produced the decided conviction, that men who have received an University education ought to command the preference. Normal or Training Colleges sprung up in Scotland with the introduction of the Privy Council grants. They were designed to qualify youths of promise specially for the profession of teaching, and large sums are expended annually on their maintenance and education. In England, where large masses of the population have been reared in utter ignorance of the beggarly elements of knowledge, to the great disgrace of her opulent Established Church, such Training Schools have proved serviceable in sending out schoolmasters and schoolmistresses suited to the wants of the country. In Scotland, however, they have contributed to lower the quality of national education. Nor need this fact excite wonder or incredulity. The people of Scotland, and, above all, the peasantry, have been always accustomed to look for schoolmasters of superior learning—men who have spent some years in an University, who are in some respects on a level with the parish minister, and who are qualified to educate boys intended for professions to enter the Universities with credit. Such candidates for superior learning may not be numerous, and their training may have occasionally interfered with the teaching of the elementary branches; still the parishioners took a pardonable pride in their erudite schoolmaster. Frequently he was a good Latinist, a fair Grecian, and a competent mathematician; knew French, and, perhaps, German grammatically; had some acquaintance with mental philosophy and physical science; was conversant with general literature; and was, in short, a man of cultivated mind, extensive information, and studious habits. To this class of lettered pedagogues Scotland owes much of her general intelligence and respect for learning. How few of my readers can tell how slender is the stock acquired at a Normal College! Few of the students know Latin Grammar; to Greek, French,

and German they are entire strangers. They learn the elementary books of Euclid, and a scantling of Algebra, with the outlines of Grammar, English, Geography, History, Music, and Drawing, which branches can be learned more conveniently at a common school.

One branch indeed, unknown in the old preparation of schoolmasters, is professedly taught in the Normal Colleges—that is, the Theory and Art of teaching, termed by the Germans *Pedagogic*. If this were taught on philosophical principles to young men competent to understand mental philosophy, by instructors who were themselves qualified for the work, something might be said in its favour. At present, however, in spite of all the attempts to write up Normal Schools by persons interested in their continuance on their present footing, I have no hesitation in declaring that the lessons received by the students in the Art of Teaching possess little theoretical or practical value; and I have never met with an intelligent schoolmaster who had passed through a course of such training that did not confirm my estimate. Thus Normal students quit the walls of their Colleges devoid both of a liberal, thorough education, and of the practical power to communicate what little they really do know. A third evil is frequently ingrafted on the system. For though some of them supplement the defects of a feeble and faulty system by subsequent individual study and application, as might be done without a Normal School or any other training, the great majority, as the late Mr John Carmichael, himself a most accomplished teacher, expressed it, enter the teaching profession, “not only with low attainments, but, what is worse, with low aspirations.*” The best

* Four years' experience as English and Classical lecturer in a Normal College warrants me in speaking thus plainly. The kindness extended to me by the whole body of the students when I left it is not yet forgotten. At the same time, the best of them reckoned the time spent there little better than wasted, on account of the meagre course of study enjoined by the Committee of the Privy Council. Since that time I have often met them, and their language is still stronger. It has been unwisely urged that all teachers ought to possess degrees of Master of Arts. This rule would have excluded some of the ablest and most eminent teachers, such as Mr James Carmichael, of the Edinburgh Academy, and Mr Munn of the High School. Even Professor Blackie never took that degree, and Mr John Carmichael received the honorary title from his University after he became a Master in the High School. In fact, students who evince extraordinary predilection for some

preparation, therefore, for a National Schoolmaster is an University education, and an assistantship in a good school. To encourage such aspirants to qualify themselves for National Schools ought to be the constant aim of a really liberal and enlightened system of National Education. Such was the splendid conception of John Knox, whose truly grand and elevated character now stands out in bolder and brighter relief than ever, when contrasted with the paltry, niggardly, shallow, and unpatriotic schemes propounded in the latter half of this vaunted nineteenth century. Would it not have grieved the heart of the great Reformer and legislator to the quick, if he could have foreseen the possibility of the parish schools being occupied by illiterate teachers, pronounced to be incapable of instilling into the gentle and susceptible minds of their pupils the principles of religion? * Would it not have shocked him to listen to the speeches of sundry modern speculators, who have made the question of education an instrument of personal aggrandisement or of political agitation?

All those who have read my Tract on Endowments are entitled to anticipate my putting in a word for the proper remuneration of the liberally-instructed, well-qualified, and truly efficient schoolmaster. For men of a lower stamp there is less to be said. On the Privy Council system much blame undoubtedly rests. It familiarised Scotland with ill-educated schoolmasters, with ill qualified inspectors, with puny pupil teachers, as well as with a Vice-President and a Secretary who

special department, sometimes cultivate it to the exclusion of any other. Lord Justice-Clerk Moncreiff was a very distinguished student in Edinburgh University, but took no degree, as graduation was then almost obsolete, as it was long after in my time. Professor Macdougall, too, whose course in the Edinburgh High School and University was so brilliant, never took a degree. Professor Calderwood, his successor, was in the same category, as was Professor Aytoun.

* Whilst the School Inspectors might confine their attention to the secular branches, the examination on the Bible might be entrusted to the ministers of the Presbyterian or other denominations. Even Episcopalians of the Reformation stamp receive the Westminster Catechism. When Voluntaries or Secularists ask me "What of Ireland?" I answer that I am a Scotsman, living in and writing for Scotland. If they wish to know how the Scriptural Irish National System was sapped and mined by the Ultramontane Catholic Bishops, let them peruse the "Life of Archbishop Whately," by his Daughter (2 vols.); and the Essay on "Scotch Education Difficulties," by Mr A. C. Sellar, M.A., in the "Recess Studies."

broke faith with them all round. Of the six Scottish Education Bills introduced into Parliament during the last fifteen years, the general tendency was to lower the office of the educational profession. Mr Moncreiff's intentions were good, but his performances were small. His Bills, too, were so clumsily drawn that, as a bill-framer, I verily believe I could have drawn a better one myself.*

It remains to be seen how far Lord Advocate Young's measure will warrant the statesman-like character ascribed to it by many of his supporters. Even if it pass through Parliament, much of its operation will depend on the views and action of the Local Boards which it will create. To the creation of such Boards I can have no objection. If the members of a congregation are competent to choose their minister, the ratepayers are perhaps no less fit to choose the schoolmaster, though, as in the election of ministers, their choice may not always fall on the most eligible candidates. All human institutions, however, being imperfect, of two evils we must choose the smaller, unless by some happy contrivance we can avoid both. That the general body of ratepayers will feel lively interest in the election of the schoolmaster is very probable. All elections attract some interest: every elector feels his own power and importance; his vote is eagerly canvassed by candidates or by their friends; and his own triumph is gradually mingled with that of him whose claim he has undertaken to promote. After the conflict has been decided, and the battle lost or won, the ratepayers will cease to manifest much anxiety about the welfare of the school or of the schoolmaster, unless they happen to be parents.† And here the analogy between the Church

* My learned friend, Mr Joseph Grant, W.S., informs me that I committed an error in stating in my last work that the office of Accountant in the Court of Session was created for his brother, Mr William Moncreiff, who now holds it. It was created by Lord Advocate Rutherford, and the first occupant was Mr John Gibson-Maitland, who held it for ten years. Mr Grant I met at the funeral of Mr John Carmichael, March 6, 1871. He was present at the funeral of Dr Adam, his Rector in the High School, who died 1809. What an interesting mass of Edinburgh traditions, as well as of more precious lore, will perish with Mr Grant!

† While this sheet was passing through the press, I read a spirited and enlightened pamphlet, entitled "Remarks on the Scotch Education Bill, by a Parish Minister." I do not know his name, and the name of his publisher is not given, but I know and highly esteem his printer, Mr William Gilchrist, 64 Howard Street,

and the School ceases. Many very intelligent and respectable individuals who have attended church from their childhood, and who are the most zealous auxiliaries of their minister in every church enterprise, cannot be induced to care so much for the schoolmaster. They may be bachelors or spinsters; they may be parents without families; or their children may have passed from school into manhood. Now, it is questionable whether the general body of parents, thus rapidly fluctuating, is either very well qualified or very likely to make sufficient provision for even the most unexceptionable schoolmaster.

It has been asserted on high authority that a good schoolmaster will never fail to earn a suitable income. Some high authorities, when dealing with subjects on which they are ignorant, will assert anything to escape from a dilemma.* Are the school fees of poor and scanty districts sufficient for the decent maintenance of the schoolmaster? Are not the stipends of many Voluntary ministers largely supplemented by extraneous aids? Besides, the schoolmaster labours under a drawback from which the other liberal professions are exempted; he is unfitted at an earlier period for severe and acceptable labour. After sixty years of age, he has mostly ceased to retain the vigour, animation, and elasticity essential to the discharge of his duties. At the same age, ministers still retain their wonted popularity; physicians are in lucrative practice; professors are lecturing with the wisdom and authority conferred by profound meditation and protracted experience; advocates mount the Bench, and barristers take their seat as Lord Chancellors on the woolsack; but to the schoolmaster there is opened a prospect of forced inaction, generally accompanied with pecuniary embarrassments, not the result of extravagance or improvidence, but of the slender income enjoyed during the whole of his professional career.†

Glasgow. Mr Gilchrist is a credit to his honourable craft, to Dr Buchanan, his minister for nearly forty years, and to his native town of Campbeltown. He is one of the few men who "do good by stealth, and blush to find it fame."

* *πάντοτε ἐμαθία*, says the ancient proverb, still as true as when it was first uttered.

† I have already expressed my preference of an Imperial legislative provision for religious instruction. Local Boards might take cognisance of certain branches required in particular localities. For instance, navigation is an important branch of education in seaport towns.

This brings me to the subject of retiring allowances. The bloated pension list was violently and righteously exposed by Joseph Hume and Daniel Whittle Harvey, after the passing of Earl Grey's Reform Bill. On the question of pensions generally, I am disposed to agree with Mr Stanfield, a member of the present Cabinet, who, at his recent re-election for Halifax, said that public officials who are properly paid are not entitled to any pension. According to the rules now in force, all persons employed in the Civil Service must enter it under twenty-five years of age, and retire at sixty through infirm health, when they receive during life a yearly pension equal to four-fifths of the income they were receiving at the date of their retirement. Is this arrangement defensible? Candidates for the Civil Service are always abundant and eager for admission; their work is mostly mechanical, and not injurious to health; their incomes are always increasing, and are not subject to the depressions and reverses of trade. Why, then, should they not be allowed to hold their posts as long as they can do their work, and make that provision for old age which is made by the hundreds of thousands who are compelled to fight their way in the great struggle of life? Some of our municipal and Parliamentary agitators might, by grappling with a question of this kind, confer a better service on their countrymen than they can hope to do by clamouring for female suffrage, or for legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister, or for mixed male and female instruction in medical classes and hospitals. Life-interests must, of course, be respected, but new entrants might be cautioned against expecting the continuance of the present scheme of superannuation. If, however, it be continued, why should the schoolmaster not be entitled to its provisions? Surely he is as useful a functionary as a Post-office clerk or a Custom-house tide-waiter, or a clerk in the Court of Session. I have never been able to comprehend why, in all Mr Moncreiff's Education Bills, the only responsible or lucrative posts were proposed to be filled up by briefless advocates and unpopular preachers, rather than by men who by their learning, accomplishments, and conscientious performance of arduous duty, had won a high reputation in the teaching profession.

