

BX
9084
F7C3
1853

BX
9084
F7C3
1853

12676

**CAVEN LIBRARY
KNOX COLLEGE
TORONTO**

CATECHISM

ON THE

PRINCIPLES AND CONSTITUTION

OF THE

FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

Issued by Authority of the General Assembly,

UNDER THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE PUBLICATION COMMITTEE.

A NEW EDITION, MUCH ENLARGED.



EDINBURGH:
JOHNSTONE AND HUNTER.

M. DCCC. LIII.

EDINBURGH :
PRINTED BY JOHNSTONE AND HUNTER,
104 HIGH STREET.

12676

1913

“ *At Edinburgh, the Eighth day of June, One Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty-seven Years. Session 30.*

“ Which day the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland being met, and duly constituted; *Inter alia,*

“ The Assembly having resumed consideration of the overtures on the principles of the Church, agreeably to a resolution entered in their minutes at a former diet, Dr. Candlish was heard on the subject, and the following motion was unanimously agreed to :—

“ The General Assembly having resumed consideration of the overtures, and of the report of the Committee thereanent, and being deeply sensible of the importance of instructing the people of this Church, and especially the young, in the great principles which she has been called to maintain; having also had their attention called to the Catechism on the Principles and Constitution of this Church, issued in December 1845, by authority of the Publication Committee, and since that time circulated with large acceptance in the land, and being satisfied with its soundness, as well as its suitableness to the purpose intended, approve generally of the same, as containing a valuable summary of this Church’s history, and exhibition of her distinctive principles, from the beginning of the Reformation to the present time, and earnestly recommend its general use. And the Assembly authorize the Publication Committee to superintend the issue of any new edition of the Catechism that may be prepared, and to report upon it to the next General Assembly. And waiving the farther consideration of the other matters referred to in the overtures and the report as aforesaid, the Assembly appoint this act to be read from all the pulpits on such an early Sabbath as may be agreed upon, at one or other of the ordinary diets of worship; on which

occasion ministers are enjoined to preach to their people on the doctrine of the Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, as held by this Church, according to God's Word, as well as the peculiar responsibility of the Church, and of all her faithful people in regard to it."

Extracted from the Records of the General Assembly
of the Free Church of Scotland, by

THOMAS PITCAIRN,
Cl. Ec. Scot. Lib.

CONTENTS.

	Page
CHAPTER I.—The Church	7
CHAPTER II.—The Head of the Church	9
SECTION I.—General view of the Headship of Christ	ib.
SECTION II.—Christ the Head of Existence to the Church	13
SECTION III.—Christ the Head of Ordinances	14
SECTION IV.—Christ the Head of Knowledge	17
SECTION V.—Christ the Head of Influence	19
SECTION VI.—Christ the Head of Authority	20
PART I.—The Church subject to no laws but Christ's	22
PART II.—The Church governed only by the Office-Bearers Christ has placed over it	26
PART III.—The Power and Authority exercised in the Church derived, in every age, immediately from Christ	33
PART IV.—Church Power, and the use of it	42
PART V.—Conclusion	44
CHAPTER III.—The Testimony of the Church of Scotland for the Headship of Christ	47
SECTION I.—Her anti-Papal Testimony for the Headship of Christ	ib.
SECTION II.—Her anti-Prelatical Testimony for it	50
SECTION III.—Her anti-Patronage Testimony	56
PART I.—Her former anti-Patronage Testimony	57
PART II.—Her recent anti-Patronage Testimony	63
SECTION IV.—Her anti-Erastian Testimony	67
PART I.—The former anti-Erastian Testimony	68
DIVISION I.—The Church's exercise of her Freedom to serve Christ alone as her Head	ib.

CHAPTER III.— <i>continued.</i>	Page
DIVISION 2.—Her assertion of her Freedom, when it was threatened and invaded	71
DIVISION 3.—Her vindication of her Freedom, when it was betrayed	75
DIVISION 4.—Her Sufferings in the cause of her Freedom to serve Christ	76
DIVISION 5.—Her success in obtaining the Civil Ratification of her Freedom	79
DIVISION 6.—The Abandonment of the former anti-Erastian Testimony	86
PART II.—The recent anti-Erastian Testimony	88
DIVISION 1.—The Church's exercise of her Freedom	ib.
DIVISION 2.—Her assertion of her Freedom	91
DIVISION 3.—Her vindication of it, when it was betrayed	95
DIVISION 4.—Her Efforts to recover it	96
DIVISION 5.—The sacrifice of her Temporalities for its sake	98
CHAPTER IV.—The Government of the Church	115
SECTION I.—The Office-Bearers of the Church	ib.
SECTION II.—The Courts of the Church	123

APPENDIX.

I.—Resolution of Assembly 1838, anent the Spiritual Jurisdiction of the Church	131
II.—Extracts from Claim of Right	132
III.—Protest of 1843	138
IV.—Statistics relative to the Convocation and Disruption	143
V.—Organization of the Free Church of Scotland	145
VI.—Act anent Duties of Elders and Deacons	148
VII.—Declaratory Act anent Deacons' Courts and Kirk-Sessions	151
VIII.—Act anent Questions and Formula	152
Questions to be put to Elders and Deacons before Ordination	ib.
Formula	153
INDEX TO THE CATECHISM	155

CONSTITUTIONAL CATECHISM

OF THE

FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH.

Ques. 1. To what Church do you belong?

Ans. To the Free Church of Scotland.

Q. 2. Why do you belong to that Church?

A. Because I regard its doctrines as scriptural, and its constitution and government as agreeable to the Word of God.

Q. 3. Where shall we find an authorized exhibition of its doctrines?

A. In the Westminster Confession of Faith, and in the Larger and Shorter Catechisms.

Q. 4. Why do you call it the FREE Church of Scotland?

A. For several reasons —

1. To distinguish it from another body which

claims to be the Church of Scotland, and is recognised as such by the civil power of this country.

2. To commemorate the struggle for freedom, wherein, through great temporal sacrifices, God enabled this Church to overcome at the Disruption in May 1843.

3. To bear a constant and marked protest against the usurpation, on the one hand, and the surrender, on the other, of the rights and liberties of the Church of Christ.

Q. 5. *What do you understand by a Church of Christ?*

A. A Church of Christ is a body or community professing and maintaining the saving truths of the Gospel, and formed, under Christ's authority, for the keeping of Christian ordinances, and, through the grace of the Spirit accompanying the use of divinely appointed means, for the gathering, edifying, and perfecting of God's people. (Eph. iv. 11-13.)

Q. 6. *Is the Free Church of Scotland a body of this description?*

A. I consider it to be so.

Q. 7. *What do you understand by THE Church of Christ?*

A. The Church of Christ has a twofold meaning:—

1. It signifies the whole number of the elect, who, before the foundation of the world, were given of the Father unto the Son, that by the Son they might be redeemed; and who, in due time, are called, justified, and glorified. Thus taken, it is commonly named the Catholic, or Universal Church invisible. (Eph. v. 25-27.)

2. It signifies all those throughout the world

who profess the true faith of Jesus, and subjection to his laws, along with their children. In this sense we speak of it as the Catholic, or Universal Church visible. (Acts ii. 47; 1 Cor. xii. 28.)

Q. 8. *In what relation does a particular Church—the Free Church of Scotland, for example—stand to THE Church of Christ, as now described?*

A. A particular Church is a branch of the catholic visible Church, and all its members are members of the same; and such of its members as are, or are ordained of God to be, savingly united to Christ, belong to the invisible Church.

CHAPTER II.

THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH.

SECTION I.—GENERAL VIEW OF THE HEADSHIP OF CHRIST.

Q. 9. *Who is the Head of the invisible Church?*

A. The Lord Jesus Christ. (Col. i. 18.)

Q. 10. *Who is the Head of the visible Church?*

A. The Lord Jesus Christ. (Isa. ix. 6, 7; Luke i. 32, 33; Matt. xvi. 18, 19; xxiii. 8-10; John xiii. 13.)

Q. 11. *Who is the Head of the particular Churches comprehended in the visible Church?*

A. The Lord Jesus Christ is the only Head of each of the particular Churches of Christ throughout the world. (Rev. i. 10-13; ii. 1.)

Q. 12. *Who is the Head of the individual members and office-bearers of the Church?*

A. "The Head of every man is Christ." (1 Cor. xi. 3; iv. 2-4; Eph. vi. 5-9; John xv. 5.)

Q. 13. *Is our Lord the Head of every Christian congregation?*

A. He is the Head of every Christian congregation. (Matt. xviii. 20.)

Q. 14. *Is not Christ also Head over the nations?*

A. He is "the Prince of the kings of the earth," and "Head over all things to the Church." (Ps. lxxxix. 27; Rev. i. 5; Eph. i. 21, 22; Rev. xix. 16.)

Q. 15. *What do you mean when you say that Christ is the Head of the invisible Church?*

A. The meaning is, that as the second man, the last Adam, he is its Representative and Surety in the everlasting covenant; that he is the Bridegroom, and that it is his Bride and Spouse; and that it is his Body, even the body of Him who filleth all in all.

Q. 16. *What is your meaning when you say that Christ is the Head of the visible Church?*

A. I mean that it is the kingdom of which he is the only Lord and Lawgiver; of the institutions of which he is the sole Author; and the peculiar privileges, immunities, and benefits enjoyed by which proceed from, and are conferred by, him alone.

Q. 17. *What do you mean when you say that Christ is the Head of every particular Church, or branch of the visible Church?*

A. The meaning is, that what he is to the whole, he is, and must be, to every part; since it would be subversive of the relation in which he stands to the universal body as its Head, to suppose him not

to stand in the very same relation to the several communities of which the catholic Church is made up.

Q. 18. *What do you mean when you call Christ the Head of every individual Church member and office-bearer ?*

A. That every Christian has immediate union and communion with Christ, as the only fountain of grace, truth, and spiritual authority ; and that no other party, whether civil or ecclesiastical, can come between Christ and his disciple, as the giver or withholder of spiritual influence and blessing ; or is warranted to come between Christ and his disciple, whether the disciple be an office-bearer or only a member, for the purpose of lording it over his conscience, in respect of what he is to regard as the will of his Master.

Q. 19. *Is the Christian's right of private judgment, then, involved in the Headship of Christ ?*

A. It is.

Q. 20. *What do you mean by calling Christ the Head of every congregation in the Church ?*

A. That when a congregation has to act collectively, and as an organized body, it is bound to seek out, and to walk by, his will alone, and has a right to be wholly free from coercion, whether civil or ecclesiastical.

Q. 21. *Can you specify any important occasion on which a congregation has to act in its collective capacity ?*

A. Yes ; such an occasion is when it has to choose a pastor, or other office-bearer ; or to declare if it accepts the pastor or other office-bearer proposed to it.

Q. 22. *What do you mean when you say that Christ is Head over the nations?*

A. That the nations are subjected to him for the benefit of his Church.

Q. 23. *What duty devolves upon nations in consequence of this?*

A. They are bound to own their subjection to Christ; to recognise his voice speaking to them and to the Church in the Scriptures; to take care that their legislation be not opposed to his will;* to abstain from the support or encouragement of religious error; to guard the liberties of the Church of Christ; to have respect to the interests thereof in the administration of their affairs; and to employ their power and resources in such a way as shall best contribute to its successful progress within their territory, and throughout the world (Ps. ii. 7-12; Exod. v. 2; Isa. lx. 9, 10, 12; Jonah iii. 5-10; Ps. lxxii. 10, 11, 17; Ezra vi. 22; vii. 27; Neh. xiii. 15-22; Isa. xlix. 23.)

Q. 24. *Are nations liable to Divine punishment when their rulers, acting officially, fail in their duty to Christ?*

A. Yes. (2 Sam. xxiv. 10-17.)

Q. 25. *Does punishment immediately follow the contraction of national guilt?*

A. Not always: ages sometimes elapse before the cup of a nation's iniquity is filled up. (Gen. xv. 16; Matt. xxiii. 32.)

Q. 26. *Does the moral identity of a nation continue, when the individuals composing it are changed?*

A. It does. Israel was punished in the days of

* *E.g.*, in regard to marriage, slavery, the Sabbath, education, &c.

David for the breach of engagements formed in the days of Joshua, 430 years before; and the Jews in the time of our Lord were punished for the sins of their ancestors; on the principle that the identity of the nation continued, and that, in a moral point of view, it was still the same. (Compare Josh. ix. 3-15, with 2 Sam. xxi. 1, 2; Matt. xxiii. 35, 36.)

Q. 27. *Is not this a principle which held true as regards the Jewish people alone?*

A. Not so. It appears to be a principle which applies to public bodies universally, be they ancient or modern, civil or ecclesiastical. (Gen. xv. 16; Exod. xiii. 19; xvii. 8-16; Isa. xiv. 21; Jer. ii. 2-7; xxv. 12; Dan. viii. 23; Amos i. 11, 12; Rev. xviii. 24; xix. 1, 2; ii. 4, 5.)

Q. 28. *Can you give a more particular explanation of the Headship of our Lord as regards the visible Church, and the true branches of the same?*

A. Yes; there are five distinct senses in which his Headship may be taken:—

1. He is the Head of *existence* to the visible Church, and the branches thereof.

2. He is the Head of *ordinances* therein.

3. He is the Head of *knowledge*.

4. He is the Head of *influence*.

5. He is the Head of *authority*.

SECTION II.—CHRIST THE HEAD OF EXISTENCE TO THE CHURCH.

Q. 29. *How is he the HEAD OF EXISTENCE to the Church?*

A. Inasmuch as the being of the Church is derived from him, and the organization of it is his

work. He creates the Church—he builds it. (Matt. xvi. 18; Heb. iii. 1-6; Isa. xliii. 15, 21; Acts xv. 14; 2 Cor. v. 17; Ps. cii. 16; cxlvii. 2-4.)

Q. 30. *Does every local Church derive its being from Christ?*

A. Yes; when Christ imparts his Gospel and his grace to a city, a province, or a country, the instant effect is, a Church of Christ in that city, province, or country. Thus it was that a Church was created at Jerusalem, at Antioch, at Ephesus, at Corinth, at Rome, &c. And in the same way, namely, by means of his Gospel and his grace, did Christ, in the days of our ancestors, give being to the Church of Scotland.

Q. 31. *Can we ascribe to Christ the origin of Churches consisting of persons who have separated from Churches previously existing?*

A. Assuredly; if the honour of Christ and the interests of his truth required the separation.

Q. 32. *Who are they that deny the Headship of our Lord in this respect?*

A. Such as maintain that Churches of Christ are merely voluntary societies, called into being by the resolution and vote of the persons composing them; or that they can be created or constituted by civil decrees and Acts of Parliament.

SECTION III.—CHRIST THE HEAD OF ORDINANCES TO THE CHURCH.

Q. 33. *Why do you say that Christ is HEAD OF ORDINANCES to the Church?*

A. Because all its ordinances are of his appoint-

ment, and it pertains to him alone to make changes upon them, or to set them aside.

Q. 34. *Can you tell anything of Christ's exercise of his prerogative as Head of ordinances?*

A. The whole of the peculiar ordinances of the Mosaic economy were prescribed by him (Acts vii. 38); when these had served their end he abolished them (Eph. ii. 14, 15; Col. ii. 14); and, under the New Testament dispensation, he has given many suitable and most precious ordinances, such as baptism and the Lord's supper, the Lord's-day, the preaching of the Gospel, the pastoral office, &c.

Q. 35. *Who are they that derogate from the Headship of Christ in this respect?*

A. Such as think that new ordinances may be instituted, or that the ordinances which Christ himself has instituted may be repealed or modified by man. (Deut. iv. 2; xii. 32; Matt. v. 19; Rev. xxii. 18, 19; Mark vii. 1-7.)

Q. 36. *Can you give any instances in which man has in this way interfered with the Headship of Christ?*

A. In the Old Testament Church, there were the ceremonies which rested on the traditions and authority of the elders: and, in New Testament times, holidays have been prescribed; the rite of confirmation has been introduced; the sign of the cross, and godfathers and godmothers, have been connected with baptism; the cup, in the Lord's supper, has been taken from the laity; kneeling in that ordinance has been required; and new sacraments have been instituted*—all without warrant from Christ.

* The five spurious sacraments of the Church of Rome are,

Q. 37. *How may the Headship of Christ be derogated from in this respect, with regard to the pastoral office ?*

A. To the pastoral office, as instituted by Christ, certain powers and functions essentially belong ; and the Headship of our Lord is infringed upon when any of these—the powers of discipline and spiritual rule, for instance—are knowingly abridged or taken away.

Q. 38. *Do you say that there is nothing in the worship of God that is left to be regulated by the discretion of those to whom Church authority is committed ?*

A. This is not affirmed. “We acknowledge that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God” (*e. g.*, the frequency and duration of Sabbath-day services, the arrangement of the several parts of worship, &c.) “and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.” (Confession of Faith, i. 6 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 26, 40.)

holy orders, penance, matrimony, confirmation, extreme unction. It is sometimes retorted upon those who plead for the Headship of Christ in the sense now explained, that they themselves infringe on it when they sprinkle instead of dip in the ordinance of baptism, and keep the Sabbath on the first, instead of the seventh, day of the week. The answer for the Church of Scotland is, that she baptizes by sprinkling, and keeps the first-day Sabbath, not because she thinks she is at liberty to make changes on Divine institutions, but because, as her standards testify (*Confession of Faith*, xxviii. 3, xxi. 7 ; *Shorter Catechism*, q. 59), she believes it can be proved from Scripture, that sprinkling or pouring is a lawful mode of baptism, and that the first day of the week has come in place of the seventh, as the Sabbath of the Lord.

SECTION IV.—CHRIST THE HEAD OF KNOWLEDGE IN THE CHURCH.

Q. 39. *What do you mean by calling the Lord Jesus the HEAD OF KNOWLEDGE in the Church?*

A. That it is by his revelations that all divine and saving truth is communicated. (Matt. xi. 27; Col. ii. 3; Heb. i. 1, 2.)

Q. 40. *Where are his revelations to be found?*

A. In the Scriptures alone. By the Word Christ speaks to the Church, in his capacity of the Prophet of God. (John v. 39; Luke xvi. 29-31; 2 Tim. iii. 15-17.)

Q. 41. *Comes not the voice of the great Teacher through the medium of tradition also?*

A. It comes only through the written Word. (Rev. xxii. 18.)*

Q. 42. *May not the unanimous consent of catholic antiquity be depended on as revealing the doctrine of Christ?*

A. The consent of antiquity is worth nothing, save as it agrees with what the Bible declares. (Isa. viii. 20.)

Q. 43. *May not the interpretations of Scripture which are given by the ministers of Christ, be received as the teaching of Christ?*

A. They may not; they are but instituted means for imparting the benefit of Christ's teaching in the Word, and are only to be valued in so far as they are fitted, and, through the blessing of

* On behalf of tradition, Romish disputants urge that it is our only means of knowing that the baptism of infants is according to the mind of Christ. The Church of Scotland holds that the baptism of infants is sanctioned and required by Holy Scripture.—*Confession of Faith*, xxviii. 4; *Larger Catechism*, q. 166; *Shorter Catechism*, q. 95.

Christ on his own ordinance, may be expected to answer that end. (Acts xvii. 11.)

Q. 44. *Is the adoption of a Confession of Faith by a Church consistent with the principle, that the only Head of knowledge is Christ speaking through the Word?*

A. Yes, provided the Bible is always received as the ultimate standard of reference and appeal. When this is not done—as it is not, for example, in the case of the formularies of the Church of Rome, and in the case of Churches which are tied to their Confessions by civil enactments* —the principle is violated.

Q. 45. *For what purposes may Confessions of Faith and Catechisms be lawfully employed?*

A. Confessions of Faith and Catechisms are proper and useful as exhibitions of Church belief, testimonies against error, tests of orthodoxy, means of instruction, and helps for understanding the Scriptures.

Q. 46. *Who are they that infringe on our Lord's Headship in this respect?*

* It is one thing for the civil privileges and endowments of a Church to be tied to a Confession by civil enactments, and quite another thing for a Church itself to be so. In the former case, the Church, when she finds that any articles of her Confession are unscriptural, is at liberty to renounce them, being only bound, if she do, to resign her temporalities. In the latter case, the law allows no relief whatever for the Church, in her corporate capacity, when she discovers errors in her Confession; which, of course, is as much as to say that the Church is bound always to go absolutely upon the supposition of its soundness, and to interpret the Word of God agreeably to its declarations. Under these circumstances, the supreme and ultimate standard of doctrine is—not the Bible, but—the Confession of Faith.

A. They are such as are not satisfied with Holy Writ as the only rule of faith.*

SECTION V.—CHRIST THE HEAD OF INFLUENCE IN THE CHURCH.

Q. 47. *Why do you call our Lord the HEAD OF INFLUENCE in the Church?*

A. Because he is the only depository of grace, and the only dispenser of it. (John i. 16.)

Q. 48. *What is implied in his being the only depository of grace?*

A. That all spiritual life and growth in the Church are derived from him, and that ministers and ordinances are but instruments and aids for bringing the soul into immediate communication with Christ and his fulness. (Col. ii. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 5; John xv. 4, 5.)

Q. 49. *What is implied in his being the only dispenser of grace?*

A. That the dispensation of the Spirit is exclusively in his hands; that the efficacy of ordinances is wholly the result of his blessing; and that

* These consist of Romanists, Tractarians, and Irvingites. The two former conjoin tradition, the consent of antiquity, and the interpretations of the clergy, with the Word, as the rule of faith. The latter appear to go a step beyond, and include the imagined prophesyings of modern religious teachers. It should be noticed, also, that the Church of Rome makes the Apocrypha part of its rule of faith. The Episcopal Churches in England and Scotland do not go this length. They read the Apocrypha, however, "for example of life and instruction of manners" (Art. vi.); and by this means they place themselves in a very undesirable dilemma. Some of the Apocryphal books *lay claim to inspiration*. The claim is either true or false. If it is true, why are these books excluded from the rule of faith? If it is false, why are writings which are forgeries upon the blessed Spirit brought into the house of God and read "for example of life and instruction of manner

the grace which the Church needs is imparted by him, both as to time and degree, according to his good pleasure. (John xvi. 7-14 ; 1 Cor. iii. 6 ; Rev. iii. 1.)

Q. 50. *Who are they that detract from our Lord's prerogative as the HEAD OF INFLUENCE ?*

A. They that do so are such as hold that the grace provided for the Church is deposited in the office-bearers or in the ordinances of the same ; and such as hold that the power of dispensing grace and the gift of the Holy Ghost is vested in the office-bearers ; or that the power of receiving or rejecting the grace by which souls are saved belongs to man's free will.*

Q. 51. *Does it mend the matter to say, that CHRIST HAS DEPOSITED in his servants and in his ordinances the grace which is destined for the Church ; or that CHRIST HAS GIVEN to his servants the power of dispensing it ?*

A. No ; because Christ has made no such deposit, and conferred no such gift. It is only by immediate communion with Christ that the members of the Church become partakers of his grace. (Col. i 19 ; Eph. iv. 11-16.)

SECTION VI.—CHRIST THE HEAD OF AUTHORITY TO THE CHURCH.

Q. 52. *Why do you say that Christ is the HEAD OF AUTHORITY to the Church ?*

* Tractarians and Romanists teach the doctrine of a deposit of grace in office-bearers and ordinances, and make the Church a reservoir whence grace is dispensed by its functionaries ; and all Prelatical Churches ascribe to their bishops a power of conveying the Holy Ghost by the imposition of their hands in ordination. Pelagians ascribe to the human will such power as subverts the doctrine of a sovereign dispensation of grace by our Lord.

A. For three reasons:—

1. Because the Church is subject to his laws, and to them alone.

2. Because the government of the Church pertains exclusively to the office-bearers whom he has set over it.

3. Because he is, in every age, the immediate fountain and sole dispenser of the power and authority which are exercised in the Church by its office-bearers.

Q. 53. *When you say that the Church is subject only to Christ's laws, and is to be governed only by the office-bearers he has set over it, do you speak of THE TEMPORAL PROPERTY that may belong to the Church?*

A. No; God has made all temporal possessions whatever subject to the civil magistrate. (Luke xii. 13, 14; Rom. xiii. 6, 7.)

Q. 54. *May the magistrate deal with the property of the Church as he pleases?*

A. He is bound to deal with it according to justice, and to have respect to the will of Christ, the glory of God, and the benefit of the Church, in his laws and decisions concerning it. (Mal. iii. 8; Neh. xiii. 10, 11; Prov. xiv. 34.)

Q. 55. *What is the remedy when the magistrate does not fulfil this obligation?*

A. There is no ordinary remedy provided for such a case; and the duty of the Church is patiently to suffer the wrong, committing itself to Him who judgeth righteously, and who will in due time plead his own cause.

Q. 56. *When you say that the Church is subject only to the laws of Christ, and is to be governed ex-*

clusively by the office-bearers he has set over it, do you speak of the members and office-bearers of the Church in their capacity of citizens or members of the commonwealth ?

A. No; in their capacity of citizens, the individuals that compose the Church are subject to the civil magistrate, to whom, in all civil matters and lawful commands, they owe the duties of loyalty and obedience. (Rom. xiii. 1, 2; Acts xxv. 10, 11; Tit. iii. 1.)

PART I.—The Church subject to no Laws but Christ's.

Q. 57. What, then, is your meaning when you assert, as in your FIRST reason for calling Christ the Head of authority in the Church, that the Church is subject to the laws of Christ, and to them alone ?

A. The meaning is, that the Church as such—in the exercise of all the functions with which Christ has clothed it—in all that relates to the bestowal of its offices and the dispensation of its ordinances—in its doctrine, worship, discipline, and government—and, in fine, to adopt the language of the celebrated Act of the Scottish Parliament 1592, in respect of “the privilege God has given to the spiritual office-bearers of the Kirk concerning heads of religion, matters of heresy, excommunication, collation or deprivation of ministers, and such like essential censures, specially grounded and having warrant in the Word of God;”—is to be governed agreeably to no other laws but those which the Lord Jesus himself has prescribed. (Ps. ii. 6; Luke i. 32, 33; Isa. xxxiii. 22; 1 Cor. vii. 23; Gal. i. 10.)

Q. 58. Where are the laws of Christ to be found ?

A. In the Bible, which is the only statute-book of his Church.

Q. 59. *Are the laws of Christ, as contained in the Bible, sufficient for all the purposes of Church government?*

A. Perfectly sufficient. It is impossible for any case to arise which may not be decided in conformity with Christ's will, on a reference to the directions which the Bible affords, and the principles it lays down.* (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17; Ps. cxix. 105.)

Q. 60. *Can you give a case in illustration?*

A. Yes. The translation of ministers from one charge to another is such a case; and the rule, "Let all things be done unto edifying" (1 Cor. xiv. 26), will suffice to enable prayerful men to decide it. The appointment of collegiate ministers, the holding of a plurality of offices, and the institution of new charges, are to be judged of and determined by the same rule.

Q. 61. *In what light are the Acts of Church Assemblies to be viewed?*

A. They are not new or additional laws, regulating points on which the mind of Christ has not been revealed, or cannot be ascertained, but declarations of the laws of Christ, and applications of these laws, and of the principles involved in them, to particular cases or circumstances. (Acts xv. 6-29, compared with 1 Cor. viii.)

