

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

to do so; and multitudes from time to time were forced to go out of the church for want of the necessary accommodation. I put in there a number of forms, and erected in vacant places, at my own expense, some open seats; but the churchwardens pulled them down, and cast them out of the church. To visit the parishioners in their own houses was impracticable; for they were so embittered against me, that there was scarcely one that would admit me into his house. In this state of things I saw no remedy but faith and patience. The passage of Scripture which subdued and controlled my mind was, "The servant of the Lord must not strive."

The late revered Bishop McIlvaine, of Ohio, when writing to me respecting some trials he had to endure in his diocese, and alluding to the way in which Mr. Simeon, in his early ministry, was enabled to meet his peculiar difficulties, said, that considering Simeon's naturally ardent temperament and his intense zeal in the Lord's service, he thought that the grace of God was never more conspicuous in him than in the patience and faith he exhibited when suffering so severely from the bitter opposition of his parishioners.

These letters, so full of valuable counsel from those eminent servants of Christ, John Thornton and John Newton, are now for the first time given to the public, with the earnest hope and prayer that, under the Divine blessing, they may still be profitable to young ministers when entering on new and perhaps difficult spheres of duty.

WILLIAM CARUS.



ART. VII.—THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

1. *Plain Words and Simple Facts about the Church of Scotland and her Assailants.* By DEFENSOR. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1879.
2. *Disestablishment.* By the DUKE of ARGYLL. Reprinted from the "Contemporary Review." London: Strahan & Co. 1878.
3. *Position and Prospects of the Church of Scotland: Address delivered at the close of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, June 3rd, 1878.* By the Moderator, J. TULLOCH, D.D., Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. W. Blackwood & Sons. 1879.
4. *Reports on the Schemes of the Church of Scotland, and of the Committee of Christian Life and Work, to the General Assembly.* Edinburgh: W. Blackwood & Sons.

THE 18th day of May, 1843, witnessed an event unique in Church history, an event which was of more than merely provincial interest and importance. On that day four

hundred and fifty ministers of the Established Church of Scotland resigned their livings, left their comfortable manses, and cast themselves upon the voluntary support of such of their flocks as were willing to join them.

Before that catastrophe the Church of Scotland was much the most powerful establishment, in its own sphere, in the realm. With such Evangelical leaders as Andrew Thompson, Chalmers, Gordon, Welsh, Buchanan, and others, by whose influence many important parishes were supplied with able and popular ministers, it was rapidly recovering the position which it had lost during the eighteenth century.

The Evangelical party, thus led, was united and enthusiastic, and had at length obtained the majority in the General Assembly. Its one difficulty was the strong popular prejudice against patronage. That prejudice was not unreasonable.

The Duke of Argyll has shown, in his interesting article on the subject in the *Contemporary*, how alien to the spirit of the Presbyterian Church was the patronage forced upon it by the Act of Queen Anne. Both by Government and by private patrons the rights, thus obtained, had been shamefully abused, causing more than one schism during the last century. Great improvement had doubtless taken place in the exercise of these rights, but every now and then some fresh scandal created an outcry.

When it is remembered how completely in a Church, where there is no Liturgy, the people are at the mercy of the minister, not only for preaching but also for worship, and further, that a large number of the livings were in the gift of Episcopalians, who never worshipped with the people, it is no wonder that the congregations felt very impatient of, what they called, the intrusion of ministers upon them without their assent.

Dr. Chalmers and his colleagues were, for the most part, men of strong conservative instincts. They wished to retain patronage, but so to restrain it as to guard it from abuse.

This was the object of the famous "*Veto Act*." By it the General Assembly conferred upon the congregations, the right, by a majority of communicants who were males and heads of families, to reject an unacceptable presentee. The power of the Assembly to pass such an Act was soon challenged in the courts of law. A long struggle between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts was the result. Other important issues were incidentally raised, and at length, when the courts of law had decided on every point against the Assembly, the minority with great dignity and self-sacrifice seceded from the Church.