I conclude this Tract with the wise and weighty sentence of my own Professor Kelland, a Cambridge Senior Wrangler, and the son of a Devonshire Rector, who, after thirty-three years' residence in Scotland, thus addressed his students in November, 1870 :—" If I have not signally failed in making my meaning clear, you will see that I find in Scotland one great characteristic feature which distinguishes it from England—the broad-cast sown, firmly rooted growth of mixed education—Homer and the horn-book side by side in the country school—a system which fuses the lower and middle classes in a kindly mass, in which the latter are not deteriorated, but the former elevated—a system suited to the simplicity of Scotland, as the system of grand endowment and magnificent educational machinery for the rich, with humble schools for the poor, is suited to the luxury of England. To the aristocratic Englishman this system of Scotland is an abomination. He sincerely believes that his own system is vastly superior, and he will do his best, be assured, to force it on you. Listen to this. When a deputation, including our most excellent Principal, went up to London a few months ago, to pray the authorities not to do anything which shall tend to destroy the character of the Scotch schools, the Chancellor, Mr Lowe, put this very significant question, 'What do you want taught in the parochial schools? Would you like the children to learn quadratic equations, or Latin or Greek?' There spoke out the old English educational aristocrat. It is as if he had said (I hope I quote reverently), 'Shall I take of the children's bread and cast it to dogs'—said, indeed, with very different feelings and intentions from those which first drew forth the words."*

* The House of Commons and the Empire have seen the fate of Mr Lowe's Budget of 1871, his sardonic insolence, and subsequent submission. During several years he and Mr Lingens defied School Committees, and insulted schoolmasters without stint or mercy. I challenge special attention to the fact that Mr Bruce, M.P., was one of the House of Commons Committee which, in 1866, condemned the constitution of the Privy Council Committee of Education as anomalous, and recommended its abolition. Prior to that year he had been Vice-President of the Committee, and was fully cognisant of its defects. When Mr W. E. Forster, the present Vice-President, was a private member of the House, he also condemned the Privy Council Committee. His speech is reported in Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.

POSTSCRIPT.

I FEEL it needful to explain to many distant friends why my "Facts and Fallacies" have not appeared sooner. Early in January, 1871, when I was going to press, I was seized with a fierce rheumatic fever, just after "J. L.," a correspondent of an Edinburgh Journal, had vented his "indignation and contempt" at my exposure of the Rev. Dr Robert Wallace for remaining in the Church of Scotland, while he was denying and assailing her fundamental doctrines. Thanks to the assiduous skill of my medical adviser, Dr Stevenson Smith, 16 Duke Street, my recovery was speedy and complete. Whether there was any necessary connection between the exposure and the fever, I do not pretend to say. Surely, in this instance, the "post hoc" was not "propter hoc." It was some consolation to hear from Dr Smith that I had "strong recuperative powers," and I hope that my indignant censor, who is unknown to me, will command the services of an equally able physician, if he be overtaken by fever or any other ailment, while occupied in a righteous cause.

... ..

... ..

I N D E X.

- Adam, Rev. Dr, 43.
Adam, Dr, Edinburgh High School, 183.
Adderley, Mr C., M.P., 173.
Adolphus, Gustavus, 6.
Alexander, Rev. Dr W. L., 3, 58, 63, 104.
Ammonius, 97.
Anaxagoras, 87.
Anderson, Rev. Alexr., M.A., 45, 46, 52, 66, 137.
Anderson, Rev. Dr, 51, 150.
Anderson, Mr Robert, 119.
Anixamander, 86.
Anixamenes, 86.
Antiochus, 96.
Antisthenes, 92.
Arcesilaüs, 88.
Ardmillan, Lord, 3, 5, 8, 44, 64, 130.
Argyll, Duke of, 27, 104, 178.
Aristippus, 92.
Aristotle, 3, 93, 94.
Arnold, Mr Matthew, 164.
Arnot, Rev. William, 21.
- Bacon, Lord, 100, 134.
Baird, Messrs, Gartaherrie, 74, 76.
Baird, Mr James, 143, 148.
Balmer, Rev. Dr, 38, 40, 41, 104.
Banks, Mr J. H., 75.
Barclay, Mr Sheriff, 17.
Bayne, Mr Peter, 103.
Begg, Rev. Dr, 59, 113, 118, 132, 138, 134, 136, 138, 139, 141, 168.
Bennie, Rev. Dr, 168.
Bentham, Jeremy, 98.
Berkeley, Bishop, 98.
Binnie, Rev. Dr, 104.
- Bisset, Rev. Dr, 103.
Black, Rev. P. C., 167.
Blackie, Professor, 109.
Blanc, Louis, 150.
Boethius, 98.
Bonar, Rev. Dr, 77, 132, 138.
Bouterweck, 97.
Boyd, Mr Edmund, 164.
Boyle, Lord Justice-Clerk, 132.
Bright, Mr John, M.P., 151, 167.
Brown, Rev. Dr Charles J., 70, 163.
Brown, Rev. Dr John, 36, 38, 40, 41, 51, 58, 59, 61, 104, 113.
Brown, Dr Thomas, 98.
Bruce, Mr H. A., M.P., 63, 172, 173, 186.
Buchanan, George, 6.
Buchanan, Rev. Dr, 16, 21, 24, 25, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 41, 59, 75, 82, 84, 102, 132, 133, 138, 150, 163, 183.
Buchanan, Mr, advocate, 71.
Burns, Robert, 5.
Butler, Bishop, 98.
Buxton, Mr, M.P., 173.
- Caird, Rev. Dr, 144.
Cairns, Rev. Dr, 44, 47, 60, 135, 141.
Campbell, Lord, 5.
Campbell, Sir James, 103.
Campbell, Mr J. A., 17, 168.
Campbell, Mr Henry, M.P., 178.
Campbell, Sheriff Neil C., 64.
Campbell, Rev. Principal, 110.
Candlish, Rev. Dr, 4, 45, 69, 113, 131, 132, 133, 138, 139, 150, 173.
Carmichael, Mr James, 176, 182.
Carmichael, Mr John, M.A., 53, 84, 181, 182, 183.
Carlyle, Rev. Dr, 54.

- Carlyle, Thomas, 149.
 Carneades, 88.
 Chalmers, Rev. Dr Thomas, 6, 23, 37,
 50, 57, 68, 69, 78, 82, 101, 114, 117,
 131, 137, 138, 151, 159.
 Chalmers, Rev. Dr William, 153.
 Chambers, Dr Robert, 5, 9.
 Charteris, Rev. Dr, 17, 76, 100, 127,
 138, 140, 144.
 Christison, Dr, 92.
 Chrysippus, 95.
 Cicero, 31, 32, 96.
 Clark, Rev. Thomas, 129, 130.
 Clarke, Dr, 98.
 Clay, Mr, M.P., 173.
 Cleghorn, Sheriff, 64.
 Clerk, Sir George, 17, 18.
 Cobbett, William, 14.
 Cobden, Mr, M.P., 65.
 Colston, Councillor, 115.
 Combe, Mr George, 113, 114, 116, 167.
 Compte, Auguste, 98.
 Connell, Sir John, 71.
 Cook, Rev. Dr, Haddington, 17, 138.
 Cook, Rev. Dr George, 6, 103.
 Cook, Rev. John, Laurencekirk, 138.
 "Courant," Edinburgh, 124, 125, 126.
 Cousin, Rev. William, 63, 132.
 Cowper, Mr Henry, M.P., 173.
 Craik, Rev. Dr, 93.
 Cranbourne, Lord, 173.
 Cranbrook, Rev. James, 126.
 Craufurd, Mr, M.P., 145.
 Crawford, Rev. Dr, 119, 138.
 Cudworth, Dr, 98.
 Cullen, Cardinal Paul, 33.
 Cumming, Dr, 177.

 Dalkeith, Earl of, 58.
 Davidson, Rev. Dr P., 52.
 Davidson, Rev. Dr A. D., 103, 132.
 Democritus, 86, 96.
 Demosthenes, 90.
 Derby, Earl of, 28.
 Dickson, Dr David, 163.
 Disraeli, Mr Benjamin, M.P., 150.
 Divorty, Rev. P., M.A., 144.
 Dodda, Mr James, 133.

 Donaldson, Dr, 166.
 Douglas, Rev. Dr, 131.
 Drummond, Rev. Mr, 115.

 Eadie, Rev. Dr, 104, 152.
 Edmond, Rev. Dr, 157.
 Edwards, Jonathan, 98.
 Ellice, Mr, M.P., 12.
 Empedocles, 87.
 Epicurus, 95, 96.
 Erskine, Professor, 5.
 Erskine, Rev. Dr, 6.
 Erskine, Rev. Ebenezer, 6, 52, 53.
 Erskine, Rev. Henry, 53.
 Erskine, Rev. Ralph, 53.

 Ferguson, Mr, of Cairnbrock, 55.
 Finlay, Mr John Ritchie, 121.
 Finlayson, Rev. Dr, 152.
 Forster, Mr W. E., M.P., 172, 186.
 Fraser, Rev. Donald, M.A., 153.
 Fraser, Rev. William, 167.
 French, Rev. Dr, 29.
 "Free Lance," 101.

 Galbraith, Sheriff, 168.
 Gale, Dr, 98.
 Gibson, Rev. Dr James, 29, 32, 39, 40,
 43, 44, 59, 136, 137, 138, 150.
 Gibson, Mr John, 176.
 Gilchrist, Mr William, 184.
 Gillan, Rev. Dr, 102.
 Gilfillan, Rev. George, 45, 46, 108, 133,
 134.
 Gillespie, George, 6.
 Gladstone, Mr W. E., M.P., 150.
 Glover, Rev. Dr, 163.
 Gordon, Mr E. S., M.P., 4, 23, 110.
 Gordon, Rev. Dr, 163.
 Gordon, Rev. E., 11.
 Gordon, Mr John, 163, 177.
 Gordon, Mr Joseph, 144.
 Goodair, Professor, 5.
 Gorgias, 88.
 Gowanlock, Rev. J. T., 52.
 Grant, Rev. Mr, 109.
 Grant, Mr Joseph, W.S., 183.
 Granville, Earl, 172.