* "All the *substantials* of Church government under the New Testament are laid down in the Word in particular rules, whether they be touching officers, ordinances, censures, assemblies, and the compass of their power; . . . and all the *circumstantials* are laid down in the Word under general rules of order, decency, and edification."—*The London Ministers on the Divine Right of Church Government*, p. 47.

Q. 62. *Can you illustrate what you have now said?*

A. Easily. The well-known Veto Act was simply an application of Christ's great law of Christian liberty to the particular case of the settlement of ministers; and most of the minute rules connected with that Act were just an application of that other great law, "Let all things be done decently and in order," to the same case.*

Q. 63. *If you found Church judicatories passing Acts irrespective of the laws of Christ in the Bible, and introducing, at their own discretion, rites and institutions for which there is no Scripture warrant, what would you say?*

A. That these judicatories were arrogating to themselves Christ's prerogative as the Lawgiver of his Church.

Q. 64. *And if you found them, in matters properly ecclesiastical, passing Acts, not for applying or administering the laws of the Bible, but for applying Parliamentary laws and the judgments of civil tribunals, and carrying into effect the principles embodied in these, what would you say?*

A. That they were putting the civil power into Christ's place as Lawgiver of the Church.

Q. 65. *And what would you say of the civil legislature that should affect to regulate the internal affairs of the Church by its enactments?*

A. That it was assuming Christ's prerogative as the Lawgiver of the Church, and putting its own statute-book in the room of the Bible.

* The case of the Veto Act is adduced because it is so well known, and not because it is thought to exhibit a very successful or perfect application of the great Bible law of Christian liberty.

Q. 66. *Is this a thing ever done by civil legislatures?*

A. Often. The Acts of the British Parliament for increasing and diminishing the number of bishops in the Church of England, are examples. The Act of the reign of Queen Anne, concerning patronage in Scotland, as that Act is now explained by the civil courts, is also an instance.

Q. 67. *But is not patronage a civil right?*

A. The right of nomination to a benefice or living is a civil right; but the right of nomination to the pastoral office is not, and cannot warrantably be treated as a civil right, any more than the right of ordaining to that office.

Q. 68. *Does not the Act of Queen Anne confine itself to the right of nomination to the living?*

A. It was at one time understood to do so; but now, as will on all hands be allowed, it is extended to the right of nomination to the office of a minister of Christ. A farther encroachment is made on the ecclesiastical territory by the Scotch Benefices' Act (commonly called Lord Aberdeen's), which regulates the formation of the pastoral tie.

Q. 69. *May it not be pleaded that these and similar Acts of Parliament should be regarded in the same light as the Acts of Church courts, viz., not as new laws, or as superseding the authority of Scripture, but merely as declaring and applying the laws and principles which the inspired Word contains?*

A. That plea is met by the second reason which was assigned for calling Christ the Head of authority to the Church, namely, that the government of the Church pertains exclusively to the office-bearers whom Christ has set over it.

PART II.—*The Church Governed only by the Office-Bearers Christ has placed over it.*

Q. 70. *What is your meaning by this?*

A. The meaning is, that the office-bearers of the Church are the only parties who have a right to declare authoritatively, to apply, or administer, the laws of Christ in ecclesiastical affairs.

Q. 71. *May not the office-bearers of the Church come under a CIVIL OBLIGATION to take and act upon a specified view, and to make certain specified applications of the laws of Christ?*

A. If they do, they abdicate the function which Christ has conferred upon them, and the civil magistrate comes into the place Christ has assigned to them as the governors of his house.

Q. 72. *Why is it so?*

A. It is so from the very nature of a civil obligation.

Q. 73. *What is a civil obligation?*

A. An obligation which it is competent and proper to enforce by the secular arm, and the breach of which is punishable with damages, imprisonment, and other civil pains and penalties.

Q. 74. *Does it make no difference if the view to which the office-bearers of the Church are restricted by civil obligation be a sound one?*

A. It makes no difference at all; for it is not on account of its soundness that they must walk by the particular view, but simply because of civil obligation, and the command of the magistrate.

Q. 75. *Do all matters of civil obligation belong to the government of the civil power?*

A. They necessarily do.

Q. 76. *What, then, follows, when the administration of Church affairs is made matter of civil obligation?*

A. The administration of Church affairs belongs, in that case, to the province and government of the civil power.

Q. 77. *And in what light are Church office-bearers to be viewed, when the ordaining of ministers, the forming of the pastoral tie, and the general duty of Church government, are made matters of civil obligation?*

A. They are to be viewed as the organs through whom the State exerts its spiritual authority, and executes its spiritual business; and as the deputies, commissioners, and vicegerents of the civil magistrate for disposing of causes and matters ecclesiastical.

Q. 78. *Does there remain to the Church, under these circumstances, any government "distinct from the civil magistrate?"**

A. None whatever.

Q. 79. *What would be the effect of a civil obligation to depose heretical and immoral ministers, and to exclude heretical and immoral members from the communion of the Church?*

A. The effect would be, to entitle the civil magistrate to receive appeals from the decisions of Church courts in cases of heresy and immorality, and to reverse and annul Church censures when he

* "The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hands of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate."—*Confession of Faith*, xxxi. 1.

deemed the charge irrelevant or the proof insufficient.

Q. 80. *What would be the effect of a civil obligation to preach Bible doctrine, and to conduct public worship in a scriptural and edifying manner?*

A. The effect would be, to make the magistrate the judge of the sermons and the prayers of the ministers of the Gospel, and to entitle him to punish them with the temporal sword if *he thought* their sermons or their prayers to be unscriptural or unprofitable.

Q. 81. *Do these objections apply to a civil obligation which can be got rid of—say by resigning the temporalities and privileges of an Establishment—whenever conscience would feel aggrieved by fulfilling it?*

A. Yes, and with force unabated. So long as Church office-bearers are under civil obligation in ecclesiastical affairs, they are but the instruments of the magistrate, who is the real governor of the Church all the while. To say that they can escape, when they please, from civil obligation, is merely to say that they can resume their proper place and functions as the only lawful rulers of the Church, and cannot, therefore, avail to show that they have not, in the meantime, given them up.

Q. 82. *But has it not been asserted that the magistrate has a divine right to some share in the government of the Church?*

A. It has.*

Q. 83. *On what grounds?*

A. Chiefly because of the part taken by godly Jewish magistrates, such as David, Jehoshaphat,

* See Article xxxvii. of the Church of England.

Hezekiah, &c., in restoring and regulating the ancient Church of Israel.

Q. 84. *How do you confute those that argue in this manner?*

A. The answer generally is, that many things may and ought to be done in extraordinary circumstances, as when the Church has been disorganized and broken up through the spread of idolatry or by the arm of persecution, which are not warrantable in ordinary times;—that the Jewish State, moreover, differed from all others, in respect that the civil law itself was given by express revelation from God; that all who were subject to it were members of God's Church by birth; and that false religions were to be put down by the civil power: in respect, also, that the monarchy, at least in the case of those who reformed and regulated the Church, was a type of the kingly office of Christ; that the kings were sometimes themselves inspired prophets (as David and Solomon), and as such, *were office-bearers in the Church*; that they always had prophets (as Gad, Nathan, Hanani, Isaiah, &c.) to direct them in the service of God, and in the application of their authority to the concerns of his Church; and that it appears to have been their practice to consult these prophets, and to receive, by their means, special communications of the divine will on all great emergencies. (1 Chron. xxix. 22, 23; 2 Chron. xviii. 4, 6; xix., xx. 14; 2 Kings iii. 11; xix., xx, xxiii. 2.)

Q. 85. *Did not Paul appeal unto Cæsar?*

A. Yes, when an attempt was made to subject him to civil penalties, and a crime against the State was laid to his charge. (Acts xxiv. 5; xxv. 8-11.)

Q. 86. *Is the notion that God has assigned to the civil magistrate some share in the government of the Church consistent with the principle of religious toleration?*

A. It is subversive of that principle. If the magistrate possesses, *by divine right*, authority in the Church, that authority must extend to all the sections of Christ's Church that exist in his dominions, whether publicly endowed or voluntarily supported—whether they conscientiously object to his interference as unlawful, or approve of it as warranted and required by Scripture; and must necessarily be exercised according to the particular views of religious truth and duty that happen to be entertained by him, and, therefore, so as to lead to the suppression of all diversity of faith and ecclesiastical polity.

Q. 87. *By what arguments do you prove that the office-bearers of the Christian Church are alone entitled to administer its government?*

A. By such arguments as these: Christ has committed to them the undivided power of the keys (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; John xx. 23); has laid the whole responsibility of the government of the Church upon them (Acts xx. 17, 28; 1 Pet. v. 1-4; Rev. ii. 14-20); has addressed to them all the directions for carrying it on (Matt. xviii. 15-18; Tit. i. 5-9; iii. 10; 1 Tim. iii., v.), and all the promises of grace for the performance of it (Matt. xxviii. 20; 2 Cor. xi. 28, compared with xii. 9; Eph. iv. 7, 11, 12); has described the rewards of success in it as rewards to be gained only by them (1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Pet. v. 4); has declared the correlative duty of obedience in Church affairs,

which is incumbent on private Christians, to be a duty of obedience to them (1 Thess. v. 12; Heb. xiii. 7, 17); has not enjoined obedience to the magistrate except in civil matters (Rom. xiii. 1-7; Luke xii. 13, 14); has prescribed qualifications for ecclesiastical rule in the case of Church office-bearers, and has prescribed no such qualifications in the case of civil governors (1 Tim. iii. 4, 5; Tit. i. 5-11); has declared the power with which the magistrate is armed to be the power of the sword—which is a kind of power that cannot, without persecution, be used for governing the Church (Rom. xiii. 4); and, in fine, has drawn the line of demarcation between the provinces of Church and State, so that the rulers of the one may not cross the boundaries of the other, by his memorable language to Pilate: “My kingdom is not of this world.” (John xviii. 36.)

Q. 88. *Does not an alliance between Church and State necessarily imply that a certain share in the government of the Church pertains to the civil power?*

A. Church and State may be, and at present actually are, connected, upon terms and principles that make the magistrate a judge and ruler over the Church; but an alliance, as such, involves nothing of the kind, any more than an alliance between two independent nations, as France and Britain, involves the subjection of one of them to the other.

Q. 89. *What is the true idea of an alliance between Church and State?*

A. A covenant of mutual friendship, co-operation, and assistance.

Q. 90. *When it becomes a question whether or*

not the terms of alliance have been kept by one of the parties, who is to decide?

A. Neither party can decide for the other without destroying its independence. Each must decide for itself.

Q. 91. *May not the civil court, as a third and neutral party, be competent conclusively to settle such disputes?*

A. The civil court, from its very nature, cannot be a third party in such a case. It is merely the organ and instrument of the State.

Q. 92. *What, then, is it competent for the State to do, if it is of opinion, or if its tribunals decide, that the Church has broken the terms of alliance?*

A. The only thing, after trying to convince the Church of its error, is to put an end to the alliance, and withdraw the civil benefits it had conferred.

Q. 93. *What would you say if, instead of doing that, the State should resort to fines, and other penalties for compelling the Church to act according to its views?*

A. That it was assuming to itself the government of the Church.

Q. 94. *But are not Church office-bearers truly the rulers of the Church, so long as they alone perform the solemn act of ordination, and inflict the censures of discipline?*

A. No; it is not enough that they do these things. They are but the instruments and mere hands of the magistrate, so long as they have the circumstances under which, or the rules and principles agreeably to which, these things are or are not to be done, peremptorily prescribed by the civil power, and enforced with the temporal sword.

Q. 95. *Are the office-bearers of the Church, then, not liable to err?*

A. Doubtless they may err; but the magistrate also may err, and is all the more likely to do it when he assumes a jurisdiction for which he is neither qualified nor commissioned.

Q. 96. *Is there no remedy open to those who may be aggrieved by the proceedings of the office-bearers of the Church?*

A. They have a remedy; they can take their appeal to the Head of the Church.

Q. 97. *What does this right of appeal imply?*

A. That the right of *private judgment* belongs to the individual members and office-bearers of the Church.

Q. 98. *Are those who take an appeal to Christ, at liberty to disregard the sentence or proceedings of which they complain?*

A. They are, but at their peril, and as they shall answer to Christ when he decides on their appeal.

PART III.—*The Power and Authority Exercised in the Church Derived, in every age, immediately from Christ.*

Q. 99. *What do you mean by asserting, as in your THIRD reason for calling Christ the Head of authority in the Church, that he is the immediate Fountain and Dispenser of the power and authority which are exercised in the Church by its office-bearers?*

A. That the power and authority of the pastors and rulers of the Church are not derived by transmission from their predecessors, but come directly from Christ, the Head; in other words, that Christ did

not give a deposit of communicable power and authority to the first ministers of his Church, and then ascend to heaven, and keep aloof, leaving them and their converts, and all that came after, to make the best of it, without any subsequent supply; but that, having in himself the only deposit of power and authority that are capable of communication, and retaining in his own hands the issue thereof through every age, he is with his Church alway, for the purpose of dispensing them, and ever present among his people, as he promised to be—walking, the Author and Bestower of every gift, in the midst of the golden candlesticks. (Matt. xxviii. 18, 20; Rev. ii. 1; iii. 1, 7.)

Q. 100. *Is anything else implied in the doctrine which your third reason lays down?*

A. It is also implied that the members of the Church are not the source of the power and authority of the office-bearers, and that these are not conveyed by the congregational act of election. (Acts xx. 28; Luke xii. 42.)

Q. 101. *How are Church power and authority conveyed by Christ?*

A. Through the commission, or warrant and call, which every pastor and Church ruler receives from him. (Matt. ix. 38; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Heb. v. 4.)

Q. 102. *Must not every Church office-bearer be ordained by those who have been in office before him?*

A. Yes, in ordinary circumstances, that must be done. (Acts vi. 3, 6; xiv. 23; Tit. i. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 14.)

Q. 103. *Does not the act of admitting to the ministry convey the power and authority that are necessary to the exercise thereof?*

A. Not otherwise than power and authority can be said to be conveyed by the act of the commander of an army, when he receives among his officers, or by the act of a bench of judges, or the senate of a royal college, when they receive into their body, the individual who has the warrant and commission of his sovereign.

Q. 104. *Whence are the power and authority of any office derived?*

A. Not from those that only ministerially admit to it; but from the party by whom it is created or instituted, and from whom the commission to hold it, and the warrant to admit to the discharge of its duties, proceed. (Acts xx. 28.)

Q. 105. *Can you illustrate this subject from any of the anointings that were practised in Old Testament times?*

A. Yes. When David was anointed by Samuel to be king over Israel (1 Sam. xvi.), when Hazael was anointed by the prophet of the Hebrews to be king over Syria (1 Kings xix. 15), and when Jehu was anointed to be king of the ten tribes, by one of the children of the prophets (2 Kings ix. 1-6), there could be no transmission of the royal authority by the parties who severally anointed these monarchs; and the ceremony could amount to no more than a divinely commanded recognition and dedication of the individuals to the office for which they were chosen of the Lord, and the authority of which was directly conveyed in the call which the Lord addressed to them.

Q. 106. *Do we not obtain a farther illustration from the anointing of the high priests in the ancient Church?*

A. We do. There could not be transmission, from the party anointing, of the powers and functions of the high priesthood, when Aaron was anointed; and still less could there be, when Aaron's descendants, each after the death of the high priest that went before him, were successively anointed. (Exod. xxix.)

Q. 107. *How were the Levites ordained to their ministry in the Old Testament Church?*

A. The children of Israel laid their hands on them, and Aaron offered them before the Lord. (Numb. viii. 10, 11.)

Q. 108. *What did the ceremony imply?*

A. It implied the setting apart and admission of the Levites to the service to which the Lord had called them. (Numb. viii. 14, 19, 22.)

Q. 109. *What is the duty and peculiar function of Church rulers in the matter of sending forth ministers of the Gospel?*

A. Their duty is, to ascertain the individuals whom *the Lord hath chosen* (Acts i. 24); that is to say, whom the Lord is calling, and to whom he is now addressing the commission (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; John xx. 21) which he addressed, in the first instance, to the apostles; and, having done so, to recognise, set apart, and admit these individuals as ministers in the Church.

Q. 110. *What was the course pursued in appointing a successor to Judas?*

A. First, by looking for the person best qualified; and next, by casting the lot between two who seemed equally eligible, the mind of the Lord was ascertained, and the person was found out whom the Lord had chosen. This being done, Matthias

was recognised as Christ's servant, and admitted to his office by being "numbered with the eleven apostles." (Acts i. 21-26.)

Q. 111. *Was the same course followed when deacons were appointed?*

A. Substantially the same. The persons most acceptable to the disciples, and most eminent for the gifts and graces that were necessary and proper for the office, were sought out; and they whom the Lord had chosen, and to whom his warrant and call were addressed, having thus been discovered, the apostles admitted them to their duties by prayer and the imposition of hands. (Acts vi. 1-6.)

Q. 112. *How did the ordination of Paul and Barnabas to their great Gentile mission take place?*

A. The Holy Ghost announced that the Lord had chosen and called them to that service, and commanded the pastors of Antioch to "separate" them, or set them apart for it. (Acts xiii. 1, 2.)

Q. 113. *What did the Church rulers of Antioch then do?*

A. "When they had fasted and prayed, they laid their hands on them, and sent them away." (Acts xiii. 3.)

Q. 114. *What did this act of appointment really amount to?*

A. To a recognition of Paul and Barnabas as having the Lord's commission and call, a solemn dedication of them to their work, and a formal admission of them to the discharge of its duties.

Q. 115. *What lesson may be drawn from the use made of the Presbytery of Antioch on this occasion?*

A. That the ordination of ministers to the ser-

vice of their Master by the rulers of his Church is of great importance, and, when it can be had, is not to be dispensed with.

Q. 116. *How was Timothy ordained?*

A. The gift of the ministry was given him, we are told, "by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." (1 Tim. iv. 14.)

Q. 117. *What are we to understand by this?*

A. That the Holy Ghost announced him by special revelation, as one whom the Lord had chosen to serve him in the Gospel; and that, in due time, the presbytery formally recognised him as such, and as having Christ's warrant and call, and thereupon admitted him to the work by the imposition of hands.

Q. 118. *Do apostolic times furnish any examples of persons having authority to preach the Gospel although not ordained?*

A. They do. Apollos was without ordination, and yet the Lord accepted and blessed his ministry. (Acts xviii. 24-28; 1 Cor. iii. 5, 6.) Philip, so far as appears, had only a deacon's ordination, and yet he preached and baptized, and was approved of the Lord (Acts viii. 5-12, 26-40); and they that were scattered abroad by the persecution that arose about Stephen, and who, there is reason for thinking, were private members of the Church, went everywhere preaching the Word, and the hand of the Lord was with them. (Acts viii. 1, 4; xi. 19-21.)

Q. 119. *What inferences are to be deduced from these things?*

A. That the call and commission of Christ are distinct from the ordination of Christ's servants;

that it is the former that convey the power and authority of spiritual office; and that there may be a lawful ministry in the Christian Church without any personal succession from the apostles of our Lord.

Q. 120. *What is to be drawn from the case of the person, mentioned in Mark ix. 38-41, who was improperly checked by the disciples, when he was casting out devils in Christ's name?*

A. That the fact of casting out devils in Christ's name was evidence that he was not without authority from Christ so to do.

Q. 121. *Are we not thus supplied with an argument from analogy on the subject of ministerial authority?*

A. Yes. It may hence be inferred that the fact of successfully preaching the Gospel, and driving Satan from sinners' hearts by the Word, proves that they who do so have authority from Christ. (1 Cor. ix. 2.)

Q. 122. *Would you infer, from these examples, that men, in settled times, and under ordinary circumstances, may enter upon the ministry without the sanction of the rulers of the Church?*

A. Certainly not.

Q. 123. *Do you say that the blessing of God on an individual's ministry is enough to prove that there was no irregularity or sin in the manner of entering upon its exercise?*

A. No; but it may be held to prove that there was a divine call to the work, and that the individual is accepted as a servant of the Lord.

Q. 124. *Supposing that it was not through the*

immediate call of Christ, but through the line of an unbroken series of ordinations, coming downwards from the first ministers of Christianity, that the power of office in the Church, and the commission to preach the Gospel, were conveyed, what would the consequence be?

A. One of two things would be true, *either* that the great Roman Antichrist—that mystical woman who is drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus—is capable of constituting a minister of Christ, and of imparting Christ's authority and commission, and that this, in fact, is what it does every time it ordains a priest to say mass; *or*, that the Church of Christ must be held to be at present, and to have been for ages, without ministers, and that nobody whatever can be reasonably regarded as at this moment having authority and commission from Christ to labour in his Gospel.

Q. 125. *What conclusion must persons of evangelical views, who hold the doctrine of apostolical succession, as commonly understood, be prepared to adopt?*

A. That probably ninety-nine out of every hundred of the pastors and ministers all over the globe, who have been called and commissioned by Christ, are unfaithful and unworthy—idolatrous priests of the Romish and Eastern Churches, or strangers to vital religion; and that, of those pastors and ministers who are faithful and worthy, and by whose instrumentality the cause of Christ is actively carried on in the world, there are perhaps nine out of every ten—a vast majority, at all events—not in Prelatical succession from the apostles, and whom

Christ has therefore neither called nor commissioned.*

Q. 126. *Has the Lord given his Church any permanent rule for ascertaining the individuals whom he calls to be his ministers?*

A. Yes.

Q. 127. *How has he done this?*

A. By describing in his Word the qualifications and endowments which he confers upon those to whom his call and commission are addressed (1 Tim. iii. 1-12; Tit. i. 5-9); and by intimating that, in his bestowal of the special grace for office, there is the token and evidence of his call to the exercise of it. (Rom. xii. 6-8; 1 Cor. xii. 7-11, 28; 1 Pet. iv. 10.)

Q. 128. *When may an individual ordinarily conclude that he is chosen and called of the Lord to the ministry?*

A. When he finds reason to believe that zeal for the divine glory and love to souls are inclining him to the work; when a field of labour is in providence set before him; and when the Church and

* The Church of England, whose ordination service is constructed on the principle of the transmission of authority from the ordainer to the ordained, makes a lamentable distinction between the priests of Rome and the pastors of non-Episcopal communions—insisting upon re-ordination in the case of the latter, before she admits them to the ministry within her pale, and not requiring it in the case of the former, because *they* have already had Episcopal ordination! A more emphatic and pregnant declaration that Popish priests have Christ's commission, and that Presbyterian and Congregational pastors have it not, could not be given. It is a public and standing affront to the sister Churches of the Reformation. It is an indignity to Christ, whose ministers she disowns, and whose commission she prefers to recognise as in the hands of the servants of Antichrist.

its rulers are prepared to recognise him as one whom the Lord hath chosen and called.

Q. 129. *Is the possession of suitable qualifications enough of itself to show that the Lord is calling an individual to the charge of a particular congregation?*

A. It is not enough; there must be something besides, to show that, of the various individuals who may be qualified for the ministry in a particular congregation, and of the various congregations for the charge of which a particular individual may be qualified, the Lord is calling the particular individual to serve him in the particular congregation.

Q. 130. *What must there be to show this?*

A. There must be lawful nomination or election to the particular charge.

Q. 131. *What do you hold in regard to the individual who, out of the general number of those that may be qualified for a particular charge, is competently elected or nominated to it?*

A. That he has a title to ordination and admission by the rulers of the Church.

PART IV.—*Church Power, and the Use of it.*

Q. 132. *What is Church power commonly called?*

A. The power of the keys. (Matt. xvi. 19.)

Q. 133. *Why is it so named?*

A. To denote that it is delegated and ministerial. (Isa. xxii. 20-22.)

Q. 134. *How is it divided?*

A. Into four parts.

Q. 135. *What is the first?*

A. The *dogmatic* power, in virtue of which the doctrines and laws of the Word are declared, and religious controversies are determined. (Acts xv.)

Q. 136. *What is the second?*

A. The power of *order*, in virtue of which arrangements are made and rules are framed for doing all things in an orderly, decent, and edifying manner. (1 Cor. xiv. 26, 40.)

Q. 137. *What is the third?*

A. The power of *discipline*, in virtue of which admission is given to Church privileges, scandals are investigated, and censures pronounced, both on office-bearers and members of the Church. (Matt. xviii. 18.)

Q. 138. *What is the fourth?*

A. The power of *ordination*, in virtue of which those who are found to be duly qualified and called are admitted to the offices Christ has instituted in the Church. (2 Tim. ii. 2.)

Q. 139. *When is the dogmatic power abused?*

A. When it is made the pretext for a claim of infallibility, and employed to subvert the right of private judgment; and when that implicit submission, which is due only to the Word, is demanded for Church formularies and decrees.

Q. 140. *Who are guilty of this abuse?*

A. Romanists, who say the Church is infallible; and Tractarians, who require implicit faith in it.

Q. 141. *When is the power of order abused?*

A. When rites and observances are instituted which have no warrant in the Word; and divinely appointed ordinances are modified or set aside.

Q. 142. *When is the power of discipline abused?*

A. When due care is not taken to exclude from sealing ordinances the ignorant and the scandalous; and when censures are inflicted harshly, without sufficient evidence of guilt, or against the liberties which Christ has bestowed.

Q. 143. *When is the power of ordination abused?*

A. When it is exercised in cases where there is no sufficient evidence of Christ's call to the ministry; when it is made the basis of a claim to transmit the authority of ecclesiastical office; and when it is confounded with, and made a pretence for, a power of conveying the Holy Ghost.

PART V.—*Conclusion.*

Q. 144. *Who are they that violate the crown-rights of Christ as the Head of authority to the Church?*

A. They are such as seek to subject the Church to human laws, in place of, or in addition to, his laws in the Scriptures; and such as allow either more or less authority and power to Church office-bearers than he has given them.

Q. 145. *How do the Popish Church, and Romanizing sects, violate Christ's prerogative in this respect?*

A. By adding their own laws to his laws, and putting their interpretations of his laws in the room of his laws themselves; and by laying claim to a power of bestowing commission and authority on his servants.

Q. 146. *How do Erastians violate the prerogative of our Lord?*

A. By partially or wholly transferring to the civil magistrate the authority and power over the Church which belong only to Christ, and the jurisdiction which he has committed to the office-bearers of the Church.

Q. 147. *But when the governors of the State lay*

down the rules and principles of Church government, and ultimately decide therein, according to their views of what is scriptural, and for edification, is not Christ truly acknowledged to be Head of the Church?

A. When those whom Christ has called and commissioned to conduct the affairs of his Church in his name, and for his glory, do, with the book of his laws in their hands, and with prayer in their hearts for the Holy Spirit to give them right understanding of it, to direct them in the application of its principles, and to lead them to the adoption of measures by which the body of Christ may be edified, engage in the discharge of that duty, the Headship of Christ is acknowledged and maintained: on the other hand, when civil governors—whom Christ has nowhere called and commissioned to conduct the affairs of his Church; who have, therefore, no reason to hope for his countenance and blessing while so employed; who generally are, moreover, and, until nations are greatly changed, may be expected to be, men of secular views, and without love to Christ, or spiritual discernment, or any desire for heavenly direction—take upon them ecclesiastical authority, enact ecclesiastical rules, decide ecclesiastical questions, and issue their orders in particular cases to ecclesiastical office-bearers—even although they should profess to be guided by the Bible in all these proceedings—the Headship of Christ is disowned and cast aside, his ministers are turned into functionaries of the State, and his kingdom becomes a province of the civil jurisdiction.