Lord Melbourne was in power during the earlier stages of the conflict, and Sir Robert Peel at its conclusion. Had either of

these men taken a statesmanlike view of the situation, the disruption might have been averted.

It is important to note the principles upon which the newly-formed Free Church took its stand. They are well set forth by Dr. Chalmers in his eloquent introductory address, at the opening of the first Free Church Assembly :—

The Voluntaries (he said) mistake us if they conceive us to be Voluntaries. We hold by the duty of Government to give of their resources and their means for the maintenance of a Gospel ministry in the land. . . . We hold that every part and every function of a commonwealth should be leavened with Christianity, and that every functionary, from the highest to the lowest, should, in their respective spheres, do all that in them lies to countenance and uphold it. That is to say, though we quit the Establishment, *we go out on Establishment principles* ; we quit a vitiated Establishment, but would rejoice in returning to a pure one. To express it otherwise, we are the advocates for a national support of religion, and we are not Voluntaries.

These were his sentiments to the end of his life. Only three months before his death, he said to the writer of this article, "We are Voluntaries only by compulsion ;" and he added, with great emphasis, "The longer I live, the more firmly persuaded I am that the voluntary principle is utterly unfit to furnish a Christian people with the means of Christian instruction."

The marvellous energy displayed by the newly-formed Free Church proved how deeply the hearts of the people were stirred. It claimed to be the Church of Scotland. It sought not merely to build a church and a manse, but also a school and a school-master's house, in every parish, and to a great extent it succeeded. It sought to supplant the time-honoured Divinity Halls of the four Universities, and the Professors in its new Colleges were speedily surrounded by the very pick of the youth of Scotland who desired to give themselves to the sacred ministry.

And yet, whilst there was much to wonder at, and much to admire, there was also much to regret in the conduct of the seceding party. They indulged in the most bitter and unscrupulous attacks upon those who remained, especially such as held distinctively Evangelical views.

They constantly represented such men as actuated by the most sordid motives, so that, at that period of fanatical excitement and virulent aspersion, it required more courage for an Evangelical man to remain in the Establishment than to secede. Some, however, did remain ; and the reason given by Dr. Norman M'Leod probably expresses what they felt : "The reason," he said, "why I can conscientiously remain in the Church, is simply because I believe I have spiritual liberty to obey everything in God's word. I know no verse in it which I cannot obey as well as any seceder can. This suffices me."

We presume it would be held sufficient by any clergyman of the Church of England; and much as we regret the painful misunderstandings between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts, and the very superficial view of the crisis which was taken by the leading statesmen of the day, we cannot but wish that the good men who left the Church had remained, and waited patiently until their principles should prevail.

The immediate result of the schism upon the Established Church was disastrous in the extreme. Nearly half of its parishes were vacant, and had at once to be supplied. Most of the foreign missionaries, amongst whom we must include the honoured names of Wilson and Duff, went with the seceders, and all its machinery for promoting the cause of the Gospel was thrown completely out of gear. For a time, a spirit of rancorous animosity was kept alive against it, by the able articles of the Free Church newspapers, and by the excited harangues which were too frequently heard from Free Church pulpits. Scotland was then a most disagreeable place of residence. The best friends were separated, and the peace of thousands of families was sorely disturbed. But it is against the nature of things that such excitement should become chronic. Slowly and surely the Establishment recovered its lost ground, whilst the Free Church began to gravitate towards Voluntaryism, and at last so completely did it depart from its *only raison d'être* that it seriously entertained a proposal to amalgamate with the United Presbyterian Church, a body which repudiates and condemns all connection between Church and State. The union, indeed, would have been effected but for the persistent opposition of a minority, who still hold by their original principles, and who threatened the majority with legal proceedings if they persevered. This phase of the controversy was very curious, for it showed that the Free Church could not escape from the control of the civil courts by quitting the Establishment. It possesses a considerable amount of property, which has been bestowed upon it, or bequeathed to it, upon the faith of its remaining true to its original principles; and if it departs from them, the civil court can and will interfere.