- Grey, Earl, 56, 108.
 Grey, Earl De, 172, 179.
 Grey, Rev. Dr, 163.
 Grote, Mr, 86.
 Guthrie, Rev. Dr Thomas, 4, 8, 21, 118,
 117, 163, 171.
- Hamilton, Patrick, 6.
 Hamilton, Rev. Dr James, 77.
 Hamilton, Sir William, 86, 94.
 Hampden, Dr, 86.
 Harper, Rev. Dr James, 45, 151.
 Hartley, David, 98.
 Harvey, Rev. J. Mitchell, 29.
 Harvey, Dr, 180.
 Harvey, Daniel Whittle, 28, 184.
 Hatherley, Lord Chancellor, 147.
 Haxton, David, 6.
 Hay, Rev. Dr, 38.
 Hedderwick, Mr James, 65.
 Heeren, Professor, 86.
 Henderson, Alexander, 6.
 Henderson, Rev. Dr, 39.
 Henderson, Mr John, 13.
 "Herald, Glasgow," 101, 153, 177.
 Heugh, Rev. Dr, 51.
 Hill, Rev. Principal, 6.
 Hippias, 88.
 Hobbes, Thomas, 98.
 Holyoake, Mr G. J., 98, 124.
 Howes, Mr, M.P., 173.
 Hugo, Victor, 150.
 Hume, David, 37, 98.
 Hume, Joseph, 28, 184.
 Hunter, Sir James, 5.
 Hunter, Rev. Dr, 163.
 Hutchison, Dr, 98.
 Hutton, Rev. George, 52.
- Inglis, Rev. James, 52.
 Inglis, Rev. Dr John, 6, 117.
 Inglis, Lord Justice-General, 65.
- Jamieson, Rev. Dr, 138.
 Jardine, Professor, 161.
 Johnston, Dr Samuel, 162.
 Johnston, Rev. Dr William, 152.
 Johnston, Rev. Dr J. B., 157.
- Johnston, Rev. Dr George, 45.
 Johnstone, Rev. James, 77, 78, 79.
 Jowett, Professor, 117.
- Kelland, Professor, 185.
 Kennedy, Rev. John, 132.
 Ker, Rev. Dr, 141, 157.
 King, Rev. Dr, 152.
 Kingsley, Rev. Charles, 97.
 Kidston, Mr William, 4, 168.
 Kinnaird, Lord, 65.
 Knox, John, 2, 6, 16, 101, 105, 138,
 182.
 Knox, Mr Thos., J.P., 72.
- Laing, Dr, 166.
 Lang, Rev. Dr, 144.
 Langwill, Rev. Mr, 118.
 Law, Mr James, 121.
 Lee, Rev. Dr Robert, 112, 114, 115, 116,
 117, 118, 119, 124, 140.
 Lefevre, Mr, M.P., 173.
 Leibritz, 98.
 Leitch, Rev. Dr, 104.
 Leslie, Alexander, Earl of Leven, 6.
 Leslie, Sir John, 5.
 Leucippus, 96.
 Levy, Mr Henry, 66.
 Lewes, Mr, 86.
 Lewis, Bailie, 72.
 Lewis, Rev. Dr James, 29, 30, 31, 32,
 33, 34, 35, 36, 37.
 Lingen, Mr R. R. W., 171, 173, 174,
 175, 176.
 Linton, Captain, 73.
 Lister, Professor, 93.
 Logan, Mr William, 87.
 Lorimer, Rev. Dr, 44.
 Lowe, Mr, M.P., 175, 176, 185.
 Lucretius, 96.
- Macaulay, Lord, 108.
 M'Call, Captain, 82.
 M'Combie, Rev. Dr, 110.
 Maccorquodale, Mr Donald, 10.
 M'Crië, Rev. Dr, 56, 130.
 M'Donald, Rev. Mr, 110.
 M'Duff, Rev. Dr, 50, 144.

- M'Ewen, Rev. Dr, 47, 51, 149, 150, 151.
 Macfie, Mr, R. A., M.P., 77.
 Macgill, Rev. Dr, 13.
 M'Gregor, Rev. Professor, 132.
 M'Gregor, Dr James, 140.
 Mackintosh, Sir James, 58.
 M'Lagan, Mr, M.P., 10, 17.
 M'Laren, Mr Duncan, M.P., 21, 65, 71.
 M'Laren, Mr Charles, 121, 167.
 M'Lauchlan, Rev. Dr, 137.
 M'Leod, Rev. Donald, 144.
 M'Leod, Rev. Dr Norman, 17, 18, 50,
 75, 102, 113, 138, 144, 152, 171.
 Macmillan, Mr John, M.A., 166, 167.
 Macmillan, Rev. John, 25
 Macrae, Mr David, 152, 153.
 Mair, John, 6.
 Maitland, Mr J. G., 183.
 Marlborough, Duke of, 172.
 Marshall, Rev. Dr Andrew, 27, 29, 30,
 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41,
 51.
 Marshall, Rev. Dr William, 51, 137.
 Massingham, Rev. Dr, 168.
 Maxwell, Sir W. S., M.P., 173.
 Maurice, Rev. Mr, 86.
 Mearns, Rev. Peter, 131.
 Melville, Andrew, 2.
 Miall, Mr Edward, M.P., 49, 157.
 Middleton, Mr John, 10.
 Mill, Rev. J. S., 5.
 Miller, Rev. Dr Samuel, 43, 120, 132,
 138.
 Miller, Mr, M.P., 21, 173.
 Milne, Rev. Robert, M.A., 168.
 Moncreiff, Lord Justice-Clerk, 65, 154,
 182, 183, 185.
 Moncreiff, Rev. Sir Henry, 136.
 Monro, Rev. Dr, 163.
 Montagu, Lord Robert, 173.
 More, Henry, 98.
 Morison, Rev. Dr, 104.
 Morrison, Rev. Mr, 111.
 Morrison Mr, M.P., 173.
 Muir, Rev. Dr William, 114, 117.
 Munn, Mr David, 166, 182.
 Murray, Lord, 113, 116.
 Muter, Rev. Dr, 34.
 Napoleon Bonaparte, 149.
 Napoleon, Louis, 149.
 Neander, 149, 151.
 Newman, Bishop, 161.
 Newman, Francis William, 92.
 Nicholson, Rev. Dr, 138, 139.
 Nixon, Rev. William, 59, 67, 138.
 Norris, Dr, 98.
 Northcote, Sir Stafford, M.P., 173.
 Oliphant, Mrs, 113.
 Oliver, Rev. Alexander, 52.
 O'Loghlen, Sir Colman, 173.
 Page, Dr, 127.
 Paine, Tom, 7.
 Pakington, Sir John, 173.
 Paley, Dr, 98.
 Paterson, Rev. Dr A. S., 138.
 Peddie, Mr James, W.S., 13.
 Peddie, Rev. Dr, 152.
 Peel, Sir Robert, 14, 28, 50.
 Philo, of Larissa, 96.
 Philo, the Jew, 97.
 Phin, Rev. Dr, 77, 119.
 Pillans, Professor, 145, 163.
 Pirie, Rev. Dr, 102, 103, 110, 124, 152.
 Pirret, Rev. David, 77, 79, 80.
 Pitt, Mr, 3, 5.
 Plato, 90, 91, 92.
 Pliny, 89.
 Polwarth, Lord, 110.
 Plotinus, 97.
 Posidonius, 95.
 Proclus, 97.
 Protagoras, 88, 93.
 Purchas, Rev. Mr, 121.
 Pyrrho, 94.
 Pythagoras, 87.
 Quincey, Thomas De, 31, 32, 169.
 Rainy, Rev. Dr Robert, 45, 55, 131.
 Reid, Dr, 177.
 Renton, Rev. Henry, M.A., 52, 161.
 Ritchie, Rev. Dr John, 41, 61.
 Robertson, Rev. Dr James, 50, 113.
 Robertson, Rev. F. L., 105.

- Robertson, Rev. Dr William, 138.
 Robertson, Rev. Mr, 109.
 Robson, Rev. Dr, 157.
 Rogers, Mr Henry, 32.
 Runciman, Rev. Dr, 138, 140.
 Russel, Mr Alex., 65, 115, 121.
 Russell, Bishop, 163.
 Russell, Earl, 179.
- Sandford, Sir Daniel, 161.
 Sandford, Sir Francis, 176.
 "Scotsman" newspaper, 53, 65, 113,
 115, 147, 167.
 Scott, Rev. Archibald, 167.
 Scott, Rev. Dr, 13.
 Scott, Sir Walter, 134.
 Seaton, Mr George, advocate, 109.
 Sellar, Mr A. C. M., 180, 182.
 Sellar, Professor, 96.
 Shaftesbury, Lord, 86.
 Shakspeare, William, 49.
 Sievwright, Rev. James, 7.
 Simpson, Mr James, 167.
 Smart, Rev. Dr, 51.
 Smart, Captain, 82.
 Smith, Dr Adam, 5, 98.
 Smith, Rev. Dr Thomas, 138, 139.
 Smith, Rev. Dr William, 17, 50, 110,
 119, 145.
 Smith, Rev. James, 130.
 Socrates, 89, 90.
 Stansfield, Mr M.P., 184.
 Stevenson, Rev. R. H., 119.
 Stevenson, Rev. Robert, 168.
 Stewart, Dugald, 116.
 Story, Rev. Herbert, 112, 113, 115,
 117, 119.
 Strang, Dr, 81.
 Stuart, Rev. Moody, 132.
 Stuart, Prince Charles, 62.
 Sturge, Joseph, 150.
 Swinton, Mr Campbell, 17.
 Sylla, 96.
 Syme, Professor, 5.
 Symington, Rev. Dr, 104.
- Tait, Mr S. M., 70.
 Taylor, Rev. Dr John, 152.
- Taylor, Rev. Dr James, 51.
 Tennemann, 86.
 Thales, 86.
 Thomson, Rev. Dr Andrew, St George's,
 Edinburgh, 6, 29, 117, 119, 133.
 Thomson, Rev. Dr Andrew, U. P.
 Church, 51, 152.
 Thomson, Rev. Dr William, 7.
 Touchstone, Mr, 168.
 Trench, Archbishop, 61.
 Tucker, Abraham, 98.
 Turnbull, Rev. Mr, 76.
- "Veritas," 26.
 Vespasian, Emperor, 89.
 Voysey, Rev. Charles, 108, 147.
- Wallace, Rev. Dr Robert, 76, 108, 113,
 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125,
 147, 163.
 Wallace, Rev. Mr, 127.
 Walpole, Mr, M.P., 173.
 Wardlaw, Rev. Dr, 51, 57, 58, 66, 151.
 Wedderburn, Sir David, M.P., 179.
 Weir, Rev. Mr, 3.
 Wellington, Duke of, 28.
 Welsh, Rev. Dr, 117.
 Whately, Archbishop, 162.
 Whitelaw, Mr Alexander, 76, 148, 168.
 Wilberforce, William, M.P., 167.
 Wilkie, Sir David, 5.
 Winchester, Dr, 17.
 Wilson, Rev. J. H., 48.
 Wishart, George, 6.
 Wood, Rev. Dr, 163.
 Woodford, Dr, 177.
 Wylie, Rev. Dr, 131.
- Xenophanes, 87.
- York, Duke of, 53, 62.
 Young, Mr, George, M.P., Lord Advo-
 cate, 154, 167, 183.
 Young, Rev. Dr, 51.
 Young, Mr Andrew, 163.
- Zeno, of Elea, 88.
 Zeno, the Stoic, 95.