Q. 148. *Has the principle of Christ's Headship,*

in respect of authority, an important bearing on the purity and progress of the Gospel, and the edification and increase of the Church?

A. It has. To intercept the communion of spiritual office-bearers with Christ himself, and his mind and will as contained in the Bible, whether as regards doctrine, discipline, or ecclesiastical administration, must have an injurious effect on the feelings and character of the office-bearers themselves, and must act perniciously on the interests of the Gospel and the true prosperity of the Church. (Matt. vi. 24; Gal. i. 10.)

Q. 149. *Does our Lord's Headship over the nations convey to Church rulers any civil authority, or any right of controlling the magistrate in the performance of the duties of his office?*

A. No. (Luke xii. 13, 14.)

Q. 150. *What is the difference between the Popish and the Erastian view of the jurisdiction of the Church, as regards the civil magistrate?*

A. By the former, the Church's authority is extended over the province of the magistrate; and by the latter, the magistrate is made supreme in the province of the Church.

Q. 151. *Where lies the truth, as respects these views?*

A. The truth lies between. Both the magistrate and the Church are entitled to be free. Neither has any lawful authority over the other. (John xviii. 36.)

CHAPTER III.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND
FOR THE HEADSHIP OF CHRIST.

Q. 152. *Of how many parts does the Church of Scotland's testimony for the Headship of Christ consist?*

A. Of four parts.

1. There is her anti-Papal testimony for it.
2. Her anti-Prelatical testimony for it.
3. Her anti-Patronage testimony for it.
4. Her anti-Erastian testimony for it.

SECTION I.—THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND'S ANTI-PAPAL
TESTIMONY FOR THE HEADSHIP OF CHRIST.

Q. 153. *When did the Church of Scotland first specially appear as a witness for the Headship of Christ?*

A. When, along with the rest of the Churches of the Reformation, she threw off the supremacy of the Pope.

Q. 154. *Did all the Protestant Churches act as witnesses for the Headship of Christ, when they rejected the Papal dominion?*

A. No.

Q. 155. *Why do you say that?*

A. Because most of them acquiesced, to a greater or less extent, in the assumption, by other parties, of the ecclesiastical supremacy which had been wrested from the Pope.

Q. 156. *Did the Church of Scotland do so?*

A. No; from the beginning she maintained that it was Christ's place that the Pope had usurped in the Church, and she resisted all attempts on the part of others to intrude into it.

Q. 157. *What is the substantial import of her anti-Papal testimony for the Headship of Christ?*

A. The substance of it is, that the Pope is that Man of Sin who—opposing and exalting himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God—usurps the place of Christ as Head of ordinances, of knowledge, of influence, and of authority in the Church.

Q. 158. *To what period in the history of the Church of Scotland does her anti-Papal testimony for Christ's Headship principally belong?*

A. To the period of her first Reformation.

Q. 159. *How has this testimony been exhibited?*

A. In the sufferings of her martyrs, the labours of her ministers, the obligations of her covenants, and the solemn declarations of her standards.

Q. 160. *Who were her most eminent martyrs in this cause?*

A. Patrick Hamilton, George Wishart, and Walter Mill.

Q. 161. *What minister was most distinguished as an instrument raised up by God to guide her into the position of a witness for Christ and his prerogatives against the Roman Antichrist?*

A. John Knox.

Q. 162. *Is it not the fact that Knox appealed to the nobility and civil estate of the realm against an ecclesiastical sentence?*

A. It is the fact that he thus appealed from a

sentence that was passed by a conclave of Romish ecclesiastics.

Q. 163. *Was not this an admission on his part that the spiritual supremacy which had been exercised by the Pope belonged to the civil magistrate?*

A. Not so, indeed. The sentence he appealed from, although passed by ecclesiastics, was a temporal sentence, decreeing the penalty of death against him; and his appeal implied simply that the magistrate alone had the power of the sword.

Q. 164. *In what covenants was the Church's testimony displayed?*

A. There was a number of "bands" or covenants directed against the Papal sway. Several were adopted before August 1560, when the separation from Rome was formally effected; but by far the most remarkable and celebrated was the National Covenant, subscribed, 1580-81, by the king, his household, and persons of all ranks throughout the country, in conformity with an ordinance of the Lords of Secret Council, and Acts of the General Assembly.

Q. 165. *In what standards are the declarations exhibiting the Church's testimony to be found?*

A. Chiefly in her Confessions of Faith.*

Q. 166. *Is her testimony brought down to the present day?*

* The Old, or John Knox's, Confession, which the Church adopted in 1560, contains the following declaration:—

"Our Head and only Mediator, Christ Jesus, we confess and avow to be the Messias promised, the only Head of his Kirk, our just Lawgiver, our only High Priest, Advocate, and Mediator. In which honours and offices, if man or angel presume to intrude themselves, we utterly detest them as blasphemous to our Sovereign and Supreme Governor, Christ Jesus."—*Old Confession of Faith*, art. 11.

A. It is, in the Westminster Confession.

Q. 167. *How does that formulary express it?*

A. "There is no other Head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome, in any sense, be Head thereof; but is that Antichrist, that Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God."

SECTION II.—THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND'S ANTI-PRELATICAL TESTIMONY FOR THE HEADSHIP OF CHRIST.

Q. 168. *Wherein does the Church's anti-Prelatical testimony consist?*

A. In the opposition of her judicatories to Prelacy and its usages, and in the sacrifices and sufferings of her office-bearers and members on account of their nonconformity.

Q. 169. *What is the system of Prelacy?*

A. It is that which vests the government of the Church and the power of ordination in the hands of *prelates*—that is to say, pastors or bishops of a superior order.

Q. 170. *Why say you that the Church of Scotland's testimony against the system of Prelacy is a testimony for the Headship of Christ?*

A. Because ordinary pastors and presbyters are deprived by that system of the ecclesiastical power and authority which Christ, as Head of ordinances, has attached to their office; and because it has, in every age, and to a great extent, been accompanied by claims and pretensions inconsistent with the prerogatives of Christ, as Head of ordinances, of knowledge, of influence, and of authority.

Q. 171. *What are some of the claims and pretensions referred to?*

A. In connection with Prelatic government, there has generally been a claim of authority to decree rites and ceremonies—that is to say, to introduce new ordinances, and to modify those which Christ has appointed—and to fix and determine the meaning of Scripture by ecclesiastical interpretations; power has been alleged to unite men to Christ, to bestow pardon of sins, and to regenerate by means of baptism; and prelates are asserted to have the faculty of conveying Christ's commission, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, to all on whom they please to lay their hands.

Q. 172. *How often has Prelacy been cast out of the Scottish Church Establishment?*

A. Three times, viz., when Presbyterianism was ratified in 1592, at the beginning of the second Reformation in 1638, and at the Revolution in 1689.

Q. 173. *To what period in the Church of Scotland's history may her anti-Prelatical testimony be said more peculiarly to belong?*

A. To the period of the second Reformation.

Q. 174. *Why so?*

A. Because it was then that her antagonism to Prelacy was most decisively and energetically developed, that the system received its most signal overthrow at her hands, and that the famed bulwarks of solemn national covenants were reared against it; and because, in the whole of her after testimony, regard was ever had, more or less, to what was then achieved, and to the position then taken up.

Q. 175. *What were the most remarkable steps of the second Reformation?*

A. These four, viz., the renewal of the National Covenant, with a bond renouncing Prelacy and the Articles of Perth; the pulling down of Prelacy by the Assembly held at Glasgow in 1638; the adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant, whereby Scotland united with England and Ireland in an anti-Papal and anti-Prelatical alliance; and the approval and acceptance of the Calvinistic and Presbyterian standards drawn up by the Westminster divines.

Q. 176. *What has the era preceding the second Reformation been sometimes called?*

A. The era of the first Scottish Prelacy.

Q. 177. *Was not the second Reformation preceded by two distinct Prelacies, namely, one before, and another after, Presbytery was established in 1592?*

A. The constitution of the Church of Scotland was originally Presbyterian; but it is true that, in 1572, a kind of Prelacy was introduced at what has been called the Convention of Leith: Episcopalian authorities, however, rather disown it, because the prelates never received consecration, and were subject to trial and censure by the General Assembly.

Q. 178. *Are there any Prelatic usages by which the era of the first Prelacy was characterized?*

A. Yes; in a packed Assembly, held at Perth in 1618, five articles were passed, introducing the observance of certain holidays (viz., Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost), the rite of confirmation, kneeling at the Lord's supper, private baptism, and private communion.

Q. 179. *Were these articles complied with?*

A. By many they were not, being regarded as

unwarranted by Scripture, and therefore passed in violation of the Headship of Christ.*

* The grounds of opposition to the Five Articles of Perth were such as these, viz. :—

As to holidays.—That there is Scripture warrant and example for *one* stated holiday in the Christian Church, namely, the first day of every week; that there is also Scripture warrant for *occasional* days of religious observance, whether as days of humiliation or thanksgiving, according to the Lord's dealings with his Church and people; but that, beyond this, the authority of Scripture does not go; that, if God had intended that his Church should, in Christian times, have stated holidays over and above the weekly Sabbath, it may be believed that he would have appointed them, as he did in the case of the Old Testament Church, or, at all events, that there would have been some evidence that the apostles kept them; and that, for man to establish certain *annual* holidays, in addition to the *weekly* holiday which God has established, is an act of will-worship—is an assumption of the very power by which the Sabbath itself was instituted; and is therefore an infringement of the rights of Christ as the only Head and Lawgiver of the Church. It was held, also, that one purpose for which the Christian Sabbath was given was, that there might be a weekly commemoration of the birth, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and of the effusion of the Holy Spirit; and that the unauthorized appointment of annual commemorations of these events had some tendency to make them be forgotten, or but slightly regarded, on the day which the Lord himself had hallowed and set apart for their weekly commemoration.

As to confirmation.—That it was without divine authority or apostolic example, and, therefore, an ordinance wholly of human origin, which duty to Christ, as Head of ordinances, required them to reject. It was also considered to have a tendency to promote self-deception and false peace among the people, and to aggrandize the Prelatical order.

As to kneeling at the Lord's supper.—That, however plausibly it might be defended as an attitude that was devout, and that was the most becoming of any for sinners, when making so near an approach to God, it was liable to the fatal objection, that it did not receive the sanction of the Head of ordinances, when he instituted the supper; that Christ knew best what was the most appropriate attitude, and that he had adopted the posture commonly used at table when taking meat; that this posture served to express the holy familiarity to which Christ graciously admits his people—an end which could not be so well answered

Q. 180. *Was there any persecution under the first Prelacy?*

A. There was severe persecution. A despotic tribunal, called the High Commission Court, and consisting of bishops and laymen, was erected, for the purpose of summarily punishing the ministers who did not conform; and not a few were deprived of their charges, imprisoned, banished to distant parts of the country, or sent out of the kingdom.

Q. 181. *What circumstance more immediately led to the proceedings which issued in the second Reformation?*

A. The attempt to introduce Archbishop Laud's semi-Popish Service-Book.

Q. 182. *What has the period that followed the second Reformation been called?*

A. The period of the second Prelacy.

Q. 183. *What happened on the introduction of the second Prelacy?*

A. From three to four hundred ministers resigned their livings.

Q. 184. *Was there much suffering for nonconformity during this period?*

A. The Presbyterians of Scotland endured one of the hottest and bloodiest persecutions that Christian history records. They were ruinously fined, cast into prison, immured in unwholesome dungeons, banished the kingdom, sold into slavery, put to the

by the practice of kneeling; and that, in fine, kneeling was connected with superstitious and Popish views of the ordinance, and savoured of that worship of the elements which necessarily flowed from the doctrine of transubstantiation.

And as to private baptism and private communion.—That the private celebration of the sacraments was fitted to encourage the Popish notion that they were essential to salvation.

torture, drowned in the sea, executed on the scaffold, and shot down by the military, on the moors, and at their own doors, in cold blood. Even children and tender women were not always spared from the most barbarous of the inflictions of that unhappy time.

Q. 185. *Was there any separate organization of the Church under the ministers who had been obliged to vacate their livings?*

A. Only in a very imperfect degree—partly from the want of union among the Presbyterians, and perhaps from a hope that they would soon regain possession of the machinery of the Establishment, and partly from the intolerant fury of the rulers of the nation. Conventicles—a name given to all meetings of the people for Christian worship that were not held in the parish churches, and under Prelatic sanction—were forbidden by law, and heavy penalties were enacted against those who attended them. Meetings, however, were often held, both in private houses and in the fields; and the sacraments were sometimes dispensed on these occasions. Assemblies, also, of a Presbyterial character secretly met now and then; and a few individuals were ordained to the ministry.

Q. 186. *Which was the true Church of Scotland at this time—the Church that was established, or the Church that was persecuted?*

A. There can be no difficulty in recognising the outed ministers, and the people adhering to them as the Church of Knox, Melville, and Henderson—as the Protestant Church of 1560—the Presbyterian Church of 1592—the Covenanted Church of 1638.

Q. 187. *What were the respective durations of the two Prelacies?*

A. Each continued for twenty-eight years. The first extended from 1610 to 1638, and the second from 1661 to 1689.

SECTION III.—THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND'S ANTI-PATRONAGE TESTIMONY FOR THE HEADSHIP OF CHRIST.*

Q. 188. *What is lay patronage?*

A. It is that system under which the power and privilege of electing and presenting, whether to a Church living merely, or to a living and to the cure of souls conjointly, is viewed as secular property and a civil right, which may be acquired by purchase or inheritance, and possessed and enjoyed irrespectively of religious character, Christian profession, mental endowment, or moral qualification.

Q. 189. *Is the right or privilege of electing to the cure of souls essentially and necessarily of a spiritual nature?*

A. Just as much so as the power of ordaining to the Christian ministry. Both flow from Christ as Head of the Church; both ought to be exercised in subordination to his authority, and with a supreme regard to the glory of his name; and neither can be exercised aright without special grace for doing it. (Acts i. 21-26; xiv. 23.)

Q. 190. *Is it warrantable to treat a spiritual right and privilege as a piece of secular property?*

* The subject of this section belongs, logically, to the anti-Erastian testimony of the Church; but it is more convenient to treat of it in a section by itself.

A. It is the very sin of Simon Magus. (Acts viii. 18.)

Q. 191. *Is it consistent with Christ's Headship in the Church, to secularize the privilege of choosing or nominating his ministers, and convert it into a civil right?*

A. It is not; inasmuch as a privilege pertaining to his spiritual kingdom, and clearly falling under his jurisdiction as Head of the Church, is thereby withdrawn from his authority, and subjected to the kingdoms of this world.

Q. 192. *How do you divide the anti-patronage testimony of the Church of Scotland?*

A. Into two parts—her former and her recent anti-patronage testimony.

PART I.—The Church of Scotland's FORMER anti Patronage Testimony for the Headship of Christ.

Q. 193. *Wherein did her former anti-patronage testimony consist?*

A. In three things:—

1. In her efforts to restrict the right of patronage to the living.

2. In her opposition to patronage altogether.

3. In the sacrifices made by her, rather than acquiesce in its extension to the office.

Q. 194. *How were her efforts to confine it to the living put forth?*

A. By declaring and upholding it as a fundamental principle of her constitution, that the choice or acceptance of the congregation was necessary as a title to the pastoral office.

Q. 195. *Where did she declare this?*

A. In her Books of Discipline, and in various Acts of Assembly.*

Q. 196. *In what manner did she uphold it ?*

A. By refusing to ordain presentees, unless the congregation called them ; and by exhibiting, in the questions put to ministers before their ordination, the call or election of the members of the Church as the ground of her procedure in forming the pastoral tie.†

* “ Ordinary vocation consisteth in election, examination, and admission. It appertaineth to the people, and to every several congregation, to elect their minister. For altogether this is to be avoided, that any man be violently intruded or thrust in upon any congregation. But this liberty must be reserved with all care to every several church, to have their votes and suffrages in the election of their ministers.”—*First Book of Discipline*, head iv.

“ Election is the choosing out of a person, or persons, most able, to the office that vakes (is vacant), by the judgment of the eldership, and consent of the congregation to which shall be the person or persons appointed. So that none be intruded upon any congregation, either by the prince or any inferior person, without lawful election and the consent of the people over whom the person is placed, as the practice of the apostolical and primitive Kirk and good order crave.”—*Second Book of Discipline*, chapters iii. and xii.

† The following was the invariable order of procedure in the settlement of a minister :—

1. The presentation by the patron, with the presentee’s letter of acceptance, were laid before the presbytery.

2. Tho presentee was appointed to preach before the congregation.

3. The presbytery went to the parish, and asked the congregation to give the presentee a CALL in these or similar terms, viz. :—

“ We, the heritors, elders, heads of families, and parishioners of the parish of —; taking into our consideration the present destitute state of the said parish, through the want of a Gospel ministry among us, occasioned by the death of our late pastor, the Rev. — —, and being satisfied with the learning, abilities, and other good qualifications of you, — —, preacher of the Gospel, and having heard you preach to our satisfaction

Q. 197. *What have you to tell of the sacrifices she made, rather than acquiesce in the extension of the power of patrons to nominate to the office?*

A. The outed ministers of 1662 (from three to four hundred in number) were driven from their parishes for this, among other reasons, that, having previously been ordained at the suit and calling of their congregations alone, they would not agree to be anew presented to their offices by the patrons, whom the law had just restored.

Q. 198. *Were not the Erskines and their brethren, who founded the Secession Church; Mr. Gillespie, who founded the Relief; and the many thousands of the people of God who gave up their interest in the Establishment that they might escape from*

and edification, do hereby INVITE AND CALL you, the said — —, to take the charge and oversight of this parish, and to come and labour among us in the work of the Gospel ministry; hereby promising to you all due respect and encouragement in the Lord. We likewise entreat the reverend Presbytery of — to approve and concur with this our most cordial CALL, and to use all proper means for making the same effectual, by your ordination and settlement among us, as soon as the steps necessary thereto will admit. In witness whereof, we subscribe these presents," &c.

4. The presbytery considered the call, and sustained it, if sufficiently subscribed.

5. The presentee being now furnished [in so far], with a title to the benefice and a title to the office, the presbytery took him on trials.

6. The trials being finished, and the presentee found qualified, presbytery and presentee repaired to the parish, and the ordination took place after the presentee had answered the following among other questions, which were put to him in face of the congregation:—

"Have you used any undue methods, either by yourself or others, in procuring this call?"

"Do you accept of, and close with, THE CALL to be pastor of this parish, and promise, through grace, to perform all the duties of a faithful minister of the Gospel among this people?"

the intrusion of ministers, sufferers, in what was substantially the same cause?

A. Yes; the losses they incurred, and the sacrifices they made, were because they could not submit to have ministers ordained, and the pastoral tie formed, upon the patron's civil deed of presentation, and without the call of the members of the Church.

Q. 199. *What evidence is there of the Church's opposition to patronage as a system altogether?*

A. The declaration respecting it in her Second Book of Discipline;* the fact that she twice obtained its abolition by Parliament, viz., in 1649† and in 1690; and her remonstrances against the Act of Queen Anne, 1712, which broke the Treaty of Union by restoring it‡.

* "Because this order, which God's Word craves, cannot stand with patronages and presentations to benefices used in the Pope's Kirk, we desire all them that truly fear God earnestly to consider, that forasmuch as the names of patronages and benefices, together with the effect thereof, have flowed from the Pope, and corruption of the canon law only, in so far as thereby any person was intruded or placed over kirks having *curam animarum*; and forasmuch as that manner of proceeding hath no ground in the Word of God, but is contrary to the same and to the said liberty of election, they ought not to have place in this light of Reformation."—*Second Book of Discipline*, ch. xii.

† The Act 1649 declares "that patronages and presentations of kirks is an evil and a bondage under which the Lord's people and ministers of this land have long groaned; and that it has no warrant in God's Word, but is founded only on the canon law, and is a custom Popish, and brought into the Kirk in time of ignorance and superstition; that the same is contrary to the Second Book of Discipline, and to several Acts of General Assemblies, and that it is prejudicial to the liberty of the people and planting of kirks, and unto the free calling and entry of ministers unto their charge."

‡ At the Union between Scotland and England it was solemnly stipulated that the Presbyterian Church, with all its rights and privileges, as settled at the Revolution—one of the

Q. 200. *When did her former anti-patronage testimony cease?*

A. It practically ceased about twenty years after Queen Anne's Act restoring patronage was passed.

Q. 201. *How did the Church drop her anti-patronage testimony?*

A. By giving zealous effect to the law of patronage; and by recognising the patron's presentation as a title to the office no less than to the living, and thereupon ordaining presentees, when they were not only not called by the congregation, but when it reclaimed against them.

Q. 202. *Was this a necessary consequence of submitting to the Act of Queen Anne?*

A. Not a necessary consequence; for the Act of Queen Anne was not, at that time, understood as establishing patronage in any other form than as a power of giving title to the ecclesiastical benefice or living; and the civil courts were accustomed to take no other view of it.

Q. 203. *To what, then, is the conduct of the Church in abandoning her anti-patronage testimony to be ascribed?*

A. To the ascendancy at that time acquired in the Church courts by a party that was much

most highly prized of these privileges being its freedom from lay patronage—should “continue without any alteration to the people of this land in all succeeding generations;” and both Parliaments agreed and enacted, that the observance of this article should be “a fundamental and essential condition of the Union, without any alteration thereof, or derogation thereto, in any sort, for ever,” and that the sovereigns of Britain, at their accession to the crown, should “swear and subscribe” inviolably to maintain it. This was in 1707. In 1712, only five years after, Queen Anne's Act was passed, by which patronage was restored.

imbued with a secular spirit, was willing to make the Church subservient to political ends, and especially disliked the evangelical fervour and Calvinistic doctrines which were relished by the general body of the people.

Q. 204. *To what circumstance is the rise of this party to be traced?*

A. To the receiving of about three hundred curates, from the Prelatical and persecuting Establishment of Charles II., into the Presbyterian Church at the Revolution.

Q. 205. *How did the evangelical and true Presbyterian minority act, when the dominant party thus enforced lay patronage in its most obnoxious form?*

A. They maintained the attitude of a protesting body within the Establishment.

Q. 206. *Why did they not leave the Establishment?*

A. Because they considered they had ground to stand upon in its constitutional principles and statutory conditions, which could not be altered by the actings of a corrupt majority of its office-bearers.

Q. 207. *Was there anything else by which the ruling party in the Church evinced its disposition to uphold in all its rigour the system of lay patronage?*

A. Yes; it deprived of all share in the government and discipline of the Church those pastors of congregations who were not settled in parochial charges sanctioned by the civil courts, and thus practically lodged the whole administration of Church affairs in the holders of patronate livings.

Q. 208. *When did this party lose its ascendancy in the Church?*

A. In the year 1834, when it changed places with the evangelical body, and became a minority.

PART II.—*The Church of Scotland's* RECENT *anti-Patronage Testimony for the Headship of Christ.*

Q. 209. *Wherein does the recent anti-patronage testimony of the Church consist?*

A. It resembles, in all points, her former anti-patronage testimony, consisting,—

1. In her efforts to restrict the right of patronage to the living.

2. In her opposition to patronage altogether.

3. In the sacrifices she has made, rather than acquiesce in its extension to the office.

Q. 210. *What did the Church do, in 1834, to restrict the right of patronage to the living?*

A. She passed the Veto Law, declaring and enacting that a presentee should be rejected when the members of the congregation, as represented by the male heads of families in full communion, refused to accept him; and so, in effect, reviving the call as the title to the pastoral office.

Q. 211. *Did the Church do rashly in passing her Veto Law?*

A. On the contrary, she was shut up to the adoption of that, or some similar measure.

Q. 212. *Why so?*

A. Because the evangelical party, who now prevailed in her councils, had always held it as a principle, that the Church could not, without sin, act under any system of patronage which was subversive of the congregational call, or which rested the title to the holy ministry on the civil instrument of a presentation.

Q. 213. *When the law of the Church establishing the Veto was pronounced at variance with the law of the State, what did she do?*

A. She declared she was bound in conscience to adhere to her principle, and must go on without the sanction of the State in the meantime, although the effect, in the filling up of vacant parishes, should be occasionally to separate the office and the living from each other; and her strenuous endeavours were directed to a new arrangement with the State, whereby the rights of Christian congregations might be maintained, and the rights of patrons made to harmonize with the call of the people.

Q. 214. *Were her endeavours successful?*

A. They totally failed.

Q. 215. *What step was the Church led to adopt in consequence of their failure?*

A. Perceiving, after three years of fruitless negotiations with the Government of the country, that it was the existence of lay patronage which formed the great obstacle to a satisfactory settlement, and calling to mind the breach of the Union Treaty by its restoration in 1712, the Assembly of 1842 resolved and declared, by a majority of two hundred and sixteen to one hundred and forty-seven, that "patronage was a grievance, had been attended with much injury to the cause of true religion in this Church and kingdom, was the main cause of the difficulties in which the Church is at present involved, and that it ought to be abolished."

Q. 216. *Was this all that the Church did?*

A. This was not all. The rulers of the nation having at length, in 1843, definitively required her,

on her duty as a Church nationally endowed and supported, to renounce her position, and to acknowledge in the presentation of a patron a title to the ministry as well as to the living—led by four hundred and seventy of her pastors and a vast multitude of her elders, on the 18th of May in that year, she withdrew from her connection with the State; and, surrendering her temporalities and the advantages she enjoyed as an Establishment, that she might not come under an obligation to treat a spiritual privilege bestowed by her Lord as a civil right bestowed by man, she thus, through grace, gloriously consummated her anti-patronage testimony for the Headship of Christ.

Q. 217. *What position does the Church Establishment now occupy as regards lay patronage?*

A. Under final decisions of the civil courts, and under the Act of Lord Aberdeen,* passed in August, 1843, the patron's presentation is recognised as conferring on the presentee an exclusive right to be taken on trials for the pastoral office among a particular flock, and for the function of an ambassador of Christ to a particular congregation; in other words, as investing a qualified presentee with a title to ordination and the pastoral charge.

Q. 218. *What is now the law of the Establishment with respect to the call of the congregation?*

A. The law now is, that while the call may be a very good thing as an encouragement to the presentee, the want of it is no legal obstacle to the formation of the pastoral tie; and the ordination and settlement must take place, although the congregation unanimously declare that the presentee

* 6 and 7, Victoria, c. 61.

does not edify them, unless they shall state objections and reasons against him, the relevancy of which can be made good in the civil courts, and the proof in support of which satisfies the courts ecclesiastical.

Q. 219. *Are these the provisions of the Act of Lord Aberdeen?*

A. In substance they are.

Q. 220. *Does not Lord Aberdeen's Act expressly bind down the Establishment to the intrusion of ministers against the feelings and wishes of the people?*

A. Yes; the Act declares that "*it shall not be lawful to reject a presentee upon the ground of any mere dissent or dislike, expressed by any part of the congregation of the parish to which he is presented.*"

Q. 221. *Is the form of a call by the parish still used in the Establishment; and do the questions at ordination still set forth the call as the only ground on which the pastoral relation is constituted?*

A. Yes.

Q. 222. *In what light is such conduct to be viewed?*

A. It is a mockery, and is fitted to deceive.

Q. 223. *Wherein lies the difference between the position which the Establishment occupies now, and the position it occupied before 1834, as respects lay patronage and the call?*

A. The difference is, that, in effecting forced settlements, it now merely performs what is admitted to be its statutory duty; whereas, formerly, when doing the very same things, and intruding ministers on reclaiming congregations, it was understood to be but using, or rather abusing, its statutory liberty.