For a considerable time after the disruption, the Free Church scrupulously avoided joining in any crusade against the Establishment. Dr. Chalmers, in the speech from which we have already quoted, represents them as having inscribed on their flag, "We are no Voluntaries." They could not therefore consort with Liberationists and others who sought the destruction of the Establishment.

That flag, however, it has at length discarded. "We quit," said Dr. Chalmers, "a vitiated Establishment, but would rejoice in returning to a pure one." It might have been expected, there-

fore, that any action on the part of the Church they had left, in the direction of what they would consider a purer state of things, would have been hailed by them as an omen for good; and that, even if they could not yet see their way to return, any such action would lead them more patiently to wait. The abolition of patronage by the present Government, at the earnest representation of the General Assembly, would assuredly have been considered by Dr. Chalmers and his colleagues as a movement in the right direction, preparing the way for that "pure Establishment" to which they were willing to return.

This politic step has, indeed, met with the warm approval of that minority in the Free Church which still holds by its distinctive principles; but it has excited the majority to vigorous action, for the disestablishment and disendowment of the National Church. A grievance of old standing, the fruitful source of much schism, has been abolished; the Church has been rendered much more popular with the masses; hence the unworthy cry—"Down with it, down with it even to the ground!"

We believe that, even if tried by the Scottish nation, the Established Church might expect with confidence a favourable verdict. The action of the Free Church General Assembly has met with a very lukewarm response amongst the laity. The meetings which have occasionally been held in favour of disestablishment, have not been very encouraging to their promoters. But the Church of Scotland has a right to appeal to the whole nation, for she is protected in all her privileges by the Act of Union, and the question of her disestablishment is not a merely provincial question—it is of imperial importance. If the State may justly confiscate Church property on one side of the border, it may do so with equal justice on the other. The Church of England stands exactly on the same footing as the Church of Scotland, and if the latter is overthrown, then the days of the former, as an Establishment, assuredly are numbered. It becomes therefore a question of deep interest to English Churchmen, how the Church of Scotland is fulfilling her mission. There is a notion abroad, which Liberationist orators are constantly fostering, that, like the Church of Ireland, she is the Church of a mere fraction of the population. We invite our readers' attention to the following facts, which have never been disproved.

We would, first, remind them that the great bulk of the Scottish people belong either to the Established, the Free, or the United Presbyterian Churches. Episcopalians are not three per cent. of the population, and, with the exception of Roman Catholics, who are numerous in some centres of industry where there are many Irish, the other denominations are very small. The number of parishes in Scotland is 1247, and the total number of congregations, in connection with the Established

Church, is 1533. In connection with the Free Church there are 1031 congregations, and with the United Presbyterians 519. The total number of the two last is therefore 1550, leaving the National Church in a minority of only 17, as against them both. It must, however, be borne in mind that, as in England, many of the parish churches are much larger than ordinary Dissenting chapels, and therefore the number of churches does not fairly represent the amount of accommodation for the worshippers.

Presbyterian churches are generally very particular in keeping, with much exactness, the rolls of the communicants, and therefore we may gather from their own published statistics a fair estimate of their comparative strength.

In 1878, the Church of Scotland had 515,786 communicants. In May, 1877, the Free Church had 222,411, and the United Presbyterian Church 172,170. Thus a majority of 121,205 members appears on the side of the Established Church as against both the others. But both the dissenting churches confess to a decrease in membership. In the report of the Secretary of the Free Church Sustentation Fund, in December, 1875, there are these words:—"It may be assumed that our membership should have shown an increase over 1867 of 22,100. But it is shown above, on the basis of Presbyterian returns, that the increase was only 7062. There is, therefore, a deficit of 15,000, or $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent." Whilst in the United Presbyterian Church the report presented in 1877 to their Synod, after going fully into the figures supplied by their Presbyteries, concludes with the confession: "On the whole, the United Presbyterian Church may have maintained, but has not improved or strengthened, its position in relation to the total population of the country."