LORIMER AND GILLIES, PRINTERS, CLYDE STREET. EDINBURGH

Just Published, Price Five Shillings,

THE FUTURE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,

IN RELATION TO

RELIGION, EDUCATION, AND SOCIAL PROGRESS:

AN ESSAY IN FAVOUR OF A NATIONAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
ON THE BASIS OF TOLERATION, ECONOMY, AND UTILITY.

BY "FREE LANCE,"

SOMETIME PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY DIALECTIC SOCIETY, AUTHOR OF
"MEMOIR OF PROFESSOR PILLANS," "MIDDLE-CLASS EDUCATION,"
"UNIVERSITY EDUCATION," "THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES," &c.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

Glasgow Daily Express (Liberal).

"This is the most remarkable book which has appeared in Scotland for a long period, and great must be the flutter and sensation it will excite in all our ecclesiastical circles. To the politician, the journalist, and the humble Christian layman, perplexed by our ecclesiastical troubles and dissensions, and devoutly desirous to see an end of them, and the whole atmosphere and condition of our divided Presbyterian Zion made more comfortable, it presents equally great and solid attractions. There is some difficulty in defining the moral of the book, not from any dubiety or obscurity thereof, but because any definition could scarcely fail to convey an inadequate view of all the interest which the author, by incredible knowledge, and diligence almost as incredible, has crowded into his 350 pages. His central object is to advocate a great union of Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, on the basis of the National Establishment, with the law of patronage abolished, and endowments an "open question," but the ministers and congregations thoroughly united in one circle, the ministers of our present Free and Dissenting Presbyterian bodies being eligible to endowed charges when themselves so disposed, and present Established ministers being eligible to non-endowed, or partially and voluntarily endowed churches, when such a change may be equally to their liking. But while this is the leading idea of the author, and is developed with a gradual but sure and steady flow of facts, and principles, and experiences, penetrating the whole sphere of religious life, overflowing that sphere itself into the domain of education, of political economy, and moral and social order and well-being, till, like the dropping of water on a stone, hard and flinty prejudice after prejudice is worn away, and a great and deep impression is really made on the mind of the reader—the author, by a very clear and comprehensive insight into all the avenues and approaches to his main theme, carries his torch through many curious windings and labyrinths, and lightens all up with marvellous stores of ecclesiastical, literary, political, and biographical knowledge, as he proceeds with steadfast eye all the while on his principal conclusions. For example, the book embraces a history of religious secession, disruption, and schism in Scotland which, for perfect command of that very tangled skein, has rarely been equalled—never equalled in the same compass. The episode on the educational institutions and interests of Scotland is equally striking and remarkable, and the author is no less at home among religious

EDINBURGH: MACLACHLAN & STEWART, 64 South Bridge,
BOOKSELLERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

parties and conflicts in England than in Scotland, and knows quite as much about Episcopalians, Methodists, and Roman Catholics, as of Burghers and Anti-Burghers, and Old Light and New Light Seceders. Of the events which led up to the great Disruption of 1843, and which followed upon it, he has obviously been an intensely interested student and most diligent annotator. We did not think, indeed, there was any man in Scotland who could have written such a book, taking it in all its features, as this. There is an amount of personal reminiscence, anecdote, and valuable personal facts and traits in the 'Notes' at the foot of the pages, which would have afforded abundant material for half-a-dozen *brochures*. The ecclesiastical leaders who have figured so prominently in Scotland in recent times receive, of course, considerable notice from our author, and some of them are very freely handled, though, on the whole, without any personal rancour, or more of the critical quality than the general line of argument appears to justify. The book, however, cannot prove very agreeable in some quarters. The general scheme of polity commended prepares us for some severe strictures on Dr Robert Buchanan and Dr Candlish, with some praise of the honesty and consistency of Dr Gibson, many sly pokes at the exaggerations of the Voluntary principle and the aberrations of the United Presbyterians, all resting on a background of tacit blank sort of favour towards the Established Church. Given the thesis to be demonstrated, and all this in the hands of a writer of great literary parts, was what was to be expected. But our author, being the youngest son, as in one of his notes he informs us, of a Burgher minister, and no doubt the Benjamin of a Jacob who appears to have been a man of sage and temperate counsel, we can well understand that all here written is not inconsistent with deep respect for the great struggles and noble impulses of Presbyterian Nonconformity in Scotland. The author gives such excellent reasons for the great ecclesiastical reform which possesses him, that we can quite freely acquit him of all too biassed partisanship. It is marked throughout by scholarship, by study and reading most extensive, vigorous thinking, good diction, and gentlemanly and Christian feeling."

Glasgow Herald (Independent).

"An essay with such a title is sure, in these critical times, to be welcomed by all who are interested in the welfare of the Churches. Though published anonymously, the author is not unknown—'Free Lance' being already, over a wide circle, very justly esteemed as the writer of an admirable Memoir of the late Professor Pillana. We have no hesitation in affirming that his new book ought to be extensively read, that it will be extensively read, and that whosoever reads it will have no occasion to complain of its dullness. The reader will find within it a great amount of miscellaneous, and often very curious, information. While the author narrates in the text—and we must own with great fairness—the public history of the Churches, he gives, in very copious notes, many details of what may be called their secret history. The aim, at least, of the Essay is as unmistakable as the author's earnestness, and we are compelled to own that it is an honest and straightforward contribution to a great and very difficult subject. The author advocates union, but of a much more comprehensive and catholic nature than that proposed by the notable Joint-Committee. He is severe, and perhaps not too severe, upon its promoters—arguing that similar negotiations carried on in the same spirit would effect with no greater sacrifice of consistency, and no greater surrender of what is distinctive, the union of all the Presbyterian Churches on one grand national basis. We are inclined to think so too. Any way, we are convinced that the present contemplated union would not materially remedy the great evils which the essayist and all true Christians alike deplore, and that even were it to result in the political overthrow of the Establishment, it would only perpetuate and aggravate them. We are tolerably certain, moreover, that, apart from ecclesiastics and their followers, the enlightened majority in all the Churches are in favour of a more comprehensive union; and, therefore, whether his conclusions be right in themselves and fairly drawn, 'Free Lance' has struck the right key, and called attention to the real question at issue. His book proceeds on the assertion that Scotland is over-churched—an

assertion which, in the sense he makes it, no careful observer will challenge. While our country is overchurched at so great an expense, the spiritual destitution of the land is year by year increasing. As steadily as the churches grow in number, the wave of ignorance and poverty and irreligion rises higher and higher. In five-and-twenty years the churches have nearly doubled; and as one of the most natural functions of a church is the care of the poor, we might argue that poverty must have diminished in a corresponding ratio. Yet what is the fact? The cost of maintaining the poor has increased from £300,000 to £900,000; and though it would be rash to assert that they were long ago adequately maintained, they were yet in a better state than to-day. More than 1000 schools have been added during that period, yet the unwelcome assertion stares us in the face that 90,000 children are growing up without school instruction. Glasgow, with 196 churches, has a population outside all these churches of 130,000. Edinburgh, with 20 churches too many, has made public confession that its poor are unrelieved, and that 40,000 or 50,000 are living without any ordinances of religion. These are awful facts to ponder—especially for Presbyterians. For we do not hesitate to lay the blame of them very much at their door. Ask any one for the explanation of this state of matters, and the answer is immediately given—‘The dissensions of the Churches.’ To some it would seem as if ‘Free Lance’ urged a mere return to the Establishment, and that whatever changes may be necessary in the constitution of other Churches to effect the desired union, there were none to be made in hers. But the reader will see that he proposes that the Establishment should make her concessions as well as others—concessions which might be as mortifying to the denominational vanity and prestige of her members as to the rest. Patronage, of course, must be abolished; the greater part of her endowments and glebes and manses in the Highlands must be transferred to the Free Church. Not a few of her city endowments would have to go to others, and some of her chapels must be shut. In the matter of re-adjustment, the chief difficulty might be to secure the consent of the majority of Established ministers. It will be seen, however, that this idea of Union is based upon the principle of the Establishment—that is, a *territorially endowed Church*—the principle, in fact, which will ever be associated with its great founder, John Knox, and its ablest advocate in modern times, Dr Chalmers.”

Edinburgh Courant (Conservative).

“The writer has a most minute and intimate knowledge of the subject about which he writes. Scottish ecclesiastical politics is a branch of study by itself, which in the case of a stranger to the country would demand many long years of study ere he could familiarise himself with its details. ‘Free Lance’ has evidently had the advantage of living amid the scenes of some at least of the ecclesiastical movements he describes, and has kept himself informed of the most minute circumstances that might throw light on the questions under discussion. Not only so; he sometimes writes in a way which only a man who had been *behind* the scenes could do, and we have consequently the communication of a great deal of curious and interesting information about the various Scottish clerical leaders. Both his text and his notes—which form no inconsiderable part of the whole work—are full of interesting details, many of them new and strange to the ordinary reader. Considering that ‘Free Lance’ has one great topic for discussion, it is amazing how he manages to introduce a vast variety of incidental topics, most of which are of considerable and many of them of very peculiar interest. Writing with great force and facility, and with the practical pen of an evidently accomplished writer, he throws a flood of light upon numerous points and questions of ecclesiastical moment, more especially upon the leaders and the doctrines of the Free Church at the time of the Disruption in 1843. Beginning with the Reform Bill of 1832, ‘Free Lance’ passes under review the Voluntary controversy, in which those who afterwards became prominent as Free Church leaders took so active a part, and sketches the events that led up to the Disruption. With equal felicity and minuteness he describes the origin of the Secession Church and the various minor subsequent secessions, discusses the character and characteristics of the United Presbyterian

Synod, the Established and the Free Assemblies, brings into distinctive relief the several leaders of the latter—Drs Buchanan, Begg, Candlish, Gibson—and then traces the origin and progress of the movement for a union of the non-established denominations. The bearings of the Cardross case on the position of the Free Church, its practical surrender of ‘spiritual independence’ on the one hand, and the abandonment by its leaders (so-called) of the principle of National Religion on the other, are clearly unfolded, and the various subjects of controversy in connection with recent ecclesiastical agitations, such as the use of instrumental music in public worship, liturgies, hymns, &c., are intelligently and liberally considered. The important subject of National Education is not omitted—indeed, it would not be easy to say *what* is omitted that has any bearing, near or remote, upon the Churches and Church politics of Scotland. We refer our readers to the volume itself, in which they will find very many facts, incidents, and sketches of character that cannot fail to engage their attention if they feel any interest in the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland. The exposition of the fallacy of ‘Spiritual Independence’ is very clear and very complete. We trust ‘Free Lance’s’ work may help to diffuse sound views on the subject of Presbyterian union among Scottish Presbyterians of all sects, and that it may contribute to remove out of the way some of the very unsubstantial obstacles to the attainment of that great end which hold their ground only through habit and the force of prejudice.”