Q. 224. *How does this difference affect a minority who think it sinful to intrude ministers against the congregational voice, and to convert a spiritual privilege into a secular right?*

A. Such a minority, being unpledged by the terms on which the temporalities were understood to be held before 1834, had at that time ground to stand upon as a protesting body within the Establishment; but they can neither consistently nor honestly continue and protest in the Establishment now, because by the law, as now declared and fixed, no ground remains for them to stand upon, and they could not give effect to their principles if they became a majority.

SECTION IV.—THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND'S ANTI-ERASTIAN TESTIMONY FOR THE HEADSHIP OF CHRIST.

Q. 225. *What is Erastianism?*

A. It is to place the Churches of Christ, and the affairs necessarily and peculiarly belonging to them as such, under the laws or the administration of the civil magistrate.*

Q. 226. *Is a testimony against Erastianism—that is to say, a testimony for the Church's freedom from the dominion and rule of the magistrate—equivalent to a testimony for the Headship of Christ?*

A. Yes; it is Christ's prerogative, as Head of authority, that the Church be subject to his laws and to his ministers alone; and this prerogative is,

* The term *Erastianism* is derived from Erastus, a German physician, who lived in the latter half of the sixteenth century, and was the first publicly to broach the opinion, that the function of spiritual government and discipline belongs to the civil magistrate.

consequently, invaded when the Church is put in subjection either to the laws or to the servants of the magistrate.

Q. 227. *How do you divide the Church of Scotland's testimony for the freedom of Christ's Churches from the rule of the magistrate?*

A. Into two parts—her former and her recent testimony.

PART I.—*The former anti-Erastian Testimony.*

Q. 228. *Wherein did her former testimony for freedom consist?*

A. In the following five particulars, viz. :

1. In *exercising* her own freedom as a Church of Christ before the world, without fear or hesitation.

2. In *claiming and asserting* it when it was spoken against and invaded.

3. In *vindicating* it by her discipline when it was betrayed.

4. In *suffering* for it, rather than give it up.

5. And in obtaining its acknowledgment and sanction by the State.

Division I.—*The Church's EXERCISE of her Freedom to Serve Christ alone as her Head.*

Q. 229. *What were the matters in relation to which she exercised her freedom?*

A. They were such as the preaching of the Gospel and dispensation of the sacraments, the public Confession of her Faith, the Catechisms for the instruction of her people, the infliction of censures, the form of her government, and the composition of her judicatories.

Q. 230. *Did her ministers, at the Reformation from Popery, wait for the magistrate's authority or license to preach the Gospel, or dispense the sacraments?*

A. They did not wait an instant. They acted under Christ's authority and commission; and, when the magistrate laid his interdict upon them, they disregarded it, like the apostles of old—obeying God rather than man.

Q. 231. *What Confessions of Faith were adopted by the Church of Scotland?*

A. The Old, or John Knox's Confession, which was drawn up in 1560; and the Westminster Confession, which was sanctioned by the Assembly in 1647.

Q. 232. *Did the Church adopt them freely, or were they imposed upon her by the civil power?*

A. The Church freely adopted them.

Q. 233. *Did not the State adopt them too?*

A. Yes; but it was after their adoption by the Church.

Q. 234. *When the Church substituted the Westminster Confession for that of John Knox, had the sanction of the latter by the State been withdrawn?*

A. No; the Confession of John Knox had the sanction of the State at the very time.

Q. 235. *Did the Church of Scotland always adopt such catechisms as she thought necessary and fit for the Christian instruction of the people?*

A. Always; and her catechisms sometimes had the sanction of the State, and sometimes no sanction but her own.

Q. 236. *Did she consult the will of the civil magistrate in inflicting her censures?*

A. She inflicted her censures on all offenders, both high and low, according to her sense of the will of Christ.

Q. 237. *What were her proceedings in regard to the form of her government?*

A. When she became convinced that it was not scriptural, she changed it.

Q. 238. *How often did this occur?*

A. Twice—in 1580 and 1638.

Q. 239. *What circumstance was it which made the step she took on these occasions a very striking exercise of freedom from the rule of the civil power?*

A. In both cases the form of government which she renounced and set aside had the sanction and approval of the State at the time.

Q. 240. *How did she exercise her freedom in regard to the composition of her judicatories?*

A. She at once gave effect to her fundamental principle respecting the equality of ministers, by admitting into her courts all who held the pastoral office, whether they were endowed or unendowed, and whether the charges they filled were civilly established or not.

Q. 241. *Was this all?*

A. No; by her sole appointment, ruling elders were, from the very first, made members of her judicatories along with their pastors.

Q. 242. *Did not the State EXPRESSLY sanction the right of ruling elders to sit in Church courts?*

A. It did; but not till the Revolution—one hundred and thirty years after the Church had admitted them.

Q. 243. *Are there any instances of this exercise of her freedom occurring subsequently to the Revolution?*

A. Yes; ordained chaplains and missionaries were received by her as members of her judicatories till about the middle of the eighteenth century; commissioners from the Scotch Church at Campvere, in Holland, sat in her General Assemblies till the breaking up of that Church by the French invasion in the days of Bonaparte; and she passed an Act in 1814, conferring on the Scotch Church in India a right of representation in her supreme court—which right has been enjoyed without interruption down to the present time.

Q. 244. *Did the State never sanction the right of Campvere or of India to be represented in the General Assembly?*

A. Never.

Division II.—Her ASSERTION of her Freedom when it was Threatened and Invaded.

Q. 245. *Was the Church unmolested in the exercise of her freedom?*

A. Quite the contrary; her right to it was often denied, and it was the frequent object of attack by the judges and rulers of the nation.

Q. 246. *Was the Church silent when that happened, or did she practically succumb?*

A. She was not silent, nor did she ever voluntarily succumb.

Q. 247. *What was the doctrine which she promulgated respecting it in her Second Book of Discipline?*

A. She there proclaimed that

“The power ecclesiastical is an authority granted by God the Father, through the Mediator Jesus Christ, unto his

Church, and having its ground in the Word of God; to be put in execution by them unto whom the spiritual government of the Church is by lawful calling committed." "This power ecclesiastical," she said, "flows immediately from God, and the Mediator Jesus Christ, and is spiritual, not having a temporal head on earth, but only Christ, the only spiritual King and Governor of his Church. It is a title falsely usurped by Antichrist to call himself head of the Church, and ought not to be attributed to angel nor man, of what estate that ever he be; saving to Christ, the only Head and Monarch of the Church. Therefore this power and policy of the Church should lean upon the Word immediately, as the only ground thereof, and should be taken from the pure fountain of the Scriptures, the Church hearing the voice of Christ, the only spiritual King, and being ruled by his laws." "As the ministers and others of the ecclesiastical estate are subject to the civil magistrate, so ought the person of the magistrate to be subject to the Church spiritually and in ecclesiastical government. And the exercise of both these jurisdictions cannot stand in one person ordinarily." "The magistrate neither ought to preach, minister the sacraments, nor execute the censures of the Church, nor yet prescribe any rule how it should be done."—*Second Book of Discipline*, ch. i.

Q. 248. *What did John Knox say, when her right to hold General Assemblies without the royal permission was challenged by the Secretary of State?*

A. "Take from us the liberty of Assemblies," he said, "and take from us the Gospel!"

Q. 249. *What did Andrew Melville say to King James on the subject of her freedom?*

A. "Sir, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland; there is King James, the head of this commonwealth, and there is Christ Jesus, the King of the Church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. Sir, those whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over his Church have power and authority from him to govern his spiritual kingdom, both jointly and severally; the which no Christian king or prince

should control and discharge, but fortify and assist; otherwise they are not faithful subjects of Christ and members of his Church. We will yield to you your place, and give you all due obedience; but again I say you are not the head of the Church. You cannot give us that eternal life which we seek for even in this world, and you cannot deprive us of it."

Q. 250. *What happened when, in 1582, a messenger-at-arms charged the General Assembly, on pain of rebellion, to desist from the trial of Archbishop Montgomery?*

A. The Assembly declared that it was their duty to complete the trial; and they completed it accordingly, and passed sentence on the archbishop.

Q. 251. *What happened when the Black Acts of 1584, overthrowing the liberties of the Church, were proclaimed at the Market Cross of Edinburgh?*

A. Some of the most eminent ministers of the Church attended, and read a protest against them.

Q. 252. *What happened when the Royal Commissioner, in 1638, forbade the Assembly to take up the question of their competency to try the prelates for heresy and other spiritual offences?*

A. They agreed unanimously that they must take it up.

Q. 253. *And what happened when the Royal Commissioner thereupon dissolved the Assembly in his majesty's name?*

A. The Assembly found that it was their duty to Christ to continue their sittings; and they continued to sit accordingly.

Q. 254. *Did the Church rebel against the civil power by acting as you have now described?*

A. No; she only disregarded the sinful interference of the civil power, and asserted her freedom to obey Christ alone in matters spiritual.

Q. 255. *What did Henderson, the moderator of the Assembly of 1638, say in reply to the Royal Commissioner?*

A. "Whatsoever is ours," he said, "we shall render it to his majesty—even our lives, lands, liberties, and all; but for that which is God's, and the liberties of his house, we do think neither will his majesty's piety suffer him to crave, neither may we grant them though he should crave it."*

Q. 256. *How did the same Assembly describe the difference between the civil and ecclesiastical powers?*

A. "As to the persons, manner of government, matters treated, and form of proceeding, all is ecclesiastical, and only ecclesiastical, in the one; and all civil, and only civil, in the other. Their very principles and rules are different. In the one, civil laws are the rule; but in the other, the Word of God is the only rule. They are independent of one another in their own jurisdiction; and, as an Assembly cannot prescribe rules to the Parliament in civil matters, no more ought the Parliament to prescribe to the Assembly in ecclesiastical."†

* MS. account of the Assembly, quoted in "M'Crie's Sketches of Scottish Church History." a.

† Stevenson's History, pp. 303, 304.

Division III.—Her VINDICATION of her Freedom when it was Betrayed.

Q. 257. *Was not the freedom of the Church of Scotland endangered by treachery from within, as well as by invasion from without?*

A. Yes, often.

Q. 258. *On what occasion did Montgomery, archbishop of Glasgow, perform a traitorous part in regard to the freedom of the Church?*

A. It was in 1582, when the General Assembly, which, two years before, had abolished Prelacy as contrary to Scripture, was proceeding against him for assuming the Prelatical office.

Q. 259. *How did Montgomery behave?*

A. He procured the king's interdict, charging the Assembly, on the pain of rebellion, to desist from the prosecution; and, when summoned by the Assembly to answer for doing so, he appealed to the Privy Council.

Q. 260. *What did the Assembly do then?*

A. They deposed him from the ministry.

Q. 261. *Was any general Act of the Church passed in consequence of this case?*

A. Yes; an Act which, down to the present day, has never been repealed, was passed, declaring that any minister who should resort to the interdict of the civil power, for the purpose of arresting the jurisdiction of the Church, or apply to the tribunals of the State to suspend her discipline and set her sentences aside, was liable to the highest ecclesiastical censures.

Q. 262. *Were the particular offences mentioned*

in this Act ever committed by any minister of the Church of Scotland besides Montgomery?

A. Never till the year 1840.

Division IV.—The SUFFERINGS of the Church in the Cause of her Freedom from Civil Dictation.

Q. 263. *Can you tell of any persecuting laws that were levelled at the Church's freedom?*

A. Yes; there were the Black Acts of 1584, which destroyed her jurisdiction, and forbade the meetings of her courts without his majesty's leave; and there were also, among others, the Acts in the reign of Charles II., making the denial of the king's supremacy over the Church a capital crime, and imposing, in the first instance on such as were in offices of public trust, and afterwards on all the subjects of the realm, the oaths of allegiance and the test, which expressed, in the most absolute terms, the doctrine of the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown.

Q. 264. *For what did John Welsh of Ayr and his brethren suffer the loss of their livings and banishment in the year 1605?*

A. For having held a General Assembly at Aberdeen, in the face of the king's prorogation, and thus asserting the freedom of the Church in the calling of her judicatories, and the right of Christ's servants to meet in their official character, when they are of opinion that the affairs of his house require it.*

* There had been repeated prorogations, and it was well understood to be the design of the Court to prevent the meetings of Assembly altogether. In his address to the jury at his trial, Welsh said, "As for the matter whereof we are accused, we are certain that what we did belongs essentially to Christ's

Q. 265. *What view did Welsh himself take of the cause in which he suffered?*

A. "Jesus Christ is the King of saints," he said; "and his Church is a most free kingdom, yea, as free as any kingdom under heaven, not only to convocate, hold, and keep her meetings, and conventions, and assemblies, but also to judge of all her affairs, in all her meetings and conventions amongst her members and subjects. These two points, 1st, That Christ is the Head of his Church; 2dly, That she is free in her government from all other jurisdiction except Christ's—these two points, I say, are the special cause of our imprisonment, being now convicted as traitors for the maintaining thereof; we have been ever waiting with joyfulness to give the last testimony of our blood in confirmation thereof, if it should please our God to be as favourable as to honour us with that dignity; yea, I do affirm, that these two points above written, and all other things which belong to Christ's crown, sceptre, and kingdom, are not subject, and cannot be, to any other authority, but to his own altogether.

crown and kingdom; and we are now ready cheerfully to seal that testimony with our blood. Nor have we hastily adopted this resolution; for, during these twenty-four weeks of imprisonment, we have had time enough fully to consider the matter. Some, we know, treat this matter lightly, as if the cause of our suffering were trivial and unimportant; but to us it appears different, and that as a matter of conscientious conviction. We regard it as one of our Lord's prerogatives, that he be held as supreme Judge in all matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, and that under him, and according to the order established in his own house, these be judged of only by the Church; so that, just as councils, parliaments, and civil courts, belong to the royal crown of some earthly kingdom, so do all the ecclesiastical assemblies and meetings of the Church belong to Christ's crown and kingdom."

So that I could be most glad to be offered up as a sacrifice for so glorious a truth; but, alas! I fear that my sins, and the abuse of so glorious things as I have found, deprive me of so fair a crown."*

Q. 266. *In what light were the trials of the Church regarded by Samuel Rutherford during his imprisonment at Aberdeen?*

A. "Let men say what they please, the plea with Zion's enemies in this day of Jacob's trouble is, if Christ should be king, and no mouth speak laws but his."—"My case in my bonds, for the honour of my royal Prince and King, is as good as becometh the witness of such a sovereign King."—"Let no man doubt that the state of our question we are now forced to stand to by suffering, exile, and imprisonment, is, if Jesus should reign over his Kirk, or not? O if my sinful arm could hold the crown on his head; howbeit (although) it should be stricken off from the shoulder blade!"†

Q. 267. *Did many of the people of Scotland suffer under the operation of the laws that were passed against the freedom of the Church?*

A. Many did. There were many, both of the ministers and private members of the Church, especially during the period of the second Prelacy, who willingly endured all extremities, even to the penalty of death itself, rather than be unfaithful to Christ, by submitting to or acknowledging the magistrate's ecclesiastical supremacy.

Q. 268. *What was the declaration of the servant girl, Marion Harvie, when on the scaffold, immediately before her execution?*

* See the Scots Worthies. † Rutherford's Letters.

A. "I am brought here to-day for avowing Christ to be Head of his Church, and King in Zion."*

Q. 269. *Are the ministers who resigned their livings at the Restoration to be regarded as witnesses for the freedom of the Church?*

A. They are entitled to be so considered; for one of their objections to the Prelacy, to which they were required to conform, was the circumstance of its being brought in without the sanction of the Church, and founded entirely on the royal supremacy.

Division V.—The SUCCESS of the Church in obtaining the Civil Magistrate's Recognition of her Freedom.

Q. 270. *How often did the Church succeed in obtaining from the State the recognition and approval of the great principle of her freedom?*

A. Three times—in 1592, when Presbyterianism was first ratified by Parliament; at the second Reformation; and at the Revolution.

Q. 271. *Can you show wherein that recognition and approval consisted?*

A. Yes. There were—

First, The approval, in the Act 1592, of the power and freedom of the Church as exercised, throughout the previous thirty years of her history, in the calling of her Assemblies, the choosing of her polity, and the erection of the whole framework of her government; the acknowledgment in the same Act, that the whole power of governing the Church belongs to her office-bearers by divine right, and

* See Cloud of Witnesses.

the declaration that it ought not to be infringed upon by the civil magistrate; the recognition of the validity and competency of what her courts had done when it was contrary to law for them to do anything at all, and when their proceedings consisted in abolishing the Church system which had the sanction of the State, and setting up a different one in its room; along with the recognition of her right to "put order to all matters and causes ecclesiastical, according to the discipline of the Kirk.

Secondly, The abolition of the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown by an express Act of Parliament at the Revolution; and the abolition, at the same time, by another Act, of that oath of allegiance which required an acknowledgment of the sovereign as "supreme governor in *all* causes." And,

Thirdly, The ratification of the Westminster Confession of Faith, which declares, that "there is no other Head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ;" that "the civil magistrate may not assume to himself the power of the keys;" that "the Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his Church, hath appointed a government therein, in the hands of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate;" and that "it belongeth to synods and councils ministerially to determine controversies of faith," "to set down rules and directions for" "the government of the Church," and "to receive complaints in cases of mal-administration, and authoritatively to determine the same."

Q. 272. *Were there not certain apparent limitations of the Church's freedom with respect to the settlement of ministers, and the calling of General Assemblies?*

A. Yes; in the Act 1592, the appointment of the time and place of the Assembly's yearly meeting was reserved to the crown, and presbyteries were held bound and astricted to admit the qualified presentees of patrons.

Q. 273. *Was not the freedom of the Church truly and really thus infringed upon?*

A. There can be no doubt that these things were serious defects and blemishes in the Establishment which the Church obtained in 1592, and after the Revolution; and one peculiar excellence and glory of the second Reformation was, that they were not to be found in the Establishment as then ultimately adjusted. It may be granted, also, that they were the means of practically impairing the freedom of the Church; but there are grounds for maintaining that the great principle of the Church's freedom was not compromised by accepting the Establishment in which they were embraced.

Q. 274. *What view of these limitations did the Church hold herself entitled to take, her freedom and exclusive jurisdiction being, as we have seen, so fully and broadly ratified, as a necessary and paramount principle of her constitution?*

A. She considered them, not as imposing any civil obligation, in the proper sense of the term, or any duty which might be enforced by civil pains against her conscientious belief of her duty to Christ, but simply as setting forth conditions to which the State was pleased to attach the continuance of its sanction and emoluments, and as indicating points which were reckoned of so much moment that the benefits conferred by law would be withdrawn when the decision of the Church, in

the exercise of her freedom respecting them, came to be at variance with the mind of the State.

Q. 275. *Can any circumstances be mentioned confirmatory of this view?*

A. Yes; a number—such as,

First, That while, under Prelatical government, with which the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown always went hand in hand, penalties were enacted against any bishop who refused to execute the ecclesiastical duties which the law prescribed; and while the constitution of the Church of England, of which the supremacy forms an integral part, is full of such penalties, no penalty whatever, enforcing the duties of Church courts, occurs in the Statutes establishing Presbyterianism.

Secondly, That the case of Church courts refusing to fulfil the condition declared by the State was expressly provided for, as regards the settlement of presentees, by the expedient of conveying the fruits of the benefice to the patron—an expedient going upon the principle that the Church was free, and that the power of the State reached only to the temporalities of the Establishment.

Thirdly, That the freedom of the Church, in respect of the settlement of ministers and the condition relating to it, was recognised by a train of decisions in the civil courts themselves, and was admitted by the most eminent lawyers as the doctrine of the constitution of the country.*

* In the case of Culross, 1748, the Court of Session refused an application by the patron to prevent the presbytery from admitting another than his presentee; and in the case of Dunse, 1749, it refused to interdict the presbytery “to moderate in a call at large, or settle any other than the presentee;” because ‘that was interfering with the power of ordination, or internal

Q. 276. *Is there not a statement in the Confession of Faith, on which Erastians have fastened as favourable to their opinions?*

A. Such a statement there is in ch. xxiii. 3, which says, that “the civil magistrate hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call synods, and to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God.”

policy of the Church, with which the Lords thought they had nothing to do.” And generally, as in the case of Auchtermuchty, the Court was in the practice of holding that the only check it possessed against what it might regard as the illegal rejection of the presentee, lay in its control over the stipend, which it had the power of assigning to the patron.

Lord Kames, a distinguished judge of last century, lays it down that the sentence of ecclesiastical courts, “in providing parishes with proper ministers or pastors,” “is ultimate, *even where their proceedings are illegal*. The person authorized by their sentence, even in opposition to the presentee, is *de facto* minister of the parish, and as such is entitled to perform every ministerial function.” “It belongs, indeed, to the ecclesiastical court to provide a parish with a minister; but it belongs to the civil court to judge whether that minister be entitled to a stipend;” and “the Court of Session, *without pretending to deprive a minister of his office*, will bar him from the stipend, if the ecclesiastical court has proceeded illegally in the settlement.” “To prevent an arbitrary power” in the ecclesiastical court, “*the check provided by law is, that a minister settled illegally shall not be entitled to a stipend*. This happily reconciles two things commonly opposite. The check is extremely mild, and yet is fully effectual to prevent abuse.”

Q. 277. *Does this mean that the civil magistrate is himself to administer the government of the Church?*

A. Such cannot be the meaning; for that would be to assume the power of the keys, which the Confession says he must not do; and it would be inconsistent with the doctrine laid down in the Confession, that “the Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his Church, hath appointed a government therein *in the hands of Church officers.*”

Q. 278. *Does it mean that the civil magistrate is to receive appeals from the decisions of the office-bearers of the Church, and finally to determine in the cases thus brought before him?*

A. Such cannot be the meaning; for then the government would be in the hands of Church officers *conjointly with* the magistrate; whereas the Confession declares that it is “in the hands of Church officers, *distinct from* the civil magistrate.”

Q. 279. *Does it mean that, when controversies arise, and the peace of the Church is broken by the disputes of its members and office-bearers, the magistrate is entitled to call the parties before him, to give judgment between them, and thereafter to compel the Church to proceed in conformity with his views?*

A. Such cannot be the meaning; for the Confession teaches that “there is no other Head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ;” and it also declares that “*it belongeth to synods and councils ministerially*” (that is to say, under Christ) “to determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience, and to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God and government of his Church;” and in this very

passage it is intimated that the magistrate cannot effectually accomplish the object it is his duty to aim at, without resorting to the authority of ecclesiastical assemblies.

Q. 280. *Does it mean that, when Church and State differ on any question of Church polity, or discipline, or Scripture principle, the State must always be held to be in the right, and it is the duty of the Church to succumb; or that, on the supposition of the State being in the right (a thing which, however, cannot be certainly known), the Church may be compelled by the civil arm to give way?*

A. In that case there *would* be another head than the Lord Jesus Christ, and there would *not* be, in any reasonable meaning of the words, a government in the Church "distinct from the civil magistrate."

Q. 281. *Does it mean that the magistrate shall make the Church obey his Acts of Parliament?*

A. No; it says expressly that he is to provide that the things done by the Church shall be "according to the mind of God."

Q. 282. *Does it mean that ecclesiastical synods cannot be held unless he is pleased to convoke them?*

A. It says nothing like that; his power to call synods, when he wishes to consult them, and to have their aid, neither excludes nor infringes on the Church's right to hold them when she thinks them necessary; as is specially shown in the Act of Assembly 1647, by which the Confession was approved and adopted.

Q. 283. *Does it mean that he may lawfully infringe on the freedom of synodical deliberations?*

A. Such cannot be the meaning; for, in doing

so, he must arrogate the power of the keys, destroy the distinction between civil and ecclesiastical government, and make himself head of the Church; and a synod acting under coercion would, in respect of character and authority, be indeed no synod at all.

Q. 284. *What, then, is the meaning of it?*

A. The meaning of it is, that the magistrate hath authority, and it is his duty, in his official capacity, to concern himself about the interests of religion and the welfare of the Church; and, in such ways as are competent to him, consistently with Christ's exclusive Headship in the Church, and the rights of that government which is "distinct from the civil magistrate," namely, by his example, his influence, and his legitimate control over temporal things, to take order (not to *give* order, or command, but to *take* order, or provide) for their advancement.

Division VI.—The Church's ABANDONMENT of her former anti-Erastian Testimony.

Q. 285. *Was the Church stedfast in her anti-Erastian testimony?*

A. It cannot be said that she was.

Q. 286. *Had she any conflict with the State, in which the latter was allowed to prevail?*

A. She had no conflict with the State.

Q. 287. *What then?—did she quietly give way, when the State encroached on her jurisdiction?*

A. She cannot be altogether acquitted of having done so on several occasions after the Revolution. Her jurisdiction, however, was, on the whole, rather

respected by the State and its courts, till a few years before the Disruption.

Q. 288. *Of what, then, do you chiefly complain?*

A. There is reason to fear that, while formally exercising her legally guaranteed freedom, many of her proceedings, especially with regard to patronage and the settlement of ministers, were dictated in a large degree by an Erastian spirit of subjection to the civil power.

Q. 289. *Did the Executive of the country put forth any Erastian pretensions during the period that followed the Revolution?*

A. It did.

Q. 290. *Can you say what they were?*

A. It affected to regulate the public prayers for the royal family; claimed the right of appointing, by its sole authority, public fasts and thanksgivings; and, on several occasions, forbade the meetings of the General Assembly.

Q. 291. *Did the Church firmly resist these encroachments?*

A. No.

Q. 292. *How do you account for her servile behaviour?*

A. It was owing to the influence of the worldly party before described, whose origin is to be traced to the three hundred curates brought in at the Revolution.

Q. 293. *Were these curates Erastians?*

A. They were all of them men who, before the Revolution, had sworn to maintain the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown.

Q. 294. *Was there not a minority, who gave*

proof of their attachment to the original principles of the Church of Scotland?

A. Yes. The evangelical body was, for a long time, few in number, and much depressed; but they generally withstood and protested against whatever seemed to compromise the freedom of the Church to serve Christ alone as her Head.

PART II.—*The Recent anti-Erastian Testimony*

Q. 295. *When did the period of the Church's recent anti-Erastian testimony commence?*

A. In 1834, when the evangelical party acquired the majority in the General Assembly.

Q. 296. *Wherein did it consist?*

A. In these particulars, viz.,

1. In *exercising* her freedom to serve Christ alone as her Head.

2. In *claiming and asserting* it, when it was spoken against and invaded.

3. In *vindicating it by her discipline* when it was betrayed.

4. In *seeking its restoration*, when the State had taken it away.

5. In *sacrificing her temporalities* to regain and preserve it.

Division I.—*The Church's EXERCISE of her Freedom.*

Q. 297. *What did the Church do in the exercise of her freedom?*

A. She adopted two great measures, commonly known as the Act on Calls, or the Veto Law, and the Chapel Act.

Q. 298. *What account can you give of these measures?*

A. The Veto Law, as has already been explained, was to prevent the forcible intrusion of ministers; and the Chapel Act was to restore the pastoral office to its integrity in unendowed charges, by receiving their ministers into Church courts, and allowing them to have the power of discipline in their own congregations, and to take part in the general government of the Church.