Fife Herald (Liberal).

“A most able and ingenious treatise, displaying a comprehensive and varied knowledge of ecclesiastical men and events and secret movements throughout all the Scottish and even the English denominations, and a rich treasury of new anecdotes about Scottish Presbyterian ministers during the last *thirty* years. We have read the entire treatise with the utmost care, interest, and admiration. ‘Free Lance’ careers over the whole ecclesiastical field of Scotland, dispersing companies, and even regiments, slaying generals, and by some slight but dexterous thrusts giving incurable wounds to the many individual officers of all ranks. His pleadings are remarkably comprehensive, powerful, keen, and learned, and it is, beyond all comparison, the Church-treatise of the times. The notes, appended at the bottom of almost every page, are full of the freshest and most varied information; and, quite apart from history, contain a copious treasury of original biographical materials—such new and side-splitting anecdotes of clerical groups and individuals as we know of no other man who could have produced.”

Fifeshire Journal (Conservative).

“‘Free Lance’ has not been pleased to reveal his name. In his preface he tells us that he is an educator, and his book betrays strong leanings towards his own profession. He professes to be a native of Fifeshire. He has been a student in Edinburgh University, but he must have resided long in Glasgow, and in England, as well as abroad. Certain passages of his book contain fierce denunciations of personages who are represented as chargeable with trickery and persecution; while in others the utmost delicacy and tenderness are exhibited towards weakness, sorrow, and misfortune. How he has come by his knowledge of many transactions which we supposed were shrouded in mystery can only be conjectured, but his revelations bear the signature of truth and reality. A bolder writer has not arisen in our time. Verily, he is a ‘Free Lance,’ and, like ‘Hal o’ the Wynd,’ he fights for his own. The general tone of his strictures is inimical to the policy of the Free Church leaders, yet he breaks out into warm eulogies of some Free Church ministers—such as Dr Hanna, Dr Davidson, of Aberdeen, and Dr Roberts, of London. He is equally eulogistic of Dr John Brown, of Edinburgh, whom he appears to have known. His political creed is his own. Earl Russell, Mr John Bright, and even Mr Disraeli, are held up to admiration; while Mr Gladstone is interrogated and occasionally censured. Strange to say, he frequently goes out

of his way to praise the University of St Andrews, the prowess of whose professors and students is admirably chronicled. Indeed, the students of that University are everywhere quoted and eulogised—Dr Chalmers, the Cooks, the Craiks, Dr Hetherington, Dr W. L. Alexander, Dr Crawford, Dr P. Davidson, of Edinburgh, Dr Tulloch, and Dr Andrew Taylor. Mr M'Laren, M.P., must feel grateful for the kindly notices which he uniformly receives. The famous and intricate Cardross case, in which Dr Robert Buchanan bore a signal and not very glorious part, is unravelled with legal accuracy."

Dundee Advertiser (Liberal).

"Not only is the text bristling with information, but the most circumstantial of all memories overflows into footnotes as long as De Quincey's, and still more replete with anecdotal matter. 'Free Lance' has used his eyes and ears as few men have done, and we doubt if there be a person living in Scotland more minutely and accurately acquainted with the ongoings of Church Courts, and the public and private history of notabilities both here and across the Tweed. He is as full, as accurate, and not so dull as an almanac. He traces *ab ovo* the history of all the religious denominations in Scotland; records their early struggles, their thick-coming controversies, their schisms and separations. Although not beyond middle age, he often writes with such thoroughly minute and masterly information about long-past events that almost you fancy you are reading the productions of one who had been contemporary with the earlier days of this century, with the Old Light schisms, the Anti-burgher and Burgher disputes, which really happened before he was born. And when he comes to his own times, why he seems to have been present at every important debate in every General Assembly and Synod for thirty years, to have met somewhere or other every man of note in Scotland, and to have made himself acquainted with all the events and incidents in their history, public or private. And when you think, surely his ubiquity is bounded by the Border, he suddenly leaps to London, and shows the same extraordinary knowledge of the press, Parliament, and pulpit of the Metropolis. Edinburgh, however, is 'Free Lance's' element, and, as we remarked in our review of his 'Life of Pillans,' his mind is somewhat over-prepossessed in favour of Modern Athens men and tastes. Still, to do him justice, his criticism everywhere rather errs—if it errs at all—on the side of profuse panegyric. If he can say no good of men, he says little ill. A happy temperament shows him in all the Edinburgh men of mark, and many others, a vast army of giants; and where some severe and astute critics might be dreaming of Lilliput, he finds himself in the Brobdingnagian capital, and can hardly walk without being crushed by the Woods, and Forbesees, and Gibsons, and Horatius Bonars, and Rainys, and Henry Rentons, and Dr William Marshalls, and Dr Robert Buchanans, and a hundred others—heroes of the hour—whose names are at present chiefly known in Scotland, and for whom the Conversations Lexicons of the twentieth century will find but sparing space. 'Free Lance,' along with his kindly criticism of men, is also very liberal in his view of measures. He is inclined, on the whole, to Broad Churchism—looks lovingly on the organ movement and other phenomena of advancement—rates Dr Hanna at his true value, and is, with him, favourable to a united Church on the widest scale, admitting the Establishment, retaining the endowments, and working out the Territorial principle. This, he thinks, would have been Dr Chalmers' idea too, had he lived. We are thankful to 'Free Lance' for his very smart *brochure*, which, while it is written from his own point of view, and illustrated out of his own really marvellous resources of knowledge of the times, and of the men of the times, is also valuable as embodying substantially the views of such able thinkers as Dr Wallace, Dr Hanna, and many others, who, while heartily deploring the present wild welter in which our Churches, both north and south, are, or will shortly be, plunged, and fully alive to the deficiencies of all existing endowed sects, are not prepared to go the whole length of the Voluntary system as an exclusive form of Christian finance, and think they see their way to a comprehensive and catholic Protestantism. 'Free Lance' argues in favour of his own scheme at considerable length and with great ingenuity.

Perthshire Advertiser (Liberal).

"This is an extraordinary book—extraordinary for its learning, for its narrative, for its argument, for its suggestions, eminently extraordinary for the insight it affords into the family history of theological parties and politics during the past quarter of a century. Professedly its object is union. It purports to be a pleading for a community of fellowship among all who have really Christian sentiments, and who are endeavouring after the Christian life, whatever may be their convictions about details of doctrines or formulas of belief. It advocates a 'National Presbyterian Church, on the basis of Toleration, Economy, and Utility,' as the readiest and most practical way of attaining so desirable an end. Ignoring the clergy, it appeals directly to the national heart, and calls upon all who are earnestly desirous of the salvation of souls and of society to overleap the paltry distinctions of phrase which have so long kept them asunder, and secure the realisation of a union which shall be omnipotent in the interest of justice and truth. In sympathy, the writer is truly catholic. He won't be a censor of parties. Sectarian antipathies he distinctly disavows. The folly and misleading tendencies of such he endeavours to demonstrate by a candid consideration of the facts of history and the remorseless logic of events. There is scarcely a topic of social and political kind that is not stated and discussed with a felicity and pungency that would do credit to the most brilliant of our modern essayists; while cardinal and apparently organic differences are subjected to a local inquest as critical and excisive as the most exacting syllogiser could desire. The relation between Churches and the civil tribunals has been the subject of much misconception, much misrepresentation, much revolutionary bravado, much unwarrantable and distressing censure of some of the most able and upright occupants of the Scottish bench. Many volumes have been written upon it—most from an antagonistic point of view, and with a strong party bias. Even a recent digest of 'The Law of Creeds' is no exception to the generality; for, unperceptive of the fact that the relation is complex, subsisting not merely in virtue of conscience, but of conscience and contract united, the writer goes on to defend a principle whose logical ultimate is necessarily Popery or rebellion. Properly regarded, the much maligned Cardross case was a protest in favour of civil liberty and salutary ecclesiastical independence. The claim of Dr Buchanan in the west, and Dr Candlish in the east, when rightly analysed, was simply the assertion of a Divine right to do wrong, on the ground that, to them, it seemed right. At the root of every legal system there are certain rules of natural equity which demand and receive universal respect. They are of the essence of social order. They are the basis of social right. The triumph of their antagonists is revolution. No vapouring about the Headship of Christ—no assertion of the dominance of conscience—no pretence of spiritual authority—will avail to extenuate, much less to justify their infraction. So long as men, whatever be their calling, are human beings and live in society, their acts must be regarded as human and fallible, and approved or condemned by society according to the consequences they are calculated to produce. No assumption of spiritual authority can suspend the action of legal institutions. The civil judges must be the supreme determiners of what is legal or illegal, otherwise there is an *imperium in imperio*, which is anarchy. Contracts must be sacred and enforced, or the right of property would become a name. Bargains obstructing the administration of justice must be radically void, else oppression, extortion, or confiscation might be perpetrated with impunity. Social liberty, in every relation, has certain bounds, prescribed implicitly by the law even when not expressed. Such were the principles which Mr Macmillan asserted in opposition to the contention of his opponents that they were not responsible for their actions, as Free Church officials, to the Civil Courts, and that, as having a right to construe their own contracts, they could pronounce what appeared to the judges in such courts to be a most flagrant breach of bargain, an act in conformity with the law of Christ. The judges in the Court of Session repudiated these principles without any hesitation, and affirmed the obligation laid upon them by society of deciding what contracts were legal, and whether, if legal, any particular contract submitted to them had been observed. At the same time, they decided that bodies of religionists united for purposes of fellowship and devotion would be protected in the exercise of their faith and the possession of their pro-

perty, and that their rules of association would be respected and enforced by the civil power, in so far as they did not interfere with the constitutional principles of right and liberty. The writer of this able volume refers to the Cardross case as not only exhibiting the true position of the Free and Voluntary Churches, but also of showing the policy of union with the Establishment in respect that the latter has all the liberty of these Churches and something more. Its courts are really such. Their members have a jurisdiction positively independent of the civil tribunals. While, upon relevant allegations of wrong, the ordinary judicatories are bound to inquire not merely into the regularity of the procedure, but also into the merits of cases of discipline in Voluntary Churches, the judgments pronounced in the courts of the Established can only be quashed or altered in respect of manifest informalities resulting in tangible injury and loss to the sufferer. This is a strong point, and all who attach any importance to what has been misnomered 'spiritual independence' may find it worth their while to look into it, *ere it be too late*."