Q. 299. *Was she imperatively called on to pass these Acts?*

A. Yes; both by considerations of principle and expediency.

Q. 300. *By what considerations of principle was she constrained?*

A. The intrusion of ministers is unauthorized by Scripture, and is inconsistent with the spiritual liberty of Christian congregations; and the evangelical body, when a minority, had, on these grounds, always opposed it; and the denial of the power of the keys to any who are invested with the pastoral office is to violate Christ's institution, according to which that power belongs to them.

Q. 301. *What were the considerations of expediency that had weight with the Church?*

A. The importance of drawing closer the bond between pastor and people; of giving an impulse to her extension at a time when the population had far outgrown all the means of religious instruction and superintendence; and of promoting her efficiency and the vigour of her spiritual operations throughout the land.

Q. 302. *Were the two great measures adopted by the Church fitted to answer these ends ?*

A. They were, most powerfully; as, indeed, was shown by their effects.

Q. 303. *What were their effects ?*

A. That class of students for the ministry—previously a large one—who, without any evidence of piety, and possessing no suitable gifts, relied for Church livings on their connection with patrons and heritors, as the sons of their stewards or tenants, or as the tutors of their children, immediately and almost totally disappeared; the number of godly and devoted pastors, and zealous and prayerful elders, grew with unexampled rapidity; and whereas, during sixty years preceding May 1834, only sixty places of worship had been erected by voluntary contribution within the Establishment, that very number sprang up in the single year thereafter, and nearly two hundred were added before 1843—being an increase equal to one-fifth of all the places of worship which formerly belonged to the Church of Scotland.

Q. 304. *Was there no drawback to these pleasing results, in the strife and bad feeling created by the Veto Act ?*

A. None that deserves mention. The Veto Act wrought admirably. In nineteen settlements out of twenty neither strife nor bad feeling attended it; and where anything of that kind did occur, it could never be fairly ascribed to the working of the law itself.

Q. 305. *But is not the Church chargeable with having gone beyond her province, when she passed the enactments referred to ?*

A. Certainly not. The formation of the tie between pastor and flock, and the powers and duties of the pastoral office, which alone she dealt with in these enactments, are matters purely, essentially, and unalterably ecclesiastical, and pertain exclusively to the jurisdiction of those to whom Christ has intrusted the government of his Church.

Q. 306. *Did the Church receive any encouragement and approbation from the civil magistrate when she passed the Veto Act?*

A. She did. The law officers of the crown gave their opinion in favour of it; and, after the rising of her Assembly, the Lord Chancellor of England, in his place in the House of Lords, pronounced a high eulogium on what had been done.

Division II.—Her ASSERTION of her Freedom, when it was Spoken against and Invaded.

Q. 307. *What did the Church do in the way of claiming and asserting her freedom, when it was spoken against and invaded?*

A. She passed, in 1838, a resolution declaratory of her exclusive jurisdiction under Christ in matters ecclesiastical, and announcing her purpose "at all hazards to defend it, by the help and blessing of that great God who, in the days of old, enabled our fathers, amid manifold persecutions, to maintain a testimony, even to the death, for Christ's kingdom and crown;" and she adopted, in the Assembly of 1842, her "Claim, Declaration, and Protest, anent the Encroachments of the Court of Session."

Q. 308. *Had the freedom of the Church been*

seriously threatened, at the time of passing the Resolution of 1838 ?

A. Yes; very startling opinions on the subject of her jurisdiction had been expressed by several of the Lords of Session, when giving judgment in an action against the legality of the Veto Act.

Q. 309. *What did the Lord President say on that occasion ?*

A. His Lordship said: "That our Saviour is the Head of the Kirk of Scotland in any *temporal*, or *legislative*, or *judicial* sense, is a position which I can dignify by no other name than absurdity. The *Parliament* is the temporal head of the Church, from whose Acts, and from whose Acts alone, it exists as the National Church, and from which alone it derives all its powers."*

Q. 310. *What was the judgment of the Court of Session in 1838 respecting the Veto Act ?*

A. That it was illegal, and contrary to the Act of Queen Anne respecting patronage.

Q. 311. *Was the court unanimous ?*

A. No; out of thirteen judges five of the most distinguished lawyers that ever sat on the bench gave their voice that the law was not transgressed.

Q. 312. *Did the House of Lords concur with the Court of Session ?*

A. It did, in 1839, by its first Auchterarder decision.

Q. 313. *Was the judgment inconsistent with the freedom of the Church ?*

A. The Church was willing to understand that it only implied that her enactment was without the civil sanction, and could carry no civil conse-

* Authorized Report of Auchterarder Case, vol. ii. p. 10.

quences along with it ; and she thought it her duty to wait till she saw if the court would confine it to that practical result.

Q. 314. *Had her freedom been actually invaded when the Claim of Right was adopted in 1842?*

A. By that time it had undoubtedly suffered many unheard-of and most grievous infringements.

Q. 315. *Did the Church, in these circumstances, assert her violated liberties only in words?*

A. No ; disregarding the spiritual supremacy which the civil court had assumed, she felt it her duty to refuse giving effect to its decisions, and at once to break its interdicts, in matters ecclesiastical.

Q. 316. *What was the precise nature of these interdicts?*

A. They were interdicts against the ordination of ministers ; against the deposition of a minister found guilty of theft by a judgment in which he himself acquiesced ; against the trial, in one case, of a minister who was accused of fraud and swindling, and in another case, of a licentiate accused of drunkenness, and other gross immoralities ; against the performance of the function of spiritual government by pastors of the Church ; against assigning parishes *quoad sacra*, appointing kirk sessions therein, or receiving the ministers of such parishes to sit in Church courts ;* against the exercise, by communicants, of the spiritual privilege of dissenting from the settlement of unacceptable presentees ; and against the preaching of the Gospel

* When parishes were overgrown, and too populous to be well attended to by their ministers, the Church had been accustomed, so far as she had the means, to divide them into manageable districts, which she placed under separate pastoral superintendence. As the tithes of the original parishes were not interfered with,

and dispensation of the sacraments throughout a whole district, by authority of the Church.

Q. 317. *What did the Church specially propose to herself in giving forth her Claim of Right?*

A. To procure redress, if possible, for the grievances of which she had to complain, and to lay a foundation for the course it would be necessary for her to take, should no redress be obtained.

Q. 318. *What was the substance of that solemn deed?*

A. It set forth, in the first place, her constitutional principles concerning the Headship of Christ, and the freedom of her office-bearers and members, which flows from it, along with the national guarantees by which these were ratified and protected, in the second place, the various encroachments on her rights and liberties by the civil courts; in the third place, the impossibility, consistently with her duty to Christ the Head, of submitting to the civil supremacy which had been assumed; and, in the last place, the necessity under which she would be placed, if redress was denied, of withdrawing from her connection with the State.

Q. 319. *Was the Claim of Right carried by a large majority?*

A. By a large majority—241 against 111.

Q. 320. *In what do you consider that the attacks upon the freedom of the Church originated?*

A. In the extreme aversion with which the two great measures of 1834 were regarded by many worldly men.

and the whole emoluments and civil rights of their ministers remained to them, these districts were called parishes *quoad sacra*. Under the Chapel Act of 1834, kirk-sessions were created for the purpose of discipline in *quoad sacra* districts, and the ministers of such districts took their seats in Church courts.

Q. 321. *Whence arose that aversion ?*

A. From the undisputed tendency of the measures of the Church to promote evangelical religion, and to unfit the Church for being a political tool.

Division III.—The Church's VINDICATION of her Freedom when it was Betrayed.

Q. 322. *Who were guilty of betraying the freedom of the Church ?*

A. The Moderate party, as they used to style themselves, must be held to have been guilty as a body in this respect, their constant endeavour being to induce the Church to acquiesce in the assumed supremacy of the civil courts.

Q. 323. *Were there not individuals of their number whom the Church deemed it necessary to subject to her discipline ?*

A. Yes.

Q. 324. *What individuals were these ?*

A. They were chiefly seven ministers of the Presbytery of Strathbogie—being a majority of that court.

Q. 325. *What did these persons do ?*

A. They formally resolved to disobey their ecclesiastical superiors, and to obey the civil court, by ordaining a minister to the parish of Marnoch against the unanimous voice of the people.

Q. 326. *How did the Church act on their taking this step ?*

A. She suspended them from their offices.

Q. 327. *Did they return to their duty after this had been done ?*

A. No ; they persisted in their course ; took on trials the rejected presentee, in defiance of an ex-

press prohibition from the Church; and, in obedience to an order from the Court of Session, intruded him on the parish.

Q. 328. *Did they do anything else?*

A. Yes; they appealed to the civil court to stay the Church's discipline against them, and asked it, in effect, to assume the power of the keys, and take upon itself the functions of that government which Christ has made "distinct from the civil magistrate;" and the civil court, at their instance, violently entered Christ's house, reversed the spiritual sentence which his servants had pronounced in his name and by his authority, restored the seven ministers to their sacred functions, and interdicted the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments in the district of Strathbogie by those whom the Church appointed.

Q. 329. *What did the Church do now?*

A. After striving in vain to convince the seven brethren of the heinous sin she believed they had committed, she prosecuted them, by libel, for breach of their ordination-vows, and for treason against the Lord Jesus Christ as King and Head of his Church; found them guilty of these offences, by a majority of 222 to 125, in her General Assembly of 1841, and thereupon deposed them from the holy ministry.

Division IV.—*The Church's EFFORTS for the restoration of her Freedom, when the State had taken it away.*

Q. 330. *At what time do you consider the freedom of the Church to have been taken away?*

A. It was *practically* taken from her towards the

end of 1839, when the Court of Session, armed with the compulsitors of the civil law, began to encroach upon her jurisdiction.

Q. 331. *What was thereupon done by the Church, in order to recover it?*

A. She asked the Queen's Government to interpose; she fixed upon one of the Court of Session's decisions, in which the civil supremacy over her was involved, and carried it, by appeal, to the House of Lords; and, in 1842, she issued her Claim of Right, for the information of the Legislature and the country at large

Q. 332. *Can you tell what the decision was against which she appealed to the House of Lords?*

A. It was what is known as the second Auchterarder judgment, by which the court had found that presbyteries were liable for damages, if they did not proceed with the trials and settlement of presentees whom they had previously rejected on account of the general and conscientious opposition of the people.

Q. 333. *What was the fate of her appeal?*

A. It was unsuccessful. The House of Lords (August, 1842) affirmed the principle of the civil supremacy in matters ecclesiastical.

Q. 334. *What did she do after this?*

A. She made a final attempt to move the State to do her justice, appealing to the Queen through the Government of the day, and urging her Claim of Right on the notice of Parliament.

Q. 335. *What was the result?*

A. A letter from the Secretary of State repudiating her principles, and asserting her subjection to the civil supremacy; and an adverse vote in the

House of Commons refusing, by an immense majority, to take her Claim into consideration.

Q. 336. *Do you know the dates?*

A. The letter of the Secretary of State was dated in January, and the vote of the Commons happened in March, 1843.

Q. 337. *Did the Scottish representatives concur in the vote of the House of Commons?*

A. No; the greater number of them opposed it.

Division V.—The Church of Scotland's SACRIFICE OF HER TEMPORALITIES to Regain and Preserve her Freedom.

Q. 338. *When did the Church first contemplate the alternative of being driven to give up her connection with the State?*

A. At the General Assembly in May 1842, when she issued her Claim of Right.

Q. 339. *What was it that occurred soon after, and contributed to hasten the crisis?*

A. The judgment (August, 1842) of the House of Lords, as the court of last resort, establishing the principle that her judicatories were liable for damages, when they did not administer her affairs in conformity with the findings and requirements of the civil tribunals.

Q. 340. *Was this the first occasion of a judgment by the House of Lords that was unequivocally subversive of the Church's jurisdiction and liberty?*

A. It was the first.

Q. 341. *Was it substantially confirmatory of all that had been done by the Court of Session?*

A. Substantially it was.

Q. 342. *How was the judgment received by the Church?*

A. It produced a deep sensation; her metropolitan presbytery instantly stopped proceedings in the settlements going forward within its bounds; and her faithful ministers everywhere began to see that the hour of their trial was at hand.

Q. 343. *What step was now taken by the evangelical ministers of the Church?*

A. To the number of about five hundred, they met in Edinburgh in November 1842, and spent a week in prayer and mutual consultation respecting the circumstances in which, as the holders of State endowments, they were placed by the decision of the House of Lords, and respecting the duty which, by reason of these circumstances, might now be incumbent on them.

Q. 344. *How was this Convocation opened?*

A. By public worship, and a discourse from Dr. Chalmers on the text, Ps. cxii. 4: "Unto the upright there ariseth light in the darkness."

Q. 345. *At what conclusion did the assembled brethren arrive?*

A. They resolved, with singular unanimity, *first*, That they could never abandon the principles for which the Church was contending, or submit, in their capacity of rulers of the Church, to the coercion of the civil power; and, *secondly*, That if Parliament refused to listen to the Claim of Right, and to restore to the Church that freedom of which the civil courts had deprived her, it would be necessary for them, as a matter of conscience and high duty, to resign their livings into the hands of the State.

Q. 346. *On what view of their circumstances was the latter determination founded?*

A. They considered that, while the *rights* of the State, in the disposal of the temporalities of the Church of Scotland, were limited by God's law and by international engagements formed at the union of the kingdoms, its complete *power* over them was unquestionable; so that it could from time to time attach such conditions to the possession of them as it pleased; and that, in point of fact, if Parliament now rejected the Church's Claim of Right, and allowed the adverse decisions of the civil courts to prevail as the law of the land, the State must be held to have changed the terms of the Establishment, and effectually constituted submission to the magistrate's ecclesiastical supremacy a condition on which the civil benefits should thereafter continue to be enjoyed, and to have thereby left no alternative to them, as men of honesty and truth, but the fulfilment of the condition, or the surrender of the benefits.

Q. 347. *What events took place soon after the rising of the Convocation?*

A. The Secretary of State's communication to the Church, and the vote of the House of Commons, as formerly mentioned.

Q. 348. *Was not an important decision given by the Court of Session much about the same time?*

A. Yes; in what was called the Stewarton case, it was decided (20th January, 1843), after full and mature deliberation, that the pastors of congregations in *quoad sacra* churches and chapels of ease had no power of discipline, or spiritual rule, and the Church was required to abolish the sessions of

these places of worship, and to exclude their ministers from her judicatories.

Q. 349. *Was the contingency now arrived for which the Convocation had endeavoured to prepare themselves ?*

A. That solemn contingency was now come ; it was now formally, as well as practically, settled, by Queen, Lords, and Commons, that the terms on which the State continued its gifts were obedience to civil rule in spiritual things ; and the Establishment, whose freedom under Christ our fathers imagined to be for ever secured, was bound in the fetters of Erastianism.

Q. 350. *Was the Church taken by surprise ?*

A. The faithful office-bearers and members of the Church were not taken by surprise, nor (thanks unto Him who helped them) were they greatly disturbed; and it was instantly perceived that, at the General Assembly, then close at hand, the Church must be ready to act, and to choose definitively between separation from the State, with Christ for her only Head, on the one hand, and State support, with the State for her dictator, on the other.

Q. 351. *What happened on the day appointed for the meeting of the General Assembly ?*

A. The ministers and elders, commissioners to the Assembly, convened, according to appointment, on the 18th of May, 1843, in St. Andrew's Church, Edinburgh, and in presence of the Lord High Commissioner of the Queen; and the Moderator of the former Assembly, Dr. Welsh, after prayer to Almighty God, having, in his own name, and, as ultimately appeared, in the name of two hundred

and three commissioners besides, read at length a suitable Protest, the evangelical representatives of the Church withdrew thereupon in a body to the Canonmills Hall, and proceeded to constitute, in separation from the State, a free General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

Q. 352. *What was the substance of the Protest?*

A. That submission to the magistrate in spiritual things, and acquiescence in the recent usurpations of the civil courts, as well as in any like usurpations for the future, being now the conditions on which the benefits of the Establishment must be held, the protesters were constrained to resign these benefits, because they could not fulfil the conditions "without committing what they believed to be sin, in opposition to God's law, in disregard of the honour and authority of Christ's crown, and in violation of their ordination vows;" and further, that the protesting commissioners could not recognise any Assembly that might now be constituted within the Establishment as a free or lawful General Assembly of the true and ancient Church of Scotland, the conditions attached to the Establishment being subversive of the original principles and essential liberties of the Church.

Q. 353. *What spectacle arose in the metropolis of Scotland from the Disruption which has now been described?*

A. There was the spectacle of two General Assemblies—the Established Assembly and the Free Protesting Assembly—sitting at the same time, and each claiming to represent the Church of Scotland.

Q. 354. *Were the protesting commissioners, by*

whom the Free Assembly was constituted, a majority of the commissioners who had been elected throughout the bounds of the Church?

A. They were a clear majority of such as had been elected in conformity with the principles and then existing rules of the Church.*

Q. 355. *How many ministers adhered to the Free Assembly's Protest?*

A. Four hundred and seventy-four gave in their adherence, and resigned the endowments and benefits of the Establishment.

Q. 356. *How many elders adhered?*

A. Probably above two thousand—making, with the adhering ministers, there is reason to believe, a majority of the office-bearers of the Church.

Q. 357. *What proportion of the members of the Church adhered?*

A. There can scarcely be a doubt that there was a decided majority of those in full communion.

Q. 358. *To which of the two Assemblies did the deputies of sister Churches present themselves?*

A. To the Free Assembly.

Q. 359. *How did the missionaries of the Church of Scotland act when the news of the Disruption reached them?*

A. Every one of these godly and devoted men—the missionaries to the Heathen and the mission-

* In many instances, the Erastian party, when unable to command a majority of the presbytery, so as to carry the election of commissioners of their own views, had withdrawn from the meeting, on the ground of the presence of *quoad sacra* members, declared themselves the legal presbytery, and proceeded to a second election. These elections, of course, were contrary to the existing rules of the Church, and went upon principles which she regarded as unconstitutional and inconsistent with Scripture.

aries to the Jews—about twenty, in all, declared for the Free Church as the Church of their fathers, and adhered to her Protest against the Establishment.

Q. 360. *Can you show any distinction between the secession of 1843, and the secession of the Erskines and their brethren about a hundred years before?*

A. Yes; in the latter case, the dispute was between the Church and a faithful minority, who contended against her corrupt administration, and the secession was that of a minority from a majority in the Church; while, in the former case, the dispute was between the State and the Church as such, and the secession was that of the Church from the State.

Q. 361. *Is this distinction important?*

A. It is important. It shows at once the inapplicability of the charge of schism brought against the Free Church by the adherents of the Establishment. Whatever the meaning of schism may be, it does not consist in the secession of the Church from the State.*

Q. 362. *Who are the Schismatics in this case?*

A. They are those who forsook the Church, that they might cleave to the Establishment which she left behind her.

Q. 363. *How do you distinguish between the Establishment and the Church?*

A. The Establishment is the statutory provision of tithes or teinds, glebes, manses, and places of

* It is scarcely necessary to say that no condemnation of the first Seceders is here intended. Separation from a Church is, or is not, an act of schism, according to the grounds on which it has proceeded.

worship;* and the Church is the spiritual community for which that provision was made.

Q. 364. *In what manner did the Established Assembly deal with the Free Assembly's Protest?*

A. They took it into their consideration on Wednesday, May 24; "and finding that the said Protest abounds in statements which are altogether unwarranted, appointed a committee to draw up a FULL AND FORMAL ANSWER to the same, and to report to the Assembly on Saturday."

Q. 365. *What happened on Saturday?*

A. There was no report.

Q. 366. *Did the matter drop in this way?*

A. No. There was a report on Monday; and, besides the report, there were resolutions by the procurator; and there was also "a draft of an answer by Mr. Milne"—making three answers altogether; and the Assembly "approved of the diligence of their committee, and recorded their obligations for the report now laid on the table, as also for the resolutions of the procurator, and the draft of an answer submitted by Mr. Milne, *without, however, pledging themselves to adopt all the views set forth in any of these documents*; but found that a paper so important as the Protest under consideration *requires to be answered with greater care, and with fuller leisure for mature deliberation*, than it has been found possible to give to it during the pressure of business which the Assembly have had to sustain; and also, that in questions involving important points of jurisdiction, the bearings of the various judgments which have been recently pro-

* While this is the strict meaning of "The Establishment," popular usage also denotes by it the Church that is established.

nounced by the civil courts in the numerous cases that have arisen from the illegal maintenance, on the part of the Church, of the Act on Calls and the Acts with reference to Parliamentary and *Quoad Sacra* Churches, should be very carefully and maturely considered. The General Assembly recommended the whole case for the further consideration of their committee, and instructed them, accordingly, to report in the whole case to the Commission in August." The Assembly, at the same time, enlarged their committee.

Q. 367. *What happened at the Commission in August?*

A. "The convener of the committee appointed by last General Assembly to answer the Protest then given in by certain ministers and elders, gave in a report by that committee. The Commission agreed to take up the consideration of this report at their meeting to-morrow." *

Q. 368. *What occurred on the morrow?*

A. No quorum appeared, and the Commission did not meet.

Q. 369. *What became of the answer to the Protest?*

A. It was never heard of more.

Q. 370. *What did the Queen's letter say to the Established Assembly?*

A. It told them that the law, as it had been declared by the civil courts, must be "implicitly obeyed by the General Assembly."

Q. 371. *Was the law so obeyed?*

* This and the previous quotations respecting the answer to the Protest are extracted *verbatim* from the authorized account of the proceedings of Assembly and Commission.

A. In every particular.

Q. 372. *Did the Assembly make no complaint as to any of the assumptions of the civil courts?*

A. None; they bowed their necks without a murmur to the yoke imposed on them.

Q. 373. *What did they do as to the Veto Act, which presbyteries had been already commanded by the civil courts to disregard?*

A. They said that presbyteries must obey the civil courts in that matter, and disregard it accordingly.

Q. 374. *Did they repeal it?*

A. No; they said that it had been null and void from the beginning.

Q. 375. *Would they have said so if the decision of the civil courts had been in favour of the Veto?*

A. They never told what they would have said in that case.

Q. 376. *How did they dispose of the Acts as to chapel-of-ease and QUOAD SACRA ministers, which the civil courts had also said that presbyteries must disobey?*

A. They held that the decision of the civil courts as to the functions and powers of the pastoral office in the case of these ministers must be "implicitly" complied with; and, therefore, they rescinded the Acts which that decision had condemned.

Q. 377. *What was it that was really done by the Established Assembly, when they rescinded the Acts respecting QUOAD SACRA pastors?*

A. They were thereby guilty of destroying the parity of ministers, which is a fundamental prin-

ciple of Presbyterianism, and is asserted in the standards of the Church of Scotland; of taking away, or attempting to take away, at the bidding of the civil power, from between two and three hundred pastors, the function of Church government, which the Lord Jesus has authorized and commanded all pastors to exercise; and of dissolving, or attempting to dissolve, likewise at the bidding of the civil power, between two and three hundred courts of Christ's Church,* which had been organized in his name, and had enjoyed his presence and blessing during years of a zealous and faithful execution of his laws among those of whom "the Holy Ghost had made them overseers."

Q. 378. *What did they do with the deposition of the Strathbogie ministers, which the civil courts had professed to remove?*

A. They declared that it had been null from the beginning.

Q. 379. *Did they say what view they would have taken of the deposition, if the civil courts had declared it a binding censure which the Church alone could remove?*

A. No.

Q. 380. *Has the Established Church thus sanctioned all that the Strathbogie ministers did?*

A. It has.

Q. 381. *May there not be a protesting and non-Erastian minority in the Establishment?*

A. No such minority can honestly harbour in it. They remain in the Establishment on condition of submitting to the State in matters ecclesiastical.

* The kirk-sessions of the *quoad sacra* churches.

Q. 382. *But has not Lord Aberdeen's Act removed the Erastianism imposed by the civil courts?*

A. On the contrary, it has confirmed it. That Act lets the civil courts loose upon the Established Church the moment that these courts are of opinion that the limits of the Act have been transgressed.*

Q. 383. *Is it not declared in the Act of Lord Aberdeen that appeals from the decisions of presbyteries shall lie only to the superior Church courts, and that the judgments of these shall be final?*

A. Yes; but with the express and significant proviso, that the decisions of presbyteries appealed from shall be "within their competency."

Q. 384. *Can you describe the "competency" of the courts of the Establishment, as recognised and fixed by the Act?*

A. It is that of a jury who have the right, on hearing evidence, to decide whether an accusation is true, but must be guided by the judgment of the bench as to whether the matter of the accusation is really a crime. The Church may determine if

* The following expressions were used by Lord Aberdeen and the Lord Chancellor when carrying the Act through Parliament. Lord Aberdeen said (10th July 1843): "There could be no doubt whatever that any patron or presentee might, by action of declarator, bring his case before the Court of Session, and have it found whether or not the presbytery had exceeded their powers in the particular case." And the Chancellor, at the same time, declared: "If the Church courts did not conform to the Act, and exceeded the powers given to them, the civil courts had a right to interfere. It was quite unnecessary to enact anything of the kind. By so doing they would seem to throw a doubt on the subject; and if they did not take care to enact it in very full and ample terms, they would narrow the jurisdiction of the civil courts, instead of maintaining it untouched."

the objections against a presentee are proved; but the civil court alone can conclusively determine if the objections are such as ought to prevent his ordination. So also, by parity of reasoning, and according to the precedent of Strathbogie, which is left in full force by the Act, the Court of Session declares what offences deserve exclusion from the sacraments, or deposition from the ministry; and the office-bearers of the Establishment are the jury who say whether or not these offences have been committed.

Q. 385. *Since functions and duties of an ecclesiastical nature are thus divided between the Church and the State, to which of these parties are the more important and spiritual duties assigned?*

A. The question of mere fact—the question, yea or nay, as to the sufficiency of the proof brought for any charge—a question which it needs nothing but ordinary intelligence and common integrity to pronounce upon fairly—is left to the Church; and the question which, from its very nature, must always involve a point of religious doctrine and high Christian expediency—the question, namely, as to the circumstances that disqualify for the reception of the sacraments, and for the cure of souls, is reserved for the adjudication of the civil tribunals, when a party having interest calls for it.*

* The friends of the Establishment usually resort to a gloss upon this point, and represent the question which is handled by the civil courts as a question about the meaning of statutes. But the Free Church complains of that very thing. The question “as to the circumstances that disqualify for the reception of the sacraments and for the cure of souls” ought *never* to be made a question as to the meaning of statutes, except when the civil power is determining for its own guidance, in its own field, as the dispenser of the temporalities, whether or not the compact

Q. 386. *Is it not alleged that the Established Church is still free, because the members and office-bearers are at liberty to secede from her when they find that the law of Christ and her civil obligations in spiritual matters are inconsistent with each other?*

A. This is sometimes alleged.

Q. 387. *Is the allegation well founded?*

A. No. The liberty of individuals to secede from the Established Church is one thing; the liberty of the Church herself to renounce her Establishment, and to obey the law of Christ, when discovered to be at variance with the requirements of the State, is a thing quite different.

Q. 388. *Are not the courts of the Establishment now at liberty to separate from the State, when conscience forbids them to fulfil the conditions on which the Establishment is enjoyed?*

A. No. The Established Church, in her corporate capacity—her sessions, presbyteries, synods, and general assemblies—dare not, on any account, or under any contingency, separate from the State.

Q. 389. *Did her Majesty's letter to the Established Assembly in 1843 refer to this point?*

between Church and State has been broken; and when the Church is considering, for her own guidance, as the party receiving the temporalities, whether, consistently with principle and duty, she can continue to receive them any longer. With this single exception, it should always be a question as to the meaning of the Bible. The great evil is, that the Established Church is bound, in its spiritual actings, and in the exercise of discipline, to deal with this question, and to submit to its being dealt with, as a question about the meaning of statutes, and to be regulated exclusively by the finding of the civil courts on that view of it.

A. It did. Her Majesty declared that “the union of the Church of Scotland with the State is **INDISSOLUBLE**, while the Statutes remain unrepealed which recognise the Presbyterian Church as the Church established by law within the kingdom of Scotland.”

Q. 390. *What does this mean ?*

A. It has reference to a report, which had reached the Queen’s ministry, that an attempt would be made to dissolve the union between Church and State by a vote of the General Assembly, on the ground that the civil courts had affixed to the Statutes an anti-scriptural construction; and it really means that the Church, as such, is not free to withdraw from the State, although the Statutes of her Establishment should be interpreted in a way that conflicts with her duty to Christ.*

Q. 391. *Suppose that the State should repeal the present Statutes—suppose, for instance, that it abolished the Westminster Confession, and enacted another in its stead—would the Established Church, in that extreme case, be free, through its regular organs, and in its corporate capacity, to renounce its endowments and bring its connection with the State to an end ?*

A. There is no ground now for holding that it would. Individuals would be free, by the

* This was plainly involved in the civil decisions which led to the Disruption: and hence it became impossible, on the occasion of that event, to constitute, within the Establishment, a General Assembly that would have been legally free. The law would have been broken, if the Church had accomplished her secession from the Establishment in any other way than by the individual acts of commissioners, office-bearers, and members.

law of toleration, to withdraw from the Established communion, and that would be all.

Q. 392. *Does it not follow from all this that the Established Church is "the creature of the State?"*

A. Certainly.

Q. 393. *Are not the ministers of the Establishment accustomed to declare that they hold the doctrine of Christ's Headship as fully and as firmly as any can do?*

A. They are; but let them only begin to act upon the doctrine, and they will soon be reminded of their fetters.

Q. 394. *What is now the law of the land respecting the ecclesiastical power of the State?*

A. It is now the law that the State has a right to dictate to its Established Church in regard to the settlement of ministers and the formation of the pastoral tie, the composition and number of Christ's courts, the duties and functions of Christ's servants, the exercise of the power of the keys, and the preaching of the Gospel; and to punish that Church, if she disobey its commands: it is the law, that the relevancy of every libel may be carried by appeal to the civil courts, in order to be conclusively settled: and it is further the law, that the State has authority, and is entitled, when it sees good, itself to wield the power of the keys, as far as the Church it has established is concerned, by the infliction and removal of spiritual censures, by suspending the majorities of presbyteries from their judicial functions, by recalling sentences of exclusion from the sacraments, and by restoring to their

offices men who have been deposed from the holy ministry.*

Q. 395. *Are the ministers of the Establishment pledged to submit to these things?*

A. They accept and hold their benefices on condition of obedience to the law.

Q. 396. *Are they not at liberty, however, to preach the Gospel in all its fulness?*

A. No; they cannot, as upright men, teach the unmutilated doctrine of Scripture respecting Christ's kingly office and his Headship in the Church.

Q. 397. *Is not the interposition of civil authority in the government of the Church fitted also, in some degree, to neutralize the influence of the saving truths of the Gospel?*

A. It is. The full, free, and direct communion of the rulers of the Church with Christ himself, as speaking in the Word and guiding by the Spirit, cannot be interrupted, even in regard to matters of mere administration, without impairing the spirituality of the rulers, giving, in so far, a secular aspect to the Church, and, ultimately, more or less obstructing the flow of the vital stream from Him, without whom his servants and his people "can do nothing."

Q. 398. *Has the Free Church of Scotland had any reason to repent of the sacrifice she made for the Headship of Christ?*

A. She has not, indeed. Amid sore privations, which many of her office-bearers have endured, they have had the solace—and it has not been small—which a good conscience yields; the Church

* See the Protest, Appendix, No. III.

has been more than recompensed by the precious tokens of the favour of her glorious King which she has had the privilege to receive; even her enemies have been obliged to confess that the Lord hath done great things for her; and rich experience enables her to say—"Truly God is good to Israel."

CHAPTER IV.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

SECTION I.—THE OFFICE-BEARERS OF THE CHURCH

Q. 399. *Is the Free Church of Scotland a Presbyterian Church?*

A. It is.

Q. 400. *What do you mean by that?*

A. That its government is in the hands of presbyters or elders.

Q. 401. *Are these its only office-bearers?*

A. No; there are deacons also.

Q. 402. *Is there warrant in Scripture for any class of ordinary Church office-bearers besides presbyters and deacons?*

A. There is not.

Q. 403. *Are not bishops mentioned as ordinary office-bearers in the Church?*

A. They are; but bishops and presbyters are only different names for the same class of office-bearers.

Q. 404. *What is the literal meaning of the word BISHOP?*

A. Overseer or superintendent.

Q. 405. *Does it ever occur in the sense of an overseer or superintendent of the pastors of the Church?*

A. Never. In Scripture, it always signifies an overseer of the flock.

Q. 406. *Are there any texts in which the translators of the English Bible have substituted the meaning of the word BISHOP for the word itself?*

A. There are two remarkable ones. In Acts xx. 28, the Apostle Paul, addressing the elders or presbyters of Ephesus, says: "Take heed to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*", (in the original, *bishops*); and the Apostle Peter says, in his exhortation to the presbyters of Asia (1 Pet. v. 2): "Feed the flock of God which is among you, *taking the oversight* thereof" (in the original, doing the work of bishops thereof), "not by constraint, but willingly."*

Q. 407. *What conclusion do these passages lead to regarding the bishops and presbyters of the New Testament?*

A. That the offices were identical.

Q. 408. *Are these the only passages from which the identity of bishops and presbyters appears?*

A. No; it may be also inferred from Phil. i. 1, where the whole office-bearers of the Philippian Church are described as "*bishops and deacons*;" and from Tit. i. 5-7, where the terms "elders" and "bishops" are both applied to the same office.

* The natural leanings of the English translators, as members of the Church of England, account for these peculiar renderings.

Q. 409. *What is the Popish and Prelatical view respecting bishops and presbyters?*

A. That bishops are a distinct and superior class, appointed to conduct the government of the Church; and that presbyters have no power of discipline or ordination.

Q. 410. *Is the view thus given of the presbyter's office conformable to Scripture?*

A. It is not; presbyters are expressly recognised as the ordinary rulers of the Church, and administrators of its discipline (1 Tim. v. 17; iii. 3-5; Heb. xiii. 7, 17; 1 Pet. v. 1-4); they had an equal voice with the apostles themselves in the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 2, 6; xvi. 4); and they exercised the power of ordination. (Acts xiii. 1-3; 1 Tim. iv. 14.)

Q. 411. *What admission have Prelatists been obliged to make regarding the bishops and presbyters of the New Testament?*

A. They admit that the name of bishops is a general one, given to all the teachers of the Church, and used, in some instances (as Acts xx. 17, 28), when presbyters alone are intended.

Q. 412. *To what conclusion does this shut them up?*

A. That while Scripture contains at least two formal and particular accounts of the qualifications necessary for the presbyter-bishop (1 Tim. iii. 1-7; Tit. i. 5-9), and one account of the qualifications necessary for the deacon (1 Tim. iii. 8-12), it contains no separate or special account whatever of the qualifications necessary for the prelate-bishop, who, according to them, is the most important functionary of all.

Q. 413. *May the existence of an order superior*

to presbyters be inferred from the mention of the angel in the epistles to the seven Churches in Asia?

A. Certainly not. The word angel signifies a messenger, and is thus descriptive of every pastor as bearing the message of Christ. It may here denote the presbyter or elder presiding among his fellows for the time; or it may be held to be put collectively for the ministry of the particular Churches, as the plural address in several of the epistles would seem to indicate. (Rev. ii. 10, 13, 24, 25.) It cannot, on any view, set aside the texts which ascribe the power of government and ordination to presbyters: nor may it be taken as showing an order superior to presbyters in the Churches of Asia, without implying that an incredible change had been made in their polity; because the First Epistle of Peter, which was directed, among others, to these very Churches, distinctly shows that, in Peter's day, presbyters had exclusive charge of the government of them all. (1 Pet. i. 1, compared with ch. v. 1-4.)

Q. 414. *Does the inspired record present us with any case of the ordination of deacons, when the circumstances of the Church required it?*

A. Yes; we read of the appointment and ordination of seven deacons in the Church of Jerusalem. (Acts vi.)

Q. 415. *Does it furnish any similar example of the wants of the Church making it necessary for the apostles to use their powers in the consecration of prelates?*

A. Not one; and, excepting the disputed cases of Timothy and Titus, no such thing is even pretended.

Q. 416. *If, however, the original constitution of the Church was Prelatical, must it not have happened, what with the death of apostles, and the progress of the Gospel in Asia and Europe, that many examples of this sort actually occurred?*

A. The conclusion is not easily avoided.

Q. 417. *Are we ever told, in Scripture, of the ordination of presbyters, as new Churches sprang up, and the Gospel kingdom was extended?*

A. Yes. (Acts xiv. 23.)

Q. 418. *And are we told nothing of the same kind about the ordaining or consecrating of prelates?*

A. Nothing.

Q. 419. *Is there any instance of a Bible command to ordain presbyters in every city where the Word had been received?*

A. There is. (Tit. i. 5.)

Q. 420. *Have we any instance of a command to ordain or consecrate prelates in every city or district?*

A. No.

Q. 421. *Must there not have been a prelate in every city where a Church was formed, if the angels of Ephesus, Smyrna, &c., were prelates?*

A. There must have been.

Q. 422. *If there was a prelate in every city, is it not extraordinary that, except in the case of the seven angels, the existence of such a dignitary, in any city whatever, is not once alluded to throughout the New Testament?*

A. It seems very unaccountable.

Q. 423. *If the primitive government of the Church was Prelatical, is it not strange that there should be so much in Scripture about the appoint-*

ment of the minor office-bearers, and so little that can be pretended to relate to the appointment or even the existence of the members of that exalted order, on which, as many hold, the Church's very being depends ?

A. It is a surprising circumstance.

Q. 424. *What inference are you now prepared to draw regarding New Testament Episcopacy ?*

A. That New Testament Episcopacy is the Episcopacy of presbyters.

Q. 425. *Were there any extraordinary office-bearers in the primitive Church ?*

A. Yes; there were three classes of them—apostles, prophets, and evangelists. (Eph. iv. 11.)

Q. 426. *On what grounds do you say that these were extraordinary office-bearers ?*

A. No provision was made for their continuance in the Church, as there was for that of presbyters or bishops, and deacons. (1 Tim. iii. 1-13; Tit. i. 5-9; 1 Pet. v. 1-4.) They possessed extraordinary qualifications and powers (1 Cor. xii. 8-10); and they were obviously given for the purpose of introducing the Gospel dispensation.

Q. 427. *Did our Lord's appointment of apostles imply the institution of a permanent order superior to presbyters ?*

A. There is no reason for supposing it. The apostles were inspired; they had the power of working miracles, and the gift of tongues, and could convey that power and gift by the imposition of their hands (Acts viii. 17, 18; xix. 6); and it was a necessary qualification for their office to have personally seen the Lord. (Acts i. 21, 22; 1 Cor. ix. 1.) Their office was, therefore, temporary; and,

except in the capacity of presbyters, which all of them sustained (1 Pet. v. 1; 2 John 1; 3 John 1), they had no successors.

Q. 428. *What does the word APOSTLE signify?*

A. One who is sent—a messenger.

Q. 429. *Is it ever used, by the sacred writers, to convey any other idea than that of a MESSENGER OF CHRIST?*

A. Yes. Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 25), and the brethren mentioned in 2 Cor. viii. 23, are called “the messengers”—in the original, the *apostles*—“of the Churches.” From Acts xiii. 1-3, it appears that Barnabas and Saul became the messengers of the Church at Antioch; and hence it probably is that, in Acts xiv. 14, the name of “apostles” is applied to them both.

Q. 430. *What office was held by Timothy and Titus?*

A. They appear to have been evangelists, or missionaries; and, as such, to have had no fixed charge, labouring as itinerant preachers, planting and organizing Churches among the Heathen, and ordaining native pastors over them.

Q. 431. *By whom was Timothy ordained to his office?*

A. He is expressly said to have been ordained by a body of presbyters. (1 Tim. iv. 14.)

Q. 432. *Did the Apostle Paul assist at the ordination of Timothy?*

A. We are not certainly informed that he did; but if such was the case, it was in his capacity of a presbyter; for it was as a presbytery, or body of presbyters, that the ordainers of Timothy were associated.

Q. 433. *What is meant by "the gift of God," which Timothy was exhorted to stir up, and which was in him by the laying on of Paul's hands?* (2 Tim. i. 6.)

A. It probably signifies the extraordinary influences of the Holy Ghost, which the apostles alone had the power of imparting.

Q. 434. *How many kinds of presbyters are there?*

A. Two—pastors, and ruling elders, who assist the pastors in the government of the Church. (1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Rom. xii. 8.)

Q. 435. *What is the nature of the deacon's office?*

A. To care for the poor, and to assist the other office-bearers in receiving and disbursing the funds of the Church. (Acts vi. 1-4.)

Q. 436. *Does it not belong to the deacons alone to administer the secular affairs of the Church?*

A. The greater office always includes the less (1 Pet. v. 1; 2 John 1); the presbyter may, therefore, as a deacon, take part, when it is necessary, in conducting "the outward business of the house of God;" and we find, in point of fact, that, after deacons as a separate order had been introduced, the superior office-bearers continued to attend to it, the deacons assisting, but not superseding them. (Acts xi. 29, 30; xxiv. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 1-3; 2 Cor. viii. and ix.)

Q. 437. *Is the preaching of the Gospel any part of the duty of a deacon?*

A. The deacon, as such, has no authority to preach or to rule in the Church; but persons holding that office, may, of course, if qualified, be admitted to a higher one. (Acts xxi. 8.)

Q. 438. *May the functions of ecclesiastical office be assumed without Christ's warrant and call?*

A. No. (Heb. v. 4.)

Q. 439. *By whom are the office-bearers of particular congregations to be elected?*

A. By the members of the Church in these congregations. (Acts i. 15-23; vi. 1-3; xiv. 23.)

Q. 440. *By whom are the qualifications of the persons thus elected to be finally judged of?*

A. By the rulers of the Church. (1 Tim. v. 22; 2 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. i. 5-9.)

Q. 441. *In what manner are the office-bearers of the Church to be set apart to their duties?*

A. By ordination. (Acts vi. 3, 6; xiii. 1-3; 1 Tim. iv. 14.)

SECTION II.—THE JUDICATORIES OF THE CHURCH.

Q. 442. *Did you say that the Free Church of Scotland is called a Presbyterian Church because it is governed by presbyters?*

A. Yes.

Q. 443. *What is the Scripture name for a body of presbyters?*

A. A presbytery. (1 Tim. iv. 14.)

Q. 444. *Ought there to be more than one presbyter in each congregation?*

A. There ought, if possible, to be several presbyters in each congregation. (Acts xiv. 23.)

Q. 445. *Does the government of a congregation*

belong to the congregational presbytery or eldership?

A. Yes.

Q. 446. *Is it not maintained by some that the government of a congregation belongs to the members of the same?*

A. It is.

Q. 447. *How do you prove that the eldership or congregational presbytery is the body in whose hands the government is vested?*

A. By several arguments.

Q. 448. *What is the first?*

A. That the general power of the keys was given by Christ, not to the members, but to the apostles and pastors of the Church. (Matt. xvi. 19.)

Q. 449. *What is the second?*

A. That the presbyters of the Church are called by a variety of names, which convey the idea that the government belongs to them; such as, pastors or shepherds, bishops or overseers, stewards, and governments. (Eph. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Tit. i. 7.)

Q. 450. *What is your third argument?*

A. That Christ's instructions for the government of the Church are addressed to office-bearers, and not to the members thereof. (Rom. xii. 8; 1 Tim. v. 20-22; Tit. iii. 10; 1 Pet. v. 3.)

Q. 451. *What is your fourth argument?*

A. That *skill to govern* is a prescribed qualification of the pastors of the Church, and is not a qualification for membership. (1 Tim. iii. 4, 5; Acts ii. 41; viii. 36, 37.)

Q. 452. *What is your fifth argument?*

A. That the various branches of Church power

and authority are severally committed, not to the members, but to the pastors and presbyters of the Church.

First, To the pastors and presbyters the dogmatical power is committed. (Mark xvi. 15; 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2; 2 Cor. v. 20; 1 Pet. v. 2; Acts xv. 2, 6; xvi. 4.)

Secondly, The power of order is committed to them. (Acts xxi. 18-26; Tit. i. 5.)

Thirdly, To them is given the power of discipline, otherwise called the power of binding and loosing. (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; John xx. 23; 1 Tim. v. 19; Tit. ii. 15; iii. 10.)

Fourthly, To them is given the power of ordination. (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 2.)

Q. 453. *What is your sixth argument?*

A. That the commission authoritatively to declare the mind of Christ respecting all the affairs of his Church was given, not to the members, but to the pastors and presbyters of the Church. (Matt. xxviii. 18-20; Acts xx. 27; 2 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. i. 9; Eph. iv. 11, 12.)

Q. 454. *Was not the commission to that effect given exclusively to the apostles?*

A. No. The apostles alone were appointed *infallibly* to declare the mind of Christ; but ordinary presbyters are appointed authoritatively to declare it out of the Scriptures. (2 Cor. v. 20; Eph. iv. 11-13.) At the same time, this authority is not absolute or lordly, and binds the conscience only in so far as the mind of Christ is truly declared.

Q. 455. *What is your seventh argument?*

A. Instead of the members of the Church being

intrusted with the power and function of self-government, the duty imposed upon them is obedience and submission to their pastors and spiritual rulers. (1 Thess. v. 12, 13; Heb. xiii. 17.)

Q. 456. *Have you any other argument?*

A. It may, in fine, be added, that there is no instance of the office-bearers of the Church being told to obey the injunctions, or to give effect to the decisions, of Church or congregational meetings, although there is more than one special address to them on the duties they ought to discharge. (Acts xx. 17, 28-35; 1 Pet. v. 1-11.)

Q. 457. *What are we to understand by our Lord's direction to "Tell it unto the Church?"* (Matt. xviii. 17.)

A. In consistency with the place assigned in other Scriptures to the presbyters of the Church, and the functions vested in them, as well as with a common and natural form of speech, we are to understand that a matter of discipline is submitted to the Church, when it is brought before the official representatives and rulers of the Church.

Q. 458. *Was it practicable to obey our Lord's precept otherwise than according to this view of it, in the case of some of the Churches of which the Scriptures inform us?*

A. No. The Church of Jerusalem had three thousand members added to it on one occasion, and five thousand on another; and, at a subsequent period, we find it consisting of "many myriads" of people. (Acts xxi. 20.) "How many thousands" is, in the original, "how many *myriads*;" and a myriad consisted of *ten thousand*.

Q. 459. *How do you explain the case of the in-*

restuous person, as recorded in 1 Cor. v. 1-5, and 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7?

A. It simply amounts to this, that the guilty individual was to be publicly excommunicated; and that the sentence, while it must have been pronounced by the elders of the Church, could not be fully executed without the concurrent action of the members, as it implied separation from all Christian fellowship; and the penalty, from its very nature, was, therefore, "inflicted of many."

Q. 460. *May there not be a distinction between an authoritative judgment and a concurrent judgment of approval and acclamation?*

A. Such a distinction there is (Matt. xix. 28; 1 Cor. vi. 2); and an example of it seems to be afforded in the case of the judgment in the controversy about circumcision (Acts xv. 1), which was the judgment, authoritatively, of the apostles and elders (Acts xv. 2, 6; xvi. 4), and appears to have been the judgment, by approval and acclamation, of a numerous audience of disciples. (Acts xv. 12, 22).

Q. 461. *What name is now given to the body of presbyters in a single congregation?*

A. They are called the session, or congregational eldership.

Q. 462. *Is there any Scripture warrant for judicatories of a higher order?*

A. Yes. The disciples at Jerusalem, at Antioch, at Ephesus, and at Corinth, were so numerous, and had so many pastors who laboured among them (Acts ii. 41, 47; iv. 4; v. 14; vi. 7; xxi. 20; xi. 21-27; xix. 8, 10, 17-20)—the languages spoken were so various—and the practice of hold-

ing Christian assemblies in upper chambers, school-rooms, and private houses, necessarily so much prevailed (Acts xii. 12; xix. 9; xx. 8; 1 Cor. xiv. 34; xvi. 19; Rom. xvi. 5; Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2)—that there must have been a number of congregations in each of these places; while we know, at the same time, that these congregations formed but one Church at Jerusalem, at Antioch, at Ephesus, and at Corinth, respectively, and were consequently united under one presbyterial government.

Q. 463. *Is there Scripture precedent for Church courts of a more general nature still?*

A. There is. Such precedent is afforded by the synod or council of Jerusalem, described in Acts xv.

Q. 464. *Were the resolutions of that assembly authoritative and binding?*

A. Yes; they were “decrees,” and were binding on all the Churches of Christ. (Acts xvi. 4.)

Q. 465. *Were the resolutions inspired?*

A. No; the mind of the Spirit, which they expressed (Acts xv. 28), was arrived at by discussion, by consideration of facts, and by reference to the written Word (Acts xv. 6-21); and uninspired presbyters united with the apostles in passing them. If the matter at issue had been to be determined by special revelation, there would have been no debate (verse 7), and a single apostle might have settled it.

Q. 466. *How was the synod composed?*

A. Of the twelve apostles, who, from their peculiar office, stood related, not to the Church at Jerusalem merely, but to all the Churches of Christ; of the presbyters of Jerusalem; of the commis-

sioners from Antioch; and there may have been presbyters from other Churches.

Q. 467. *Was it not by the whole Church of Jerusalem that the decrees were enacted?*

A. No; the Church of Jerusalem, as such, could have no authority to enact decrees by which sister Churches were to be bound. The whole Church, literally, embracing all its members, of both sexes and of every age, cannot possibly have been present; but the whole Church assembled—the believing onlookers—joined their judgment of approbation to the judgment of authority pronounced by the synod. (Acts xv. 22, 23.)

Q. 468. *Is it not manifestly conducive to justice that there should be courts of review and synodical assemblies to appeal to, especially in cases where it happens that local feelings run high, and local prejudices are strong?*

A. It is.

Q. 469. *Is it not the duty of Christ's Churches to engage themselves in missionary work both at home and abroad?*

A. A main part of their business ought to consist in carrying on missionary operations.

Q. 470. *Is the Presbyterian form of government, with its gradation of courts, well adapted for enabling Christian Churches to attend to the propagation of the Gospel?*

A. Yes; and the Churches within the British dominions which, as such, carry on Christian missions, are chiefly, if not exclusively, Churches having a Presbyterian organization, or what is equivalent to it; while others, who have not the scriptural machinery of Presbyterianism, find it necessary

to have recourse to the modern expedient of missionary societies, in which membership is acquired by a pecuniary contribution, and by which committees of their number are appointed to call forth and direct the efforts of Christ's disciples, to devise and apply the appropriate means, and to look out and train the fitting agents for accomplishing the great ecclesiastical work of the evangelization of the world.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

RESOLUTION OF 1838 ANENT THE SPIRITUAL JURISDICTION OF THE CHURCH.

The General Assembly, having heard and considered the overtures on the independent jurisdiction of the Church of Scotland, agreed, by a majority, to the following resolution:—

That the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, while they unqualifiedly acknowledge the exclusive jurisdiction of the civil courts in regard to the civil rights and emoluments secured by law to the Church and ministers thereof, and will ever give and inculcate implicit obedience to their decisions thereanent, do resolve, that, as is declared in the Confession of Faith of this National Established Church, “The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate;” and that in all matters touching the doctrine, government, and discipline of this Church, her judicatories possess an exclusive jurisdiction, founded on the Word of God; “which power ecclesiastical” (in the words of the Second Book of Discipline) “flows immediately from God and the Mediator, Jesus Christ, and is spiritual, not having a temporal head on earth, but only Christ, the only spiritual King and Governor of his Kirk;” and they do further resolve, that this spiritual jurisdiction, and the supremacy and sole Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, on which it depends, they will assert, and at all hazards defend, by the help and blessing of that great God who, in the days of old, enabled their fathers, amid manifold persecutions, to maintain a testimony, even to the death, for Christ’s kingdom and crown; and, finally, that they will firmly enforce submission to the same upon the office-bearers and members of this Church, by the execution of her laws, in the exercise of the ecclesiastical authority wherewith they are invested.

No. II.

EXTRACTS FROM CLAIM OF RIGHT.

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, taking into consideration the solemn circumstances in which, in the inscrutable providence of God, this Church is now placed, and that, notwithstanding the securities for the government thereof by general assemblies, synods, presbyteries, and kirk-sessions, and for the liberties, government, jurisdiction, discipline, rights, and privileges of the same, provided by the statutes of the realm, by the constitution of this country, as unalterably settled by the Treaty of Union, and by the oath "inviolably to maintain and preserve" the same, required to be taken by each sovereign at accession, as a condition precedent to the exercise of the royal authority—which securities might well seem, and had long been thought, to place the said liberties, government, jurisdiction, discipline, rights, and privileges of this Church beyond the reach of danger or invasion—these have been of late assailed by the very court to which the Church was authorized to look for assistance and protection, to an extent that threatens their entire subversion, with all the grievous calamities to this Church and nation which would inevitably flow therefrom, did, and hereby do, solemnly and in reliance on the grace and power of the Most High, resolve and agree on the following Claim, Declaration, and Protest.

After setting forth very fully the principles of the Church respecting her jurisdiction, and showing the acknowledgment and ratification of these by the laws of Scotland, the Claim proceeds to the encroachments of the Court of Session:—

WHEREAS, pending the efforts of the Church to accomplish the desired alteration of the law, the Court of Session—a tribunal instituted by special Act of Parliament for the specific and limited purpose of "doing and administration of justice in all *civil actions*,"* with judges appointed simply "to sit and decide upon all *actions civil*,"†—not confining themselves to the determination of "*civil actions*"—to the withholding of civil consequences from sentences of the Church courts which, in their judgment, were not warranted by the statutes recognising the jurisdiction of these courts—to the enforcing of the provision of the Act 1592, c. 117, for retention of the fruits of the benefice in case of wrongful refusal to admit a presentee, or the giving of

* 1537, c. 36.