Aberdeen Journal—(Conservative).

"The writer of this very clever work propounds several reforms. Among others, he would have the judicial work of the Church assigned to a Circuit Court. He proposes to divide Presbyteries, so as to enable them to give more time and consideration to their Presbyterian work. He suggests the propriety of a discretionary power to dispense with the required period of study in cases of marked qualifications. He wants special work assigned to probationers, and a systematic interchange of pulpits among ministers. The abolition of patronage is in the eyes of this author, as well as of all others, a necessary condition; and to those to whom the influence of the united spiritual energies of a great Presbyterian Church is not a primary consideration, the author points to the effect on the restoration of the management of the poor to its old voluntary form, and the settlement on a common national basis of the educational difficulty. He deals somewhat summarily with the matter; makes rather small allowance for personal sympathies and Church traditions; but, from his point of view, the wonder is that there should be any disunion. The work is very attractive as a disquisition on ecclesiastical questions, and the conduct of persons and parties. Its personal criticism is trenchant, and in its bold, discursive, vigorous way it leads the reader through the clash of principles and parties, which late years have witnessed, to certain conclusions which are by no means so clear as the writer's opinion on the person and parties which he criticises."

Aberdeen Herald (Liberal).

"The title of this book is not inviting. But those who suffer themselves to be repelled by it will miss one of the best informed and decidedly the most readable of modern Scotch polemical publications. 'Free Lance' has a marvellously extensive stock of information about the Scotch churches and Scotch churchmen of the present and past generation, and he draws upon it without reserve. Some of his personal sketches are so racy and piquant as to furnish ample reason for his preferring to be anonymous. He seems to be one of those unrestrained spirits who 'have neither kith nor kin in the country,' controversially speaking, for he hits out in every direction with impartial and unsparring fidelity. Nor does he talk at random—we have no leaps in the dark, no drawing the bow at a venture. His criticisms of party and partisan foibles have equal point and precision. Severe though his attacks in some cases are, there is as little as may be of bitterness in them, except perhaps in his handling of Dr Robert Buchanan, to whom as 'the Cardinal Antonelli of the Free Church,' 'the wise man of the west,' on whose 'Ten Years' Conflict,' he is mercilessly severe, and whose Church Court tactics are discussed in a style that resembles flaying alive. It is particularly wicked after sketching the Free Church Brummagem level of some years ago to withhold—from motives of delicacy of course!—the name of the Free Church Moderator who figured on the occasion; as if all the world does not know who he is. For the author's scheme of union we must refer to his own pages.

Elgin Courant (Independent).

"The book is certainly a remarkable one, not that it shows any very striking sagacity or foresight as to what the Church of Scotland is likely to be in the future, or what it would be desirable that she should be, but for the minuteness of the information it contains on almost every conceivable subject. It shows observation, memory, and research that are really very surprising, and it gives evidence too of scholarship and culture. In his views the writer is broad and liberal, speaking freely his opinions of men and things connected with all denominations with a fairness and freedom from bitterness which it is very pleasing to see. He is earnest, clear, and conciliatory in enforcing a union on a large scale among all the Presbyterian bodies. His arguments in favour of this deserve the utmost consideration; they are backed up by an array of facts and circumstances, derived from extensive observation and reading, which it is very rare indeed to find at one man's command."

Inverness Courier (Liberal).

"The author begins by sketching the history of the Church in the past—a lamentable picture of strife, and disunion, and disruption. Disapproving of the present movement for union among the non-established Churches, he maintains that the Free Church is pledged to the Establishment principle. To show this he quotes freely from former speeches of Dr Candlish, and convicts him pretty clearly of inconsistency in his present position. Our author by no means wishes to exclude the United Presbyterians from the national union that is proposed. He desires to see a kind of Broad Church formed, in which the standards of faith will be less rigid, and the forms of worship less exclusive. The notes, very numerous and interesting, are sure to attract the reader. Notice is taken of nearly all the men who have played a leading part in the ecclesiastical history of Scotland during the last hundred years, and scarcely a name is mentioned without a short biography or an appropriate anecdote. Some of the reminiscences are familiar friends, but many are quite fresh and generally amusing. In addition to his personal recollections, an examination of old pamphlets and newspaper files has furnished the writer with passages from forgotten speeches, and episodes in the history of the Disruption conflict. Every thoughtful person must sympathise with this desire for a comprehensive union of the various Presbyterian denominations. In a new national Church there would probably be far less dissension than in the old one, for some lessons have surely been learned by bitter experience. We are grateful to 'Free Lance' for his labours and suggestions."

Inverness Advertiser (Liberal).

"No one, we make bound to say, on reading the above title of the book, will be able to form the least idea of its varied and comprehensive contents. As a survey of Scottish religious thought for more than a century past—in fact, since the deposition by the General Assembly of the Rev. Ebenezer Erskine in the year 1740—the book, in so far as we know, stands quite alone; for simple truth, exactness, and impartiality, there is nothing like it in existence. The amount of learning and industry brought to bear on the subject is to us quite amazing; and we had imagined that the man who has shown such powers of comprehension would have devoted himself in preference to the exposition of some grand historical epoch rather than engage himself in a theme which after all can scarcely be imagined very much to excite the profound attention of a remote posterity; for no doubt the squabbling and hair-splitting of clerical courts must ere long pass away into forgetfulness, while the great truths of history and of religion can never cease to interest and to instruct. We make this observation in no spirit of disparagement; quite the reverse, since we believe that every intelligent Scotchman cannot be otherwise

than thankful that if the wretched story of our verbal entanglements in religious matters was to be told at all, the task should be undertaken by one who, like 'Free Lance,' was so thoroughly prepared for it—one well 'read up' in the history of ecclesiastical disputes, and who for the last forty years had kept his ears and his eyes wide open to all that was passing around him in religious movements, and in political as well. But the main object of the book is by no means to give a mere history of sectarianism of all descriptions, although this is done most spiritedly and with consummate knowledge. 'Free Lance' argues in favour of a comprehensive National Church, trying to show its advisability in many respects—amongst others in regard to toleration, to economy, and to utility. Into these points we do not mean to follow him, but we will say that it is impossible to overlook the general fairness, clearness, and impartiality of his statements. On the whole, we must say that this is an admirable work, conspicuous even in an age when laborious writing is common, for its command of facts and breadth of survey. We predict for it immense success, and more—that it must occupy in all time coming *the* source whence the polemical and ecclesiastical history of Scotland for the last century must be drawn. We shall only add, that whilst the Notes of writers in general may be passed over without detriment to their general arguments, those supplied by 'Free Lance' will to many be the most valuable portion of his extraordinary book."

Ayr Observer (Conservative).

"If the title be passed over, and no preconceptions allowed to interfere with its perusal, a more attractive work of its kind could hardly be lighted upon, and few who hear of it as a work of this sort will be likely to resist the wish to have a reading of it. The author, who is the son of a dissenting minister, seems to have travelled often, and mingled much amongst the leading Church controversialists of the century. With Church polemics he is thoroughly and accurately acquainted, and he writes with a freedom both of censure and satire which appeals with wonderful success to that love that most of us have to see or hear certain people handsomely taken down. Few of the men whom he names are passed over without just that one bit of piquant personal remark about them which makes the name 'Free Lance' a highly appropriate one. So far as any theory as to the 'Future Church of Scotland' is concerned, some ten or twelve lines upon one page—the 111th—contain nearly all that is put forward, and, so far as the rest of the work aids in building up the theory, it may be looked upon as proving that as men of various Churches have already, at particular junctures, given up what they had at one time or other held as absolutely essential to separate existence, so the same may be done over again, and ought to be done, for the sake of a real and comprehensive union. 'Free Lance's' idea of the basis upon which some future national Church might be constructed—we could wish that the future were not a very distant one—may be summarised in a sentence or two. It is that the Churches should simply shake hands all round, retain but divide all endowments, and supplement these in any way that may be generally approved of. In addition to this, let churches be shut that are not necessary, speaking numerically; let new ones be planted where there is any actual need; and let the territorial idea not be scouted at as impracticable. We hope the publication of the book will help on the adoption of some such plan. The real work of the Churches is still not being done, men are standing apart who ought to be going hand in hand in various schemes, and as much breath is being wasted upon matters which benefit nobody as would fan the religious energies of the whole country up to the white heat of power and usefulness, if it were only applied in the proper quarters. We should have been glad, had sufficient space been at our disposal, to have furnished our readers with a number of extracts; but we believe no one would have been satisfied with these, and as the book costs only five shillings, and really affords an amount of information about present and recent prominent men in all the Churches of Scotland, which could not well be obtained elsewhere, we are the better satisfied that the right thing to do is to refer every one to the work itself."

Dumfries Courier (Liberal).

“Our attention has been called to a curious but clever book on the Future Church of Scotland, by one who writes under the pseudonym of ‘Free Lance,’ and certainly he does not belie the name adopted, to judge from his raids upon Churches in general, and the havoc he makes, or endeavours to make, among their respective leaders. The author has read much, and observed with a keen eye all that has been going on in the ecclesiastical world for nearly half-a-century, and now comes forth with his opinion of men and things during that time, so that he is entitled to an attentive consideration. He writes fearlessly and forcibly, without any restraint, and generally keeps within the bounds of good taste and sound criticism. His motto is—‘Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur,’ which may be *freely* rendered—‘All Churches are alike to me;’ though we fear that Drs Candlish and Buchanan will not quite agree that he has kept to his text. Abundance of notes are introduced, literary, biographical, and historical, illustrative of characters and events in the narrative, and which will be regarded by the public as the most valuable and interesting portion of the volume. The Essay is more historical than prospective, and we know of no single treatise equal to it for a succinct, yet sufficiently full account of the dissensions, divisions, secessions, and controversies, which have agitated the Church since the period of the Revolution till the present time. The principal attention, however, is directed to the events which have occurred since 1832, and which have passed under inspection without any desire to conceal the asperities engendered on all sides by the heat of discussion and the force of debate.”

The Watchword (Free Church).