† 1532, c. 1.

other civil redress for any civil injury held by them to have been wrongfully sustained in consequence thereof—have, in numerous and repeated instances, stepped beyond the province allotted to them by the constitution, and within which alone their decisions can be held to declare the law, or to have the force of law, deciding not only “actions civil,” but “causes spiritual and ecclesiastical”—and that, too, even where these had no connection with the exercise of the right of patronage—and have invaded the jurisdiction, and encroached upon the spiritual privileges, of the courts of this Church, in violation of the constitution of the country, in defiance of the statutes above mentioned, and in contempt of the laws of this kingdom: as, for instance,

By interdicting presbyteries of the Church from admitting to a pastoral charge,* when about to be done irrespective of the civil benefice attached thereto, or even where there was no benefice, no right of patronage, no stipend, no manse or glebe, and no place of worship, or any patrimonial right, connected therewith.†

By issuing a decree‡ requiring and ordaining a Church court to take on trial, and admit to the office of the holy ministry in a particular charge, a probationer or unordained candidate for the ministry, and to intrude him also on the congregation, contrary to the will of the people; both in this and in the cases first mentioned invading the Church’s exclusive jurisdiction in the admission of ministers, the preaching of the Word, and administration of sacraments, recognised by statute to have been “given by God” directly to the Church, and to be beyond the limits of the secular jurisdiction.

By prohibiting the communicants§ of the Church from intimating their dissent from a call proposed to be given to a candidate for the ministry to become their pastor.

By granting interdict against the establishment of additional ministers to meet the wants of an increasing population,|| as uninterruptedly practised from the Reformation to this day; against constituting a new kirk-session in a parish, to exercise discipline; and against innovating on its existing state, “as regards pastoral superintendence, its kirk-session, and jurisdiction and discipline thereto belonging.”

By interdicting the preaching of the Gospel, and administration of ordinances,¶ throughout a whole district, by any minister of the Church under authority of the Church courts; thus assuming to themselves the regulation of the “preaching of the Word” and “administration of the sacraments,” and at the same

* 1st Lethendy Case.

† Marnoch Case.

‡ Stewarton Case.

† Stewarton Case.

§ Daviot Case.

¶ Strathbogie Cases.

time invading the privilege, common to all the subjects of the realm, of having freedom to worship God according to their consciences, and under the guidance of the ministers of the communion to which they belong.

By holding the members of inferior Church judicatories liable in damages* for refusing to break their ordination vows and oaths (sworn by them in compliance with the requirements of the statutes of the realm, and, in particular, of the Act of Security embodied in the Treaty of Union), by disobeying and setting at defiance the sentences, in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, of their superior Church judicatories; to which, by the constitution of the Church and country, they are in such matters subordinate and subject, and which, by their said vows and oaths, they stand pledged to obey.

By interdicting the execution of the sentence of a Church judicatory prohibiting a minister from preaching or administering ordinances within a particular parish, † pending the discussion of a cause in the Church courts as to the validity of his settlement therein.

By interdicting the General Assembly and inferior Church judicatories from inflicting Church censures; as in one case, where interdict was granted against the pronouncing of sentence of deposition upon a minister found guilty of theft, by a judgment acquiesced in by himself; ‡ in another, where a presbytery was interdicted from proceeding in the trial of a minister accused of fraud and swindling; § and in a third, where a presbytery was interdicted from proceeding with a libel against a licentiate for drunkenness, obscenity, and profane swearing. ||

By suspending Church censures, ¶ inflicted by the Church judicatories in the exercise of discipline (which, by special statute, all "judges and officers of justice" are ordered "to give due assistance" for making "to be obeyed or otherwise effectual"), and so reponing ministers suspended from their office to the power of preaching and administering ordinances; thus assuming to themselves the "power of the keys."

By interdicting the execution of a sentence of deposition from the office of the holy ministry, pronounced by the General Assembly of the Church; ** thereby also usurping the "power of the keys," and supporting deposed ministers in the exercise of ministerial functions—which is declared by special statute to be a "high contempt of the authority of the Church, and of the laws of the kingdom establishing the same."

* 2d Auchterarder Case.

† Culsamond Case.

‡ Cambusnethan Case.

§ Stranraer Case.

|| 4th Lethendy Case.

¶ 1st and 2d Strathbogie Cases.

** 3d Strathbogie Case.

By assuming to judge of the right of individuals elected members of the General Assembly to sit therein,* and interdicting them from taking their seats; thus interfering with the constitution of the supreme court of the Church, and violating her freedom in the holding of General Assemblies, secured to her by statute.

By, in the greater number of instances above referred to, requiring the inferior judicatories of the Church to disobey the sentences, in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, of the superior judicatories, to which, by the constitution in Church and State, they are subordinate and subject, and which, in compliance with the provisions of the statutes of the realm, their members have solemnly sworn to obey; thus subverting "the government of the Church by kirk-sessions, presbyteries, provincial synods, and general assemblies," settled by statute and the Treaty of Union as "the only government of the Church within the kingdom of Scotland."

By all which acts the said Court of Session, apparently not advertg to the oath taken by the Sovereign, from whom they hold their commissions, have exercised powers not conferred upon them by the constitution, but by it excluded from the province of any secular tribunal; have invaded the jurisdiction of the courts of the Church; have subverted its government; have illegally attempted to coerce Church courts in the exercise of their purely spiritual functions; have usurped the "power of the keys"—have wrongfully acclaimed, as the subjects of their civil jurisdiction, to be regulated by their decrees, ordination of laymen to the office of the holy ministry, admission to the cure of souls, Church censures, the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the sacraments; and have employed the means intrusted to them for enforcing submission to their lawful authority in compelling submission to that which they have usurped—in opposition to the doctrines of God's Word set forth in the Confession of Faith, as ratified by statute—in violation of the constitution—in breach of the Treaty of Union, and in disregard of divers express enactments of the Legislature.

AND WHEREAS further encroachments are threatened on the government and discipline of the Church as by law established,† in actions now depending before the said court, in which it is sought to have sentences of deposition from the office of the holy ministry reduced and set aside,‡ and minorities of inferior judicatories authorized to take on trial, and admit to the office of the holy ministry, in disregard of, and in opposition to, the authority

* 5th Strathbogie Case.

† 4th Strathbogie Case.

‡ 3d Auchterarder Case; 3d Lethendy Case.

of the judicatories of which they are members, and of the superior judicatories to which they are subordinate and subject;

AND WHEREAS the government and discipline of Christ's Church cannot be carried on according to his laws and the constitution of his Church, subject to the exercise, by any secular tribunal, of such powers as have been assumed by the said Court of Session;

AND WHEREAS this Church, highly valuing, as she has ever done, her connection, on the terms contained in the statutes herein before recited, with the State, and her possession of the temporal benefits thereby secured to her for the advantage of the people, must, nevertheless, even at the risk and hazard of the loss of that connection and of these public benefits—deeply as she would deplore and deprecate such a result for herself and the nation—persevere in maintaining her liberties as a Church of Christ, and in carrying on the government thereof on her own constitutional principles, and must refuse to intrude ministers on her congregations, to obey the unlawful coercion attempted to be enforced against her in the exercise of her spiritual functions and jurisdiction, or to consent that her people be deprived of their rightful liberties;

THEREFORE the General Assembly, while, as above set forth, they fully recognise the absolute jurisdiction of the civil courts in relation to all matters whatsoever of a civil nature, and especially in relation to all the temporalities conferred by the State upon the Church, and the civil consequences attached by law to the decisions, in matters spiritual, of the Church courts, DO, in name and on behalf of this Church, and of the nation and people of Scotland, and under the sanction of the several statutes, and the Treaty of Union herein before recited, CLAIM, as of RIGHT, that she shall freely possess and enjoy her liberties, government, discipline, rights, and privileges, according to law, especially for the defence of the spiritual liberties of her people, and that she shall be protected therein from the foresaid unconstitutional and illegal encroachments of the said Court of Session, and her people secured in their Christian and constitutional rights and liberties.

AND they DECLARE that they cannot, in accordance with the Word of God, the authorized and ratified standards of this Church, and the dictates of their consciences, intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations, or carry on the government of Christ's Church, subject to the coercion attempted by the Court of Session as above set forth; and that, at the risk and hazard of suffering the loss of the secular benefits conferred by the State, and the public advantages of an Establishment, they must, as by God's grace they will, refuse so to do; for, highly as they esti-

mate these, they cannot put them in competition with the inalienable liberties of a Church of Christ, which, alike by their duty and allegiance to their Head and King, and by their ordination vows, they are bound to maintain, "notwithstanding of whatsoever trouble or persecution may arise."

AND they PROTEST, that all and whatsoever Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain, passed without the consent of this Church and nation, in alteration of, or derogation to, the aforesaid government, discipline, rights, and privileges of this Church (which were not allowed to be treated of by the commissioners for settling the terms of the union between the two kingdoms, but were secured by antecedent stipulation, provided to be inserted, and inserted, in the Treaty of Union, as an unalterable and fundamental condition thereof, and so reserved from the cognizance and power of the federal legislature created by the said Treaty); as also, all and whatsoever sentences of courts in contravention of the same government, discipline, rights, and privileges, are, and shall be, in themselves void and null, and of no legal force or effect; and that, while they will accord full submission to all such Acts and sentences, in so far—though in so far only—as these may regard civil rights and privileges, what ever may be their opinion of the justice or legality of the same, their said submission shall not be deemed an acquiescence therein, but that it shall be free to the members of this Church, or their successors, at any time hereafter when there shall be a prospect of obtaining justice, to claim the restitution of all such civil rights and privileges, and temporal benefits and endowments, as for the present they may be compelled to yield up, in order to preserve to their office-bearers the free exercise of their spiritual government and discipline, and to their people the liberties, of which respectively it has been attempted, so contrary to law and justice, to deprive them.

AND, FINALLY, the General Assembly call the Christian people of this kingdom, and all the Churches of the Reformation throughout the world, who hold the great doctrine of the sole Headship of the Lord Jesus over his Church, to witness, that it is for their adherence to that doctrine, as set forth in their Confession of Faith, and ratified by the laws of this kingdom, and for the maintenance by them of the jurisdiction of the office-bearers, and the freedom and privileges of the members of the Church, from that doctrine flowing, that this Church is subjected to hardship, and that the rights so sacredly pledged and secured to her are put in peril; and they especially invite all the office-bearers and members of this Church, who are willing to suffer for their allegiance to their adorable King and Head, to stand by the Church, and by each other, in defence of the doctrine afore-

said, and of the liberties and privileges, whether of office-bearers or people, which rest upon it; and to unite in supplication to Almighty God, that he would be pleased to turn the hearts of the rulers of this kingdom, to keep unbroken the faith pledged to this Church in former days, by statutes and solemn treaty, and the obligations come under to God himself to preserve and maintain the government and discipline of this Church in accordance with his Word; or otherwise, that he would give strength to this Church—office-bearers and people—to endure resignedly the loss of the temporal benefits of an Establishment, and the personal sufferings and sacrifices to which they may be called, and would also inspire them with zeal and energy to promote the advancement of his Son's kingdom, in whatever condition it may be his will to place them; and that, in his own good time, he would restore to them these benefits, the fruits of the struggles and sufferings of their fathers in times past in the same cause; and thereafter give them grace to employ them more effectually than hitherto they have done for the manifestation of his glory.

No. III.

PROTEST BY COMMISSIONERS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
READ IN PRESENCE OF THE ROYAL COMMISSIONER, 18TH
MAY, 1843.

*At Edmburgh, and within a large Hall at Canonmills,
the 18th day of May, 1843 years.—Scss. 1.*

The commissioners to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, appointed to have been holden this day, having met in St Andrew's Church, the ministers and elders, commissioners thereto, whose names are appended to the Protest then and there made, and herein after inserted, having withdrawn from that place, and having convened in a large hall at Canonmills, in presence of a great concourse of ministers, elders, and people, and having duly constituted themselves in the name of the Head of the Church, and appointed the Rev. Dr Chalmers to be their moderator, the Protest above-mentioned was produced and read, and thereafter ordered to be recorded as follows:—

WE, the undersigned ministers and elders, chosen as commissioners to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland indicted to meet this day, but precluded from holding the said

Assembly by reason of the circumstances herein after set forth—in consequence of which a free Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in accordance with the laws and constitution of the said Church, cannot at this time be holden—

CONSIDERING that the Legislature, by the rejection of the Claim of Right adopted by the last General Assembly of the said Church, and their refusal to give redress and protection against the jurisdiction assumed, and the coercion of late repeatedly attempted to be exercised, over the courts of the Church in matters spiritual by the civil courts, have recognised and fixed the conditions of the Church Establishment, as henceforward to subsist in Scotland, to be such as these have been pronounced and declared by the said civil courts in their several recent decisions in regard to matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, whereby it has been held *inter alia*,—

- 1st, That the courts of the Church by law established, and members thereof, are liable to be coerced by the civil courts in the exercise of their spiritual functions, and in particular in the admission to the office of the holy ministry, and the constitution of the pastoral relation; and that they are subject to be compelled to intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations in opposition to the fundamental principles of the Church, and their views of the Word of God, and to the liberties of Christ's people.
- 2d, That the said civil courts have power to interfere with and interdict the preaching of the Gospel and administration of ordinances, as authorized and enjoined by the Church courts of the Establishment.
- 3d, That the said civil courts have power to suspend spiritual censures pronounced by the Church courts of the Establishment against ministers and probationers of the Church, and to interdict their execution as to spiritual effects, functions, and privileges.
- 4th, That the said civil courts have power to reduce and set aside the sentences of the Church courts of the Establishment deposing ministers from the office of the holy ministry, and depriving probationers of their license to preach the Gospel, with reference to the spiritual status, functions, and privileges, of such ministers and probationers—restoring them to the spiritual office and status of which the Church courts had deprived them.
- 5th, That the said civil courts have power to determine on the right to sit as members of the supreme and other judicatories of the Church by law established, and to issue interdicts against sitting and voting therein, irrespective of the judgment and determination of the said judicatories.

6th, That the said civil courts have power to supersede the majority of a Church court of the Establishment, in regard to the exercise of its spiritual functions as a Church court, and to authorize the minority to exercise the said functions, in opposition to the court itself, and to the superior judicatories of the Establishment.

7th, That the said civil courts have power to stay processes of discipline pending before courts of the Church by law established, and to interdict such courts from proceeding therein.

8th, That no pastor of a congregation can be admitted into the Church courts of the Establishment, and allowed to rule as well as to teach, agreeably to the institution of the office by the Head of the Church, nor to sit in any of the judicatories of the Church, inferior or supreme; and that no additional provision can be made for the exercise of spiritual discipline among the members of the Church, though not affecting any patrimonial interests, and no alteration introduced in the state of pastoral superintendence and spiritual discipline in any parish, without the sanction of a civil court.

All which jurisdiction and power on the part of the said civil courts severally above specified, whatever proceeding may have given occasion to its exercise, is, in our opinion, in itself inconsistent with Christian liberty, and with the authority which the Head of the Church hath conferred on the Church alone.

AND FURTHER, CONSIDERING that a General Assembly composed, in accordance with the laws and fundamental principles of the Church, in part of commissioners themselves admitted without the sanction of the civil court, or chosen by presbyteries composed in part of members not having that sanction, cannot be constituted as an Assembly of the Establishment without disregarding the law and the legal conditions of the same as now fixed and declared;

AND FURTHER, CONSIDERING that such commissioners as aforesaid would, as members of an Assembly of the Establishment, be liable to be interdicted from exercising their functions, and to be subjected to civil coercion at the instance of any individual having interest who might apply to the civil courts for that purpose;

AND CONSIDERING FURTHER, that civil coercion has already been in divers instances applied for and used, whereby certain commissioners, returned to the Assembly this day appointed to have been holden, have been interdicted from claiming their seats, and from sitting and voting therein; and certain presby-

teries have been, by interdicts directed against their members, prevented from freely choosing commissioners to the said Assembly, whereby the freedom of such Assembly, and the liberty of election thereto, has been forcibly obstructed and taken away;

AND FURTHER, CONSIDERING that, in these circumstances, a free Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by law established, cannot at this time be holden, and that an Assembly in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Church, cannot be constituted in connection with the State, without violating the conditions which must now, since the rejection by the Legislature of the Church's Claim of Right, be held to be the conditions of the Establishment;

AND CONSIDERING that, while heretofore, as members of Church judicatories ratified by law and recognised by the constitution of the kingdom, we held ourselves entitled and bound to exercise and maintain the jurisdiction vested in these judicatories with the sanction of the constitution, notwithstanding the decrees as to matters spiritual and ecclesiastical of the civil courts—because we could not see that the State had required submission thereto as a condition of the Establishment; but, on the contrary, were satisfied that the State, by the Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, for ever and unalterably secured to this nation by the Treaty of Union, had repudiated any power in the civil courts to pronounce such decrees—we are now constrained to acknowledge it to be the mind and will of the State, as recently declared, that such submission should and does form a condition of the Establishment, and of the possession of the benefits thereof; and that as we cannot, without committing what we believe to be sin—in opposition to God's law, in disregard of the honour and authority of Christ's crown, and in violation of our own solemn vows—comply with this condition, we cannot in conscience continue connected with, and retain the benefits of, an Establishment to which such condition is attached.

WE, THEREFORE, the ministers and elders foresaid, on this, the first occasion since the rejection by the Legislature of the Church's Claim of Right, when the commissioners chosen from throughout the bounds of the Church to the General Assembly appointed to have been this day holden, are convened together, DO PROTEST, that the conditions foresaid, while we deem them contrary to, and subversive of the settlement of, Church government effected at the Revolution, and solemnly guaranteed by the Act of Security and Treaty of Union, are also at variance with God's Word, in opposition to the doctrines and fundamental principles of the Church of Scotland, inconsistent with the freedom essential to the right constitution of a Church of Christ, and incompatible with the government which he, as the Head of his

Church, hath therein appointed, distinct from the civil magistrate.

And we further PROTEST, that any Assembly constituted in submission to the conditions now declared to be law, and under the civil coercion which has been brought to bear on the election of commissioners to the Assembly this day appointed to have been holden, and on the commissioners chosen thereto, is not, and shall not be deemed, a lawful and free Assembly of the Church of Scotland, according to the original and fundamental principles thereof; and that the Claim, Declaration, and Protest, of the General Assembly which convened at Edinburgh in May 1842, as the Act of a free and lawful Assembly of the said Church, shall be holden as setting forth the true constitution of the said Church; and that the said Claim, along with the laws of the Church now subsisting, shall in nowise be affected by whatsoever Acts and proceedings of any Assembly constituted under the conditions now declared to be the law, and in submission to the coercion now imposed on the Establishment.

And, finally, while firmly asserting the right and duty of the civil magistrate to maintain and support an establishment of religion in accordance with God's Word, and reserving to ourselves and our successors to strive by all lawful means, as opportunity shall in God's good providence be offered, to secure the performance of this duty agreeably to the Scriptures, and in implement of the statutes of the kingdom of Scotland and the obligations of the Treaty of Union as understood by us and our ancestors, but acknowledging that we do not hold ourselves at liberty to retain the benefits of the Establishment, while we cannot comply with the conditions now to be deemed thereto attached—we PROTEST, that in the circumstances in which we are placed, it is, and shall be, lawful for us, and such other commissioners chosen to the Assembly appointed to have been this day holden as may concur with us, to withdraw to a separate place of meeting, for the purpose of taking steps for ourselves and all who adhere to us—maintaining with us the Confession of Faith and standards of the Church of Scotland, as heretofore understood—for separating in an orderly way from the Establishment; and thereupon adopting such measures as may be competent to us, in humble dependence on God's grace and the aid of the Holy Spirit, for the advancement of his glory, the extension of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, and the administration of the affairs of Christ's house according to his Holy Word; and we do now, for the purpose foresaid, withdraw accordingly, humbly and solemnly acknowledging the hand of the Lord in the things which have come upon us, because of our manifold sins, and the sins of this Church and nation; but, at the same time, with an assured con-

viction that we are not responsible for any consequences that may follow from this our enforced separation from an Establishment which we loved and prized, through interference with conscience, the dishonour done to Christ's crown, and the rejection of his sole and supreme authority as King in his Church.

~~~~~

No. IV.

STATISTICS RELATIVE TO THE CONVOCATION AND DISRUPTION.

1.

|                                                           |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Signed the Requisition calling the meeting of Convocation | 32 |
| Of these there adhered to the Free Church . . . .         | 29 |
|                                                           | 3  |
| Left in the Establishment . . . . .                       | 3  |

2.

|                                                                                                   |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| There were entered on the Sederunt of the first diet of the Convocation . . . . .                 | 434 |
| From which fall to be deducted unordained Strathbogie missionaries, 6, and Mr Hamilton, London, 1 | 7   |
|                                                                                                   | 427 |
| There were enrolled at subsequent diets . . . . .                                                 | 38  |
|                                                                                                   | 465 |
| * Total number present at Convocation . . . . .                                                   | 465 |
| Excuses for non-attendance, made by letter or otherwise, on the part of . . . . .                 | 53  |
|                                                                                                   | 518 |

3. *First Series of Convocation's Resolutions.*

|                                                                        |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Adhered during the meeting of Convocation . . . . .                    | 425 |
| Adhered afterwards by letter . . . . .                                 | 99  |
|                                                                        | 524 |
| Deduct Mr Hamilton, London, not being a minister in Scotland . . . . . | 1   |
|                                                                        | 523 |

\* Thirteen additional ministers appear to have received tickets. These must either have absented themselves, or declined to answer to their names at the first diet, or neglected to have given in their names afterwards.

|                                                                                                                                                                             |       |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----|
| Withdrew previous to Disruption . . . . .                                                                                                                                   | 4     |     |
|                                                                                                                                                                             | <hr/> | 519 |
| Died previous to Disruption . . . . .                                                                                                                                       | 3     |     |
|                                                                                                                                                                             | <hr/> | 516 |
| Of this number there left the Establishment at the Disruption . . . . .                                                                                                     | 462   |     |
| But returned . . . . .                                                                                                                                                      | 4     |     |
|                                                                                                                                                                             | <hr/> | 458 |
| Adherents to first series of resolutions, who ultimately remained in the Establishment . . . . .                                                                            | 58    |     |
| <i>4. Second Series of Convocation's Resolutions.</i>                                                                                                                       |       |     |
| Adhered during the Convocation . . . . .                                                                                                                                    | 354   |     |
| Adhered subsequently by letter . . . . .                                                                                                                                    | 125   |     |
|                                                                                                                                                                             | <hr/> | 479 |
| Withdrew previous to Disruption . . . . .                                                                                                                                   | 3     |     |
|                                                                                                                                                                             | <hr/> | 476 |
| Died previous to Disruption . . . . .                                                                                                                                       | 3     |     |
|                                                                                                                                                                             | <hr/> | 473 |
| Adherents to Second Series at time of Disruption . . . . .                                                                                                                  | 473   |     |
| Of this number there left the Establishment at the Disruption . . . . .                                                                                                     | 445   |     |
| But returned . . . . .                                                                                                                                                      | 2     |     |
|                                                                                                                                                                             | <hr/> | 442 |
| Adherents to Second Series of Resolutions, who ultimately remained in the Establishment . . . . .                                                                           | 30    |     |
| Of the above 473, 75 were not enrolled as members of the Convocation, although a considerable part of the 75 had expressed their concurrence in the objects of the meeting. |       |     |
| <i>5. Protest read in presence of the Royal Commissioner, 18th May 1843.</i>                                                                                                |       |     |
| Signed by . . . . .                                                                                                                                                         |       | 203 |
| Viz.—Ministers . . . . .                                                                                                                                                    | 126   |     |
| Elders . . . . .                                                                                                                                                            | 77    |     |
|                                                                                                                                                                             | <hr/> | 203 |
| <i>6. Disruption.</i>                                                                                                                                                       |       |     |
| Ministers who left the Establishment . . . . .                                                                                                                              | 478   |     |
| Of whom there returned . . . . .                                                                                                                                            | 4     |     |
|                                                                                                                                                                             | <hr/> | 474 |
| Exact number who left . . . . .                                                                                                                                             |       | 474 |

7. *Elders.*

At the Glasgow Assembly, returns were reposed from 333 parishes, stating the number of adhering Elders in these parishes to be . . . . . 1681  
 Since October 1843 there has been no Report to the Assembly on the subject; the number, however, may be given at about 2600.

THOMAS PITCAIRN,  
*Clerk of Assembly and Convocation*

MAY, 1847.

---

No. V.

ORGANIZATION OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

While the scriptural principles, on which the organization of the Free Church of Scotland rests, are fully explained in chapter iv. of the Catechism, some account of their practical embodiment in the organization itself is here added, for the sake of any foreigners into whose hands this manual may fall.

In the Free Church of Scotland there are nearly eight hundred congregations, and probably upwards of six thousand office-bearers—pastors, ruling-elders, and deacons. All office-bearers are chosen by the people, and continue in their offices during life and good behaviour.

Each congregation has, or ought to have, besides the pastor, a number of elders and deacons, more or fewer, according to its size and circumstances.

The congregation is divided into districts, and every district is superintended by an elder and a deacon—the former attending to the spiritual state of the people, and the latter taking charge of their contributions for the ordinances of Christ, and caring for the wants of the poor.

The courts or judicatories of the Church are, the Kirk-session, the Presbytery, the Synod, and the General Assembly.

THE KIRK-SESSION is the lowest of these courts, and consists of the pastor or minister, and the elders of a congregation. The pastor is, *ex officio*, its moderator or chairman.

The whole government of the congregation, and conduct of its affairs, belongs to this court. It admits to Church membership; it exercises discipline; and it excludes the unworthy from the table of the Lord. It determines when the appointment of additional elders and deacons is necessary; it tries the qualifications of those who are chosen by the people; and, if it is satisfied, it ordains

them to their offices. It has jurisdiction over all the congregational office-bearers except the pastor.

When the kirk-session meets *quoad temporalia*—that is to say, in reference to the secular business of the congregation—the deacons are entitled to be present as members of it, and have an equal voice with the elders in all the proceedings. On such occasions it is called the deacons' court.

THE PRESBYTERY consists of the pastors of a group of neighbouring congregations, along with the professors of theology, if any there are, within the bounds, and one ruling elder from each kirk-session. There are seventy-one presbyteries.

It belongs to the presbytery to watch over the congregations within its bounds; to see that the orders of superior courts are obeyed; to decide in all complaints against the proceedings of kirk-sessions, and to correct what they have done amiss; to examine students for the ministry; to license preachers of the Gospel; to judge of the fitness of those whom congregations may choose to be their pastors, and to ordain to the holy ministry; to exercise discipline upon ministers of the Gospel; to superintend schools, and to look to the interests of religion throughout the district, &c. The meetings of presbytery are generally once a-month.

THE SYNOD consists of several contiguous presbyteries. It meets generally twice a-year, and receives appeals against the judgments and proceedings of the presbyteries belonging to it, as well as references for advice from these bodies, and gives decision therein. There are seventeen synods.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY consists of commissioners annually chosen by the presbyteries of the Church in a fixed proportion, according to the number of ministers they contain respectively. There are about 400 members, half of them ministers, and half of them ruling elders. The Assembly meets every year at Edinburgh, in the month of May, and sits for ten or twelve days. Its authority is legislative, judicial, and executive. Synods, presbyteries, and sessions, derive their existence from it, are subject to its control, and must obey its instructions and enactments. The Assembly decides finally in every case that is brought by reference or by appeal before it. It appoints collections to be made throughout the Church, and in every congregation, for missionary, educational, and ecclesiastical purposes. It appoints days of thanksgiving and humiliation to be observed, as occasion may require.

The moderator, or chairman, of the Assembly, as well as of the presbytery and synod, is always a minister, and is annually chosen.

The legislative power of the Assembly is put forth in the

passing of declaratory Acts, which, as the name implies, are authoritative declarations of constitutional principle and existing Church law; interim Acts, which have reference to matters demanding instant regulation, and continue in force only for a year; and standing rules or enactments. The last-named cannot be passed by the Assembly, until they have been submitted to the presbyteries of the Church for their opinion, and the consent of a majority of these courts has been obtained; and, when thus passed, the same consent is necessary before they can be repealed.

The Commission of the General Assembly, which consists of all the members of Assembly who can make it convenient to be present, holds quarterly meetings; has a delegated power in matters specially referred to it by the Assembly; acts for the Church in cases of sudden emergency and public importance; and is generally charged to take care *ne quid detrimenti ecclesia capiat*.

Great part of the executive operations of the General Assembly is accomplished by the instrumentality of committees appointed from year to year, which report their proceedings to the Assembly, and are backed by its authority.

For example, there is the Sustentation Fund Committee, which superintends the raising of contributions in all the congregations of the Church for the support of the ministry, receives these contributions into its treasury, and divides them among the pastors, according to such rules as the Assembly lays down.

There is the College Committee, which has charge of the institution for training young men with a view to the ministerial office, receives the funds contributed to its support, pays the professors' salaries, disposes of the bursaries or scholarships, manages the library and museum, &c.

There is the Education Committee, which has charge of the interests of education throughout the Church, governs the normal schools for the training of teachers, licenses teachers, receives into its treasury contributions from every congregation, pays the salaries of teachers, inspects the schools in all parts of the country, &c.

There is the Home Mission Committee, which has the care of new congregations, and attends to the whole business of Church extension, and of supplying the deficiencies of the means of grace, which may arise from the increase of the population, and the changing circumstances of the country.

There are the Church Building and the Manse Building Committees, for assisting the poorer congregations of the Church in building places of worship and dwelling-houses for their ministers.

There are the Committees for Missions to the Heathen, to the

Jews, and to Continental Europe, employing at present nearly forty European missionaries, and a large number of assistants, both preachers and catechists.

And there is the Committee for the spread of the Gospel in the Colonies.

The funds of these committees, reported to the General Assembly of 1847, as having been raised during the previous year, were as follows:—

|                                                                |         |    |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----|----|
| Committee for Sustentation of the Ministry                     | £82,166 | 8  | 8  |
| "    for College . . . . .                                     | 7,877   | 1  | 4  |
| "    for Education, . . . . .                                  | 17,073  | 0  | 7  |
| "    for Home Missions, . . . . .                              | 5,187   | 2  | 4½ |
| "    for Church Building, . . . . .                            | 3,890   | 17 | 3  |
| "    for Manse Building, . . . . .                             | 28,959  | 12 | 6  |
| "    for Missions to the Heathen, . . . . .                    | 9,816   | 15 | 6  |
| "    for Missions to the Jews . . . . .                        | 6,597   | 12 | 3  |
| "    for Missions to Continental Europe, . . . . .             | 1,809   | 7  | 2  |
| "    for Spreading the Gospel in the Colo-<br>nies,* . . . . . | 6,642   | 15 | 4½ |

It may be mentioned, that the authority of the General Assembly is sufficient to cause collections to be made, of greater or less amount, according to the ability in each particular case, throughout all the congregations of the Church, for the objects of Christian benevolence which are fixed upon.

---

## No. VI.

### ACT ANENT DUTIES OF ELDERS AND DEACONS.

*Edinburgh, 30th May, 1846. Sess. 22.*

Whereas it has become necessary, in consequence of the restoration of the scriptural order of Deacons, and in consequence of the late change in the outward condition of the Church, to point out and regulate the duties of Elders and Deacons respectively, and to define and describe the powers of the meeting of congrega-

\* These sums are not to be understood as exhibiting the whole contributions of the Free Church of Scotland for religious and ecclesiastical purposes in the particular year. Over and above the funds of the committees, every congregation has its own separate fund, out of which the minister's stipend is supplemented, and the congregational expenses are defrayed. The object here is simply to state what is done by the General Assembly and its more important committees, so as to show that the organization of the Church is not nominal or inefficient.

tional office-bearers for secular business, the General Assembly, with consent of a majority of the Presbyteries of this Church, enact and ordain:—

I. Respecting the peculiar duties of ELDERS:—

1. That they sit in Session along with the Minister, and assist in the administration of discipline, and in the spiritual government of the Church.

2. That they take a careful oversight of the people's morals and religious principles, of the attendance upon public ordinances, and of the state of personal and family religion.

3. That they visit the sick from time to time in their several districts.

4. That they superintend the religious instruction of the young, and assist the Minister in ascertaining the qualifications of applicants for admission to sealing ordinances.

5. That they superintend and promote the formation of meetings within their districts for prayer, reading of the Scriptures, and Christian fellowship, among the members of the Church.

II. Respecting the peculiar duties of DEACONS:—

1. That they give special regard to the whole secular affairs of the congregation.

2. That they attend to the gathering of the people's contributions to the General Fund for the sustentation of the ministry; and that they receive the donations which may be made for other ecclesiastical purposes.

3. That they attend to the congregational poor.

4. That they watch over the education of the children of the poor.

III. Respecting the duties which are common to ELDERS and DEACONS:—

1. That both Elders and Deacons may receive the Sabbath collections of the people, according to such arrangements as shall be made by the Deacons' Court.

2. That, for the better discharge of their peculiar duties respectively, as well as with a view to increased opportunities of doing good, both Elders and Deacons visit periodically the districts assigned them, and cultivate an acquaintance with the members of the Church residing therein.

3. That it is competent for Elders to be employed as Deacons, when a sufficient number of Deacons cannot be had.

4. That Deacons may assist the Elders with their advice, whether in Session or otherwise, when requested so to do.



IV. Respecting the meeting of Minister, Elders, and Deacons, for secular affairs,—which meeting may be called the DEACONS' COURT:—

1. That the Minister preside in said meeting, when he is present; and, in his absence, any Elder or Deacon whom the meeting may fix upon.

2. That the said meeting, or Deacons' Court, is convened by citation from the pulpit, or by personal notice to the members thereof, and is called by authority of the Minister, or at the requisition of any three members,—said requisition being addressed to the Minister, or, in time of a vacancy of the pastoral charge, to the Clerk of the said court; and the proceedings are opened and closed with prayer.

3. That this Court has the management and charge of the whole property belonging to the congregation, including church, session-house, manse, school-buildings, &c., and of all its secular affairs,—including, of course, the appropriation of seats, with the determination of all questions relating thereto; and it is the province and duty of said Court to transmit, from time to time, to the Treasurer appointed by the General Assembly, or their Committee, the funds raised for the general sustentation of the ministry; also to apply the remaining congregational funds, in fitting proportions, to the support of the minister, the payment of the salaries of the various subordinate functionaries, and the defraying of all necessary charges connected with the property, or with the dispensation of Christian ordinances; to apply, moreover, any surplus, which may thereafter arise, to religious, ecclesiastical, educational, or benevolent objects; likewise to make special collections at the church-door, as often as may appear to them to be necessary, for the temporal relief of poor members of the congregation, and for the education of the children of the poor; and, finally, to receive the Deacons' reports of their proceedings, to give them such advice and instructions as may be required, and to decide as to the payments to be made by them for the relief of the poor and the education of youth.

4. That while the church is solely at the disposal of the Minister for all religious purposes, the consent of the Deacons' Court, as well as of the Minister, is necessary, before any meeting, not strictly of a religious, ecclesiastical, or charitable nature, can be held in it.

5. That the said Court shall have one or more treasurers, and a clerk, and a separate record for the minutes of the proceedings.

6. That the record of the Court, with the treasurer's account of receipt and expenditure, after said account shall have been duly audited by appointment of the Court, shall be annually exhibited to the Presbytery of the bounds, at the first ordinary meeting



thereof after the 15th of March, for the purpose of being examined and attested by the Presbytery at said meeting.

7. That on the first Monday after said attestation of the record and treasurer's account, or on some convenient day of the first or second week following the attestation by the Presbytery, a congregational meeting shall be held, when the Deacons' Court shall present a report of its proceedings for the preceding year, give such information and explanations as may be asked for, and receive any suggestions which may be offered by the members of the congregation for the consideration of the Court, with reference to the future distribution of the funds. The congregational meeting shall be convened by intimation from the pulpit, and the Minister, if present, shall preside in it.

8. That to the said Court shall belong the appointment and dismissal of the church-officer and door-keepers.

---

### No. VII.

#### DECLARATORY ACT ANENT DEACONS' COURTS AND KIRK-SESSIONS

*Edinburgh, 7th June, 1847. Sess. 28.*

Whereas it is desirable that the existing and constitutional law of the Church respecting Deacons' Courts, and the relation of these Courts to the superior judicatories, and respecting the jurisdiction of Kirk-sessions, should be clearly known, the General Assembly declare—

1. That the business to be transacted in the Deacons' Court consists in the administration of the funds, and property, and temporal affairs, of the respective congregations.

2. That while it is inexpedient to sustain complaints or appeals against the ordinary administration of the Deacons' Court in secular and financial affairs, the said Court is nevertheless subject to the review of the Presbytery, in so far as it may take any step, or adopt any resolution, which the Presbytery can pronounce to be of a censurable nature, or in violation of any enactment of the General Assembly.

3. That it belongs to the Session to receive and accept the resignation of Elders and Deacons.

4. That it belongs to the Session to determine as to the election of Elders and Deacons, whether as regards the time and circumstances when such election may be necessary, or the number of these office-bearers that ought to be chosen; and to superintend and regulate the whole proceedings therein, according to the laws of the Church.

5. That congregational meetings are called by authority of the Session.

The General Assembly, in passing this act, exhort the Ministers and Elders of the Church to be diligent and regular in their attendance at the meetings of Deacons' Courts.

~~~~~  
No. VIII.

ACT ANENT QUESTIONS AND FORMULA.

Edinburgh, 1st June, 1846. Sess. 24.

Whereas it has become necessary, in consequence of the late change in the outward condition of the Church, to amend the Questions and Formula to be used at the licensing of Probationers, and the ordination of Deacons, Elders, and Ministers respectively, the General Assembly, with consent of a majority of Presbyteries, enact and ordain, that the following shall be the questions so to be used: And, considering that the Formula, to this act subjoined, embodies the substance of the answers to the said questions, the Assembly appoint the same to be subscribed by all Probationers of the Church before receiving license to preach the gospel, and by all office-bearers at the time of their admission: And the General Assembly, in passing this act, think it right to declare, that, while the Church firmly maintains the same scriptural principles as to the duties of nations and their rulers in reference to true religion and the Church of Christ, for which she has hitherto contended, she disclaims intolerant or persecuting principles, and does not regard her Confession of Faith, or any portion thereof, when fairly interpreted, as favouring intolerance or persecution, or consider that her office-bearers, by subscribing it, profess any principles inconsistent with liberty of conscience and the right of private judgment.

QUESTIONS TO BE PUT TO ELDERS AND DEACONS BEFORE
ORDINATION.

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 declare the Confession of Faith, approved by former General Assemblies of this Church, to be the confession of your faith; and do you own the doctrine therein contained to be the true doctrine, which you will constantly adhere to?
3. Do you own and acknowledge the Presbyterian Church

government of this Church, by Kirk-sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies, to be the only government of this Church; and do you engage to submit thereto, concur therewith, and not to endeavour, directly or indirectly, the prejudice or subversion thereof?

4. Do you believe that the Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Head of the Church, has therein appointed a government in the hands of Church-officers, distinct from, and not subordinate in its own province to, civil government, and that the Civil Magistrate does not possess jurisdiction or authoritative control over the regulation of the affairs of Christ's Church; and do you approve of the general principles embodied in the Claim, Declaration, and Protest, adopted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1842, and in the Protest of Ministers and Elders, Commissioners from Presbyteries to the General Assembly, read in presence of the Royal Commissioner on 18th May 1843, as declaring the views which are sanctioned by the Word of God, and the standards of this Church, with respect to the spirituality and freedom of the Church of Christ, and her subjection to Him as her only Head, and to His Word as her only standard?

5. Do you promise to observe uniformity of worship and of the administration of all public ordinances, within this Church, as the same are at present performed and allowed?

6. Do you accept of the office of an Elder [Deacon] of this Congregation, and promise, through grace, faithfully, diligently and cheerfully, to discharge all the duties thereof?

FORMULA.

(To be subscribed by Probationers before receiving license, and by all Office-bearers at the time of their admission,)

I, _____, do hereby declare, that I do sincerely own and believe the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith, approved by former General Assemblies of this Church, to be the truths of God; and I do own the same as the confession of my faith; as likewise I do own the purity of worship presently authorized and practised in the Free Church of Scotland, and also the Presbyterian government and discipline thereof; which doctrine, worship, and Church government, I am persuaded, are founded on the Word of God, and agreeable thereto: I also approve of the general principles respecting the jurisdiction of the Church, and her subjection to Christ as her only Head, which are contained in the Claim of Right and in the Protest, referred to in the questions already put to me; and I promise that through

the grace of God, I shall firmly and constantly adhere to the same, and to the utmost of my power shall, in my station, assert, maintain, and defend, the said doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, of this Church, by Kirk-sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies, together with the liberty and exclusive jurisdiction thereof; and that I shall, in my practice, conform myself to the said worship, and submit to the said discipline, government, and exclusive jurisdiction, and not endeavour, directly or indirectly, the prejudice or subversion of the same; and I promise that I shall follow no divisive course from the doctrine, worship, discipline, government, and exclusive jurisdiction of this Church, renouncing all doctrines, tenets, and opinions whatsoever, contrary to, or inconsistent with, the said doctrine, worship, discipline, government, or jurisdiction of the same.

INDEX.

INDEX TO THE CATECHISM.

* * *The figures denote the number of the Question.*

A

- Act of Scottish Parliament 1592—
nature of it, 271; its defects,
272, 273.
- Act of Queen Anne concerning
patronage, 66, 68; passed in vio-
lation of Treaty of Union, 199,
and *note*.
- Act, Lord Aberdeen's, of 1843—
destroys the call, and obliges the
Established Church to intrude
ministers, 218-220; Erastianism
of it, 68, 382-385.
- Acts of Church Assemblies—their
true character, 61.
- Acts of Parliament—they cannot
create Churches of Christ, 32.
- Alliance between Church and
State—true idea of it, 88, 89.
- Answer to the Protest of 1843—
364-369.
- Antichrist, Church of Scotland's
Testimony regarding, 157, 167.
- Apocrypha, 46, *note*.
- Apostolical succession, 99, 118, 119,
124, 125.
- Assembly at Glasgow in 1638, 252-
256.
- Auchterarder case—first judg-
ment, 310-313; second judgment,
331-333, 339, 341; impression
made by second judgment, 342.
- Authority, ministerial—derived by
every minister immediately from
Christ, 99; conveyed by Christ's
call, 101.

B

- Baptism—infant, 41, *note*; by
sprinkling, 36, *note*; private, 178,

179, and *note*; sign of cross in,
36; godfathers and godmothers
in, 36.

Bible the only statute-book of the
Church, 58.

Bishop—admission of Prelatists
regarding the name, 411.

Bishops—their office, 403, &c.;
same as Presbyters in Scriptures,
403-408.

Bishops, Prelatical—lack of Scrip-
ture warrant for them, 413, &c.

Black Acts, 251, 263.

Book of Discipline on Church
Power and the Headship of
Christ, 247.

C

Call of Christ—ministerial autho-
rity conveyed by it, 101, 119;
duty of Church rulers in regard
to it, 109, &c.; rule for ascer-
taining to whom it is addressed,
126-130.

Call of Congregation—Scripture
warrant for it, 13, 20, 21, 62, 439;
it is not the source or the chan-
nel of ministerial authority, 100;
Church of Scotland's contendings
for it, 194-198; form used in the
Church of Scotland, 196, *note*;
Lord Aberdeen's Act destroys
it, 218-220; use now made of it
in the Establishment, 221, 222.

Chalmers, Dr.—opens the Convo-
cation, 344.

Chapel Act of 1834—nature of it,
207, 298; operation of it interfered
with by civil court, 316; con-
demned by civil court, 348; ne-

- cessity for it, 300, 301; advantage of it, 303; competency of the Church to pass it, 305; similar exercise of power by the Church in former times, 240-244; repeal of Chapel Act by Established Assembly, 376; peculiar character of that proceeding, 377.
- Church of Christ—definition of the, 7; definition of a, 5.
- Church invisible—Head of it, 9, 15.
- Church visible—Head of it, 10, 16.
- Churches of Christ—Head of them, 11, 17.
- Church-members and office-bearers—Head of them, 12, 18.
- Church and State—the Popish and the Erastian view as to connection between them, 150, 151.
- Church of Scotland—reasons why the Free Church claims to be so considered, 352-363.
- Civil Magistrate—his jurisdiction, 53; his responsibility, 23, 54; his independence, 149-151; duty of Church-members and office-bearers to him, 56; his duty as to religion and the Church, 23, 284.
- Civil obligation—nature of it, 73; effect of it in the government of the Church, 71, &c.
- Claim of Right—adoption of it, 307; design of it, 317; substance of it, 318.
- Commission, ministerial—how it is conveyed, 99, &c.
- Confession of Faith—its doctrine respecting the Headship of Christ, and liberty of the Church, 271, 276-284.
- Confessions of Faith—their lawfulness, 44; their advantages, 45; how they may be made to interfere with the Headship of Christ, 44, 139; effect of a civil obligation to adhere to them, 44, *note*.
- Confirmation, 36, 178, 179, *note*.
- Congregation, a Christian—the Head of it, 13, 20, 21.
- Congregational system of Church government tried by Scripture, 442-470.
- Convocation of ministers in 1842—object of it, 343; its resolutions, 345.
- Covenants against Popery, 159, 164.
- Covenants, National and Solemn League, 174, 175.
- Court of Session—its respect, in former times, for the liberty of the Church, 275, and *note*; its decisions in Auchterarder case, 310, 311, 331, 332; its decision in Stewarton case, 348; its other encroachments on jurisdiction of Church, 316, 328, 330.
- Cross, sign of, in baptism, 36.
- D
- Deacons—their office, 435-437.
- Deposition—Archbishop Montgomerie's, 260; the Strathbogie ministers', 329.
- Discipline, power of—its nature, 132, 133, 137; abuse of it, 142.
- Discipline, First Book of—its doctrine as to election of ministers, 195, *note*.
- Discipline, Second Book of—its doctrine as to election of ministers, 195, *note*; its doctrine as to lay patronage, 199, *note*; its doctrine as to independence of the Church, and Headship of Christ, 247.
- Disruption, the, 216, 349, &c.
- E
- Election of Church office-bearers belongs to members of the Church, 439.
- Election of a pastor, essentially a spiritual right, 189.
- England, Church of—in a dilemma as to the Apocrypha, 46, *note*; her Erastianism, 82, *note*, 155; distinction made by her between the priests of Rome and Protestant non-Episcopal ministers, 125, *note*.
- Erastianism—what it is, 150, 225; Scripture plea for it, 82, 83; Scripture arguments against it, 84, 87; subverts Headship of Christ, 146, 147; its tendency to corrupt the Church, 148, 397.
- Erastians infringe on Christ's prerogative as Head of existence to the Church, 32; and as Head of authority, 146.
- Erskines, the, 198.

Established Church of Scotland—
not the same Church as before
1843, 352-363; obligations of its
ministers, 220, 381, 393-396; its
function under Lord Aberdeen's
Act, 384, 385; its position as re-
gards lay patronage, 217; its
position as regards the call of
the people, 218, 220; difference
between its position before 1834
and after 1843, 223, 224; has no
liberty, as a Church, to secede
from the State, 386-392, 44, *note*.
Establishment and the Church—
distinction between them, 363.
Evangelical party—their conduct
before 1834, 205, 206, 294.

F

Free Church of Scotland—why so
called, 4.
Free General Assembly of 1843,
351, 353.

G

Gillespie, Mr. Thomas, 198.
Godfathers and Godmothers, 36.
Government of the Church—does
not belong to civil magistrate,
82, &c.; does not belong to pre-
lates, 403, &c.; does not belong
to the members of the Church,
446, &c.; belongs to the presby-
ters, 410, &c., and 447, &c.

H

Harvie, Marion—her declaration
on the scaffold, 268.
Henderson, Alexander—his reply
to the royal commissioner, 255.
Holidays, 36, 179, *note*.
House of Commons—vote against
the Church of Scotland's claims,
335, 336.
House of Lords—its decisions in
Auchterarder case, 310, 312, 313,
332 333, 339-342.

I

Independence of the Church—
declaration of 1838 asserting it,
307; does not imply a claim of
infallibility, 95, 96, 98; or of civil
supremacy, 92, 151; doctrine of
Lord Kames concerning it, 275,
note.
Independence of the State, 53-55,
149-151.

Interdicts of Court of Session
against the Church of Scotland—
nature of them, 316; Church's
treatment of them, 315.
Jurisdiction of the Church—nature
and extent of it, 57, 70, 271, 279;
civil ratification thereof in Scot-
land, 270-275.

K

Kames, Lord (a distinguished
judge of the eighteenth century)
—his doctrine concerning the
constitutional freedom of the
Church, 275, *note*.
Kneeling at the communion, 36,
179, *note*.
Knox—his appeal to the civil ma-
gistrate, 162, 163; his declaration
concerning the independence of
the Church, 248.

L

Lawgiver of Church is Christ
alone, 57-62, 247.
Laws of Christ sufficient for the
Church, 38, 59, 60.
Liberty of the Church—Second
Book of Discipline upon it, 247;
John Knox upon it, 248; An-
drew Melville upon it, 249;
Alexander Henderson upon it,
255; Glasgow Assembly upon it,
256; John Welsh upon it, 264,
note, and 265; Samuel Ruther-
ford upon it, 266.

M

Magistrate—*see* Civil magistrate.
Marnoch—intrusion at, 325-327.
Martyrs of the Church of Scotland
for the Headship of Christ, 160,
180, 184, 263-269.
Melville—his speech to King
James for the freedom of the
Church, 249.
Ministers—loss of livings by them
in 1662, 183, 197, 209; and in
1843, 355.
Ministers of Establishment—their
obligations, 394-396.
Moderate party—its original char-
acter, 203; its rise, 204, 292, 293;
its Erastian spirit, 285-293, 322.
Montgomery, Archbishop—his trial
and deposition, 250, 258-260.

N

Nations—their duty to Christ, 23; liable to punishment for sins of their rulers, 24, 25; their continued identity and responsibility, 26, 27.

Nomination to the cure of souls not a matter of civil right, 67, 189.

Non-Intrusion principle, 20, 21, 62, 194, 195, *note*.

Non-Intrusion minority—cannot *now* honestly remain in Establishment, 223, 224.

Non-Erastian minority—cannot *now* honestly remain in Establishment, 331, 395.

O

Office-bearers of Church—their commission and powers, whence derived, and how conveyed to them, 99, &c.; their province and jurisdiction, 57, 61, 70, 87; by whom elected, 439; their qualifications, by whom judged of, 410.

Ordination—nature of it, 102-114, 138; its necessity, 102; abuse of power of it, 143.

P

Pastoral office—right of electing to it necessarily spiritual, 189; power of spiritual rule essentially belongs to it, 410; shorn of that power by Established Church in a certain class of cases at the dictation of the civil courts, 316, and 348, compared with 377; its relation to Christ as Head of knowledge and of influence, 43, 48.

Patronage—definition of it, 188; how far a civil right, 67; sinfulness of it, 189, 190; infringes on Headship of Christ, 191; condemned as anti-scriptural in Second Book of Discipline, and by act of Parliament in 1649, 199, and *notes*; Treaty of Union broken by restoration of it, 199, and *note*; condemned by General Assembly in 1842, 215.

Paul, the Apostle—his appeal to the civil magistrate, 85.

People, the Christian—their right to elect Church office-bearers,

439; they are not the rulers of the Church, 446-456; they are not the source or the channel of Church authority, 100.

Persecution—the Popish, 159, 160.

Persecutions—the Prelatic and Erastian, 184, 185, 197, 198, 263-269.

Perth—five articles of, 178, 179, and *note*.

Prelacy—nature of it, 169; Scripture evidence against it, 409, &c.; its claims, 170, 171; the first Scottish, 176-181, 187; the second Scottish, 182-187.

Presbyterian government—what it means, 399, 400; advantages of it, 463-471.

Presbyters—same as bishops, 406-410; two kinds of, 434; government of Church belongs to them, 410, 447-456.

Presbyteries—Scripture warrant for, 443, 462; their jurisdiction in the appointment of office-bearers, 102, 440, 441.

Presentation, civil deed of—made the title to spiritual office, 217; sacrifices of fathers of Secession and Relief in resisting this, 198.

President (the Lord) of Court of Session—his doctrine respecting the Head of the Church, 309.

Private judgment, right and duty of—flows from Headship of Christ, 18, 19, 96, 97; is subverted by Romanists and Tractarians, 139, 140.

Protest of 1843—substance of it, 352; conduct of Established Church regarding it, 364-369.

Q

Qualifications, ministerial—the ultimate judges of them, 109, 440.

R

Reformation—the first, 158-164; the second, 173-175, 181.

Resolution of Assembly anent Church's jurisdiction, 307.

Revolution Settlement, 199, 270-275.

Rites and ceremonies—Church has no authority to institute, 35, 36, 38, 141.

Rome, Church of—infringes on Christ's prerogative as Head of ordinances, 36; as Head of knowledge, 41, 44; as Head of influence, 50; and as Head of authority, 145.

Rutherford, Samuel—his testimony, 266.

S

Scotch Benefices' Act—*see* Act, Lord Aberdeen's.

Secessions, the two—Distinction between them, 360, 364.

Secretary of State—his letter rejecting the Church's Claim of Right, 335, 336.

Simony—law of patronage in the Establishment now involves the sin of, 188-190, compared with, 217.

Stewarton case—decision of, 348.

Strathbogie, seven ministers of—their proceedings in Marnoch case, 325-327; their application to the civil power, 328; their deposition, 329; their restoration by the civil court, and judgment by the Established Assembly thereupon, 378, 379.

Supremacy, royal, in matters ecclesiastical—enacted in Black Acts, and sworn to in oath of allegiance and the test, 263; sufferings and martyrdom of those who opposed it, 267-269; abolished at the Revolution, 271-275.

Supremacy of the Pope—how dealt with by the Reformed Churches, 153-156; testimony of Church of Scotland against it, 157-167.

Synods—Scripture warrant for them, 463; their authority and

jurisdiction, 38, 61, 70, 132-138, 271, 279.

T

Temporalities of the Church—they belong to the civil magistrate's jurisdiction, 53, 54.

Toleration—divine right of Erastianism subversive of it, 86.

Tractarians—doctrines held by them which subvert the Headship of Christ, 46, *note*, and 5), *note*.

U

Union Treaty between Scotland and England—violated by act restoring patronage, 199, and *note*; broken by England at the time of the Disruption, 335-337, 345, 349.

V

Veto Act—its principle, 62; passing of it, 210, 298; its tendency, 321, compared with 203; its effects, 303, 304; approved of by civil magistrate, 306; condemned by civil magistrate, 310-312; proceedings thereupon within the Establishment before and after the Disruption, 213, 373-375; competency of the Church to pass it, 305; reasons for passing it, 299-301.

W

Welsh, John—his sufferings for the Church's liberty, 264; his testimony, 265.

Westminster Confession—its doctrine respecting Headship of Christ and freedom of the Church, 271, 276-284; its doctrine respecting the Papacy, 167.