“This is certainly a very remarkable book, and we do not wonder at its rapid popularity. It is evidently written by an able and accomplished man—one who has seen much of the world, and who has penetrated with keen insight through many of the flimsy disguises by which the mass of intellects are baffled and cowed. No one who has lived long in the world, and we are ashamed to say, especially in our small Scottish world, can have failed to see that very few men dare to think for themselves, and that still fewer dare to express their sentiments, if they are opposed to those of ‘leaders.’ The mass are carried along with the current, like so much drift-wood; follow implicitly and blindly certain outstanding men, some of whom, on the other hand, have become apparently intoxicated by this blind devotion. Our ‘Free Lance’ sees all this clearly, and exposes it with great ability, ample stores of information and anecdote, and much boldness. He is jealous of the hereditary glory of Scotland, of her Scriptural schools, of her ancient Church, of the high character for integrity and consistency of her clergy. Although the son of a Seceder minister, he is totally opposed to Voluntarism, and in the interests of our common Christianity, he desires a union of all classes of Presbyterians on the basis of a reformed and renovated Establishment. This, of course, if accomplished in accordance with right principles, will be generally admitted to be a noble and worthy object. But whether it will be accomplished or not, time only can tell. Although agreeing cordially with very much in the book, we do not profess to sympathise with all the views put forth by its able author. Indeed, from some things we decidedly dissent. We should like to see clearer definitions of what the anticipated ‘Future Church of Scotland’ is to be in some matters of essential principle; but the vigour and patriotism of the book are both interesting and refreshing, and fuller information on some points may, perhaps, be given in a subsequent publication.”

Rock (Church of England).

“A very able and suggestive book.”

Christian World (English Nonconformist).

“Some of the more sagacious Scottish Churchmen have suggested the possibility of the established and unestablished Presbyterian Churches becoming one. It is understood that Dr Norman Macleod is an advocate of something of this kind. The latest indication of this feeling is the publication of a book entitled, ‘The Future Church of Scotland.’ Its author endeavours to show how all may form a comprehensive Church, and carry on a great work between them. The book is an able one.”

London Scotsman (Liberal).

“‘Free Lance’ thinks with Dr Smith, of North Leith, that there are abundance of churches in Scotland of one kind or other, but that they are badly located on account of the competition which is at work, and which would disappear under fusion. We ask the reader to go into any considerable town in Scotland on any given Sunday. He will be conducted into three churches, where he will find three services held, and three sermons preached; and unless special intimation be made, he will be utterly unable to tell whether these churches belong to one denomination or three. In these circumstances ‘Free Lance’ asks, ought not these three denominations to unite? He answers himself in the affirmative. We heartily sympathise with his programme, and hope the day will come, and that speedily, when it shall be practicable. There are signs that that day is not so far off as some appearances would indicate. There is plenty of good sense and no lack of wise suggestions in the text of the volume, but the copious notes are far the pleasantest reading in the book. ‘Free Lance’ has his favourites, and it is evident that Drs Buchanan and Candlish are not among the number. He is not intentionally warped, but it is clear that he has no great cordiality to the Free Church, and prefers the Establishment and the more moderate United Presbyterians. The late Dr John Brown is one of his prime favourites.”

Forward (Independent Monthly Magazine).

“This is a clever book of contemporaneous ecclesiastical history, written in a generous spirit. The author hides himself under the *nom de plume* of ‘Free Lance,’ and the name is suggestive of the style in which he treats his subject. He traces the origin and history of all the Scottish religious and ecclesiastical movements for these last fifty years, and shows most decidedly that Scotland does not stand to-day in the relations in which she stood in the early part of this century. Many movements have taken place since then which have eventuated in the present aspect of affairs, which is certainly only transitory. Out of the present ecclesiastical and theological chaos a cosmos will arise in the shape of a Church of Scotland, which will comprehend all the various sections of the Christian Church which now exist in the land. ‘Free Lance’ is not very definite as to the nature of this church which is to be. Indeed, he seems to us to be better at dissecting than in building up. But there must be a pulling down before there can be a rebuilding, and the author has done something towards the former, and has left, perchance, the other sphere of work to another time, or to other hands. Those who desire to have a glimpse at the men which move in, and the schemes which belong to, the Churches of Scotland, should read this volume. They will not weary over its foot-notes, which are the most instructive and interesting part of the book. ‘Free Lance’ gives a lengthy and fair account of the rise, progress, and doctrines of the Evangelical Union of Scotland and other movements, which have tended to liberalise theology, and his idea is that these have been necessary to the religious vitality of the nation. In this he is right, and but for these protests against a dark and fatalistic creed, the light and liberty of the churches would not have been so great as it is to-day. The volume is a phenomenon which is worthy of study, and is another among the many signs that we are moving if not also improving.”

Dundee Courier and Argus (Conservative.)

"The author of this Essay, already favourably known to literature as the writer of a Memoir of the late Professor Pillans, brings the same ample and minute knowledge of men and opinions which characterises his former production to bear on the question of the future of ecclesiastical Scotland. The leading idea of the work is that, as Scotch Presbyterianism has in times past repeatedly split and repeatedly united, it may as well now agree to sink all bygone differences in one all-embracing and final union. Whatever chance the writer's conclusion may have of being adopted by Presbyterians, we certainly think that he has made good his premises. He reviews in a calm, practical, unbiassed, and common-sense spirit the rise and progress of the chief Presbyterian Churches of Scotland; and he shows, by copious references, both to undisputed facts and to the recorded utterances of the leading representatives of these Churches, that each has exhibited certain inconsistencies in the course of its career, having frequently magnified points which it has subsequently subordinated, or even cancelled altogether, or having, on the other hand, elevated to the dignity of essential principles ideas which had only a gradual, and at the best a purely accidental origin. From this he deduces the practical lesson that the proper spirit of Presbyterianism is in no way contained in any of those minute differences which presently separate the different Presbyterian Churches from one another; and indeed he does not see any formidable objection, but, on the contrary, every inducement, historical, economical, and religious, to a union based on compromise, such as will reorganise the disjointed members of the original National Presbyterian Church, and even absorb such Dissenters as the Scotch Episcopalians. Such is the leading idea which pervades the Essay; but perhaps it is not the novelty of the idea so much as the mass of historical and biographical evidence, felicitously told and capable of ready verification, which constitutes the chief merit of the writer. The unprejudiced spirit in which the past history of Presbyterianism has been reviewed, or rather sketched, is as admirable as it is rare; and, indeed, for any one who wishes to obtain with little trouble a comprehensive and intelligent view of the present posture of the various ecclesiastical bodies of Scotland, we do not know a better book to recommend than this. The author, wisely we think, addresses himself not to the clergy, from whom he expects but little sympathy, but to the laity of the several Churches interested; but for both clergy and laity we may say that *Free Lance* has written a really readable and useful Essay. He has avoided all acrimony in his treatment of a subject which bristles with controverted points; and while not shrinking from avowing his opinion, we are sure that he has nowhere been consciously influenced by bias. From the intimate acquaintance which the author discovers not only with contemporaneous personages, but with the lives of many who are dead, it is impossible to read his book without gathering much information which is often curious, and is sometimes amusing. Altogether we hail the appearance of this Essay with satisfaction, as affording evidence that attention is beginning to be paid to a question which all foresee must at no distant day agitate the various Churches of Scotland."

Christian Times (Church of England and Nonconformist Evangelical Organ.)

"That an all-inclusive Presbyterian Union is practicable it is the purpose of the work we have named to demonstrate; and the author will doubtless secure a more deeply-interested perusal for what he has written from the fact that he is himself, as he frankly informs us in his Essay, the son of a Nonconformist Presbyterian minister, a man, therefore, familiar with the obstacles in the way of what he suggests that would be likely to come from the dissenting branches of the great Presbyterian family; a man, moreover, who is too well aware of the depth of conviction that animates the sturdy dissenting interest in which he was born and nursed, to make light of these difficulties. Suffice it to say, that he does not deem them to be insuperable; and the grounds of his belief are set forth in a volume of more than 350 pages, into which he has packed an amount of fact and illustration and argument that will be sure to carry conviction to many minds, and to inspire in many

breasts a portion at least of the ardour with which he is evidently inflamed. His scheme harmonizes with the aspirations of many of the noblest of his countrymen in all the Churches, both among the clergy and the laity. The late Lord Advocate of Scotland has confessed that he finds in the idea of a re-united Presbyterian Church the noblest inspirations of his official life; and not a few of the leading divines in the Establishment, of which Mr Gordon is a member, have avowed their strong desire for an all-inclusive union. 'Free Lance,' in the volume before us, states authoritatively that Dr Hanna, the son-in-law and biographer of Chalmers, and so long the colleague of Dr Guthrie at Edinburgh, is in favour of a United Church, retaining the endowment, and working out the territorial principle. In the other Churches we cannot doubt that there are men of the same spirit, men who would as willingly labour to make this glorious dream a reality. The book by 'Free Lance' will be of service to all parties in helping them to see how this great end can be achieved. This is its primary purpose and use; but we should indeed be doing injustice to its writer were we to omit the acknowledgment of its subordinate points of attraction and utility. As a piece of modern church history, Scotland has produced no work of equal value, whether we regard its wealth of information or the style in which it is conveyed. It says much for the author's purity of motive and single-eyed devotion to a noble idea that he has been content to lavish all the materials which he has gathered into these pages on the furtherance of this design. If they had been given in another form, and with a title more in accordance with their real worth and dignity, we can readily conceive that he might have secured for himself both more reputation and pecuniary profit; but of these things he has been thinking less than of the furtherance of that scheme which he has evidently so much at heart, and which is equally creditable to him as a patriot and as a Christian. His fellow-countrymen will be sure to read his work with as much relish as if it were a romance, so great are its merely literary attractions; and on this side of the Tweed it will be helpful to all catholic-minded Christian people as throwing most suggestive side-lights on a problem which has to be solved by the English Churches no less than by our brethren in the north."

Kelso Mail (Conservative).

"Its contents are so attractive that the reader who takes it up will not stop until he has perused the whole of its contents. The subject upon which it treats is of the highest importance, and the writer has evidently a fixed object in view, which he places before us with all the enthusiasm characteristic of the ardent theorist. Briefly, this subject is the establishment of a Scottish National Church on a basis broad enough to include all the sects which within the last century have set up churches of their own. Perhaps no time could have been better chosen than the present for the advocacy of such a project. A change, and a great change, has come over the character of the people of Scotland as far as regards theological doctrines. The advance of education and the almost universal acceptance of the principle of toleration have broken down to a great extent the barriers which divided sect from sect. No doubt in many Scotch towns and villages the old spirit of bigotry and Phariseism still flourishes, and a man's conduct is judged by the old rule of the Church he attends; but in the great centres of intelligence there has arisen a general desire for union among those who profess the same faith, and for the removal of these artificial differences which, although they may have originated in conscientiousness, are now regarded as of very little moment. During the last seven years two great sections of what may be termed the Secession Church have, so to speak, been coquetting with each other, without, however, having advanced much towards what would be a permanent union, and the mother Church has shown that she is not insensible to the amalgamating influences of the age. Now is the time, therefore, when proposals for a National Church are most likely to be favourably received, and the work before us propounds a scheme which, while it may not be approved of by many, will have the effect of suggesting others more practicable.

The contemplated union of the Free and United Presbyterian Churches finds no favour with the writer, for, like ourselves, he cannot understand how such a union can be effected without a great sacrifice of consistency on both sides. He scatters to the wind the dogma of 'spiritual independence,' which is asserted to be the principal link that at present connects the Churches, and points out that the Church deserted by both the parties possesses a greater degree of spiritual independence than either. In advocating his scheme of a National Church, he recognises the fact that certain concessions must be made on all hands, but he does not make clear how this disagreeable duty is to be rendered at all palatable. After all, the real value of the work does not lie in the plan suggested for a national union of Churches, but in the lucid history which the author gives of the various dissensions and ruptures in the Church. In tracing the rise of these he brings to bear on the subject a wonderful stock of information, interspersing brief, but interesting biographies of the leaders in every movement, and graphically portraying the various events which marked their course. He displays great powers of satire, and unmercifully dissects those ecclesiastical champions who have had the ill fortune to incur his displeasure. Copious notes are to be found at the bottom of almost every page, and these generally contain some entertaining anecdote, or some amusing reminiscence of well-known ministers. We commend the book to all who enjoy fresh and vigorous writing, and assuring them that they will at the same time reap the benefit of information regarding the state of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland, which it would be impossible to find in any other single volume."

Galloway Gazette (Conservative.)

"A mournful interest clings around the ecclesiastical history of Scotland of the last 310 years, at the same time cheering and saddening, hopeful and sorrow-laden. There is the stern and heroic clinging to truth, and the petty persecutions and jealousies of the sects which constituted themselves 'Churches' in the eighteenth century; the faithful adherence to the form of worship now national when Prelacy was attempted to be forced upon the people at the point of the sword, and the quarrels and internal hatings concerning non-essentials which frittered away so much energy and led too often to the substance being forgotten in straining after the shadow. At the present time the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland are five—the Establishment, the Free, the United Presbyterian, the Original Seceders, and the Reformed Presbyterian; the Burghers, the Anti-Burghers, the Constitutional Associates, the Relief, and one or two smaller divisions having become merged either into the Free, the United Presbyterian, or the United Original Seceders of 1870. And as at the present time there is another Union battle being fought, and attention is once more diverted to how fiercely Christians can hate and hurl at each other ugly names and impute sinister motives, the book before us comes with especial opportuneness. 'Free Lance' is a smart, well-read, 'taking' writer; and the personal reminiscences, the pithy biographies of departed worthies, the historical data, racy 'hits' at present agitators, and the well-digested hints as to the Future Church make up a mass of reading as interesting as it is instructive. When one thinks of the stirring events, the vast interests, and the fierce passions 'Free Lance' reduces within the volume, and the complete photograph, as it were, which he gives of the ecclesiastical movements since the Reformation in 1560, the fact is at once seen that the writer has not only a full knowledge of his subject, but knows well how to catch up the points and give an interesting outline of the religious bickerings of Scotland. Orthodoxy has been truly defined to be 'my doxy;' heterodoxy, every one else's 'doxy:' that being remembered, the key is given to the events 'Free Lance' skims over so pleasantly, dipping deeply here and there as if to show the wealth of the ore-vein he merely, so to speak, scratches. Whether his Future Church will ever be more than a dream we cannot say. The proposed Union between the Free and U.P. bodies threatens a disruption and new 'sects' if persisted in; and the acrimony of the discussions thereanent, and the more than

worldly bitterness of the wordy fight, show too plainly that the same spirit moves Dissent now which scandalised religion in Scotland at the beginning of the present century. But lest any one should think the religious bitteresses in Scotland since the Reformation have been confined to Presbyterianism, 'Free Lance' wisely glances at Romanism, Episcopalianism, Congregationalism, and Methodism, and in the hasty survey shows that neither of these bodies has been here as a shining testimony to Christian quiet and unity. All have had their disputes—all have quarrelled, each within itself—all have shown that even the best of men are guided greatly by impulse and prejudice, and that even the Church of Christ upon earth is at the best a faulty institution because of man's infirmities. Let no sect, therefore, cast stones at its neighbour, and say, 'Thou art the sinner.' We had marked a number of extracts in the book before us; but our limited space and the cheapness of the volume must stand excuses for leaving them unprinted. The 'Essay,' as 'Free Lance' modestly terms it, is a most valuable contribution to a proper understanding of the ecclesiastical history of Scotland: those who have studied well the question will derive benefit from contact with a writer so catholic-minded and logical as 'Free Lance'; while the young and the strangers within our gates will see and appreciate the worth of religious controversy, and maybe understand why it is that Churches professing one faith, having the same form of government, and to all outward appearance, agreeing in doctrine, yet see not 'eye to eye', and are as jealous, to a great extent, of each other's well-doing as rival shopkeepers. We cordially commend the book to our readers, promising them a pleasant and profitable five shillings' worth."

Teviotdale Record (Liberal.)

"This is a very remarkable and a very interesting book, well worthy of attentive perusal by all who take an interest in the past history or future progress of Presbyterianism in Scotland. The disorganised state into which Scottish Presbyterianism has fallen is, under every aspect, very deplorable; and the question how a reorganisation is to be effected, suitably to the circumstances of the present time, and in harmony with the original idea of Knox, is one which must soon occupy the earnest thought of every Scotchman who has at heart the grand ideal of the Church for which the first reformers struggled. Towards the solution of this great question the book before us is, we believe, a very valuable contribution. Valuable not so much as a thorough reasoning out of the principles upon which such a reorganisation should be established, as for the clear light which it throws on the controversies which have agitated and rent into fragments Scottish Presbyterianism; and also for the prominence into which it brings the evils social, moral, and spiritual, which these ecclesiastical divisions have produced, and still tend to foster, especially in connection with the relief of the poor, education, and missionary enterprise. The central idea of the book is to advocate a union of all the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, on the basis of a national establishment—to realise, if possible, in harmony with the changed opinions and circumstances of the age, the idea of the early reformers. This idea is not indeed formally developed in the book, but it is that which, by a kind of elective affinity, gives consistency and interest to the wonderful amount and variety of personal reminiscences which go to make it up. The author, as if instinctively aware of the effect which abstract argument on such a subject would inevitably produce in the minds of Scottish readers, does not seek to gain his ends in this way; but gives out, in a charmingly clear narrative style—never rising into eloquence, but never falling below a certain stately dignity—the details of quiet but intensely earnest personal observations of the movements of Church parties, and of the sayings and doings of ecclesiastical leaders during the last thirty years; and the result is, this remarkable, exceedingly interesting, and in some respects very queer book. The author fully justifies his assumed title of 'Free Lance' by the bold outspoken honesty with which he criticises the conduct of ecclesiastical leaders in all the churches. He often pierces, with a keen lance, the inconsistent policy of eminent men still living; but he does so in a bold chivalrous spirit, free from all personal rancour."

Northern Ensign, (Liberal.)

“This is a volume which, whatever may be said of the writer’s opinions, does him credit for making good use of his singularly ample store of facts and anecdotes. Take it all in all, the work is no ephemeral production, but will be long drawn upon for its series of faithful historical details, and valuable personal recollections and references. The foot-notes alone vest the volume with great interest. The writer, the son of an old Burgher minister, warmly advocates the union of all the Presbyterian denominations in Scotland, and supports his argument with considerable ability and tact; and though here and there indicating no great love for one of the leading denominations, and dealing heavy blows at some of the leaders, he is, on the whole, taking early education and circumstances into account, exceedingly impartial, comprehending interesting details of the early history of other denominations, and illustrating his sketches by a variety of facts and figures and personal anecdotes that vest the ‘Future Church of Scotland’ with interest to all sects throughout Scotland. It is in all respects a chatty volume, *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*, directly or indirectly relating to the subject on hand, with a *free lance* doing yeoman service to great principles most surely held by all Protestants, and advocating his views with an earnestness and a vigour that do him honour.”

Banffshire Journal, (Liberal.)

“This is an Essay on Church Union, addressed to the lay Presbyterians of Scotland, written, however, in quite a different strain, and nearly as much superior to as different from the multitude of writings that have been given to the public respecting the projected union of the Free and U.P. Churches. ‘Free Lance’ is, indeed, opposed to the union now being negotiated, but he proposes a combination of the Presbyterian bodies on a far wider basis than that presently contemplated. To represent the work as merely containing a proposal for Church union, is to give a very imperfect idea of its character. It embraces a succinct and interesting history of the various Dissenting Churches, showing the attitudes they have assumed toward each other and the Established Church at particular periods, and tracing the divergencies that have from time to time been made from the special tenets upon which they were founded. The work reveals an astonishing acquaintance with ecclesiastical history on the part of the author, and a diligence and research equally admirable. The style is lively, and the facts interesting of themselves, if not always opposite to the argument. The text is illuminated by copious notes, teeming with valuable information of a literary, biographical, and historical character. ‘Free Lance’ holds with good reason that the Free Church is committed to the principle of State endowment; and argues that, though the Voluntaries are nominally opposed to endowment, they actually are to some extent endowed from funds bequeathed by rich members. Patronage in the Established Church is of course doomed, and should the State concede the wishes of the Liberal party in the Church, our author thinks his scheme might be carried out. By such a union, ministers could be appointed to endowed or non-endowed churches, as they thought fit to accept them. The rivalry of Presbyterian Churches would, of course, cease, and the way would be paved for educational reform and extension. With the view of raising the standard of the ministry, our author desiderates greater care in the licensing of students, which could be secured either by remitting them to Presbyterian Committees, or dividing the Presbytery, so that two students could be under examination at once. Another reform he would introduce would be the trying of accused ministers by circuit court, appointed by the Assembly, with a Church Fiscal as prosecutor. In the United Church there would, of course, have to be more latitude for individual opinion than in any of the non-established Churches at present; but for the writer’s views on those and other points connected with his scheme we must refer the reader to the work itself. We may indicate, however, that while, ‘Free Lance’ claims neutral ground as the stand-point from which he looks upon the affairs of the different religious bodies, and is frank alike in his praise and censure of men and measures, he is particularly severe on the financial management of the Free Church. He makes several direct attacks on Dr Robert Buchanan, whom he represents as the only influential clergyman who bettered his position financially by leaving the Established Church.”