The returns of the Registrar-General of marriages in Scotland for 1873 are before us, and they throw important light on the question as to the comparative strength of the various denominations. It must, however, be borne in mind that since then the Church has made much progress.

The proportion of marriages performed by the various denominations in that year were—By the Established Church, 45·56 per cent.; Free Church, 21·71; United Presbyterian, 13·44; Roman Catholic, 9·16; Scotch Episcopal, 2·42; other denominations, 6·93; denominations not stated, 0·04; irregular marriages, 0·74. It is to be observed that in country districts the proportion of the Church of Scotland was 51·39 per cent.

The supporters of the National Church maintain that, from carefully compiled statistics of the whole population, it probably amounted in 1878 to 3,595,929 souls, of which the Church of Scotland numbered 1,750,000, the Free Church 805,000, the United Presbyterian Church 595,000, and all other sects 443,000.

If it is objected that these last figures must to a certain extent be mere guesswork, we can only reply that, until we can get a fair religious census, we are driven to estimates which, for want of proper *data*, must to some extent be uncertain. Both in England and Scotland the Established Churches would willingly have consented to submit to such inquiries in 1871, as would have furnished valuable information as to the relative strength of the various denominations. It was the loud outcry against such a census, raised by Liberationists, which induced Mr. Gladstone's Government to give way on that important point. Liberationists have no right to represent either of the Established Churches as supported by a minority of the population, as long as they persistently refuse to submit to the test of a religious census by the Government of the country. We consider that, as far as can be ascertained by such *data* as we possess, the Church of Scotland may justly claim to be the Church of the majority of the Scottish people; and, if Liberationists are still disposed to dispute this assertion, we would remind them that 1881 is not far distant, and that both the Established Churches earnestly desire a fair religious census. Why are Dissenters afraid to face such an ordeal?

But more is required of a National Church than that she can show her numerical strength to be satisfactory. Is the Church of Scotland true to the grand traditions of her past history?

At the beginning of this century, and for long after, Scotland was the only educated nation in the world. Each parish had its school; the stipend of the schoolmaster, like that of the parish minister, being provided out of the old ecclesiastical endowments of the country, and paid by the landlords.

This was the glory of the Church of Scotland. She could not show magnificent cathedrals, nor richly endowed colleges, but she could show, throughout the length and breadth of the land, a well-educated peasantry. The parish schoolmaster was expected to teach, not merely the three R's and the Bible and Catechism, but also the rudiments of Latin and Greek; and thus, from these country schools, youths of promise constantly found their way up to one or another of the four Universities, enabling the Universities to exercise a far more extensive influence than in England.

The population has increased far beyond the provision, which the old endowments had made, for its spiritual and educational wants. The Free Church disruption had certainly this result, that it greatly multiplied the places of worship in the land, but still in the large centres of population there has been an ever-increasing field for home mission work. Has the Established Church proved equal to her responsibilities in overtaking such work? And has she also been alive to her duty in the still

wider domain of Foreign Missions? If it can be shown that she has not been remiss in either of these particulars, a strong additional claim will be given her upon the sympathy and support of all true-hearted English Churchmen.

It is unnecessary that much should be said as regards her efforts in the cause of the primary education of the poor. The Scotch Education Act has deprived her of all control over the parish schools. Every parish has now its school-board, and, where there was any deficiency, schools have been built and are supported by rates. It is well, however, to note that before the passing of the Act, in the year 1868, the voluntary contributions of the Established Church for the education of the poor amounted to 23,444*l.* The Free Church in the same year contributed 10,069*l.*, whilst the United Presbyterian Church supported only fourteen schools in all Scotland.

Still more interesting are the statistics of Sunday-schools in Scotland. The contrast between the statistics of 1851 and 1877 are very suggestive. In the Official Report of Education in Great Britain in 1851, by Mr. Horace Mann, the number of Sunday-school scholars belonging to the three denominations, is thus given :—

Established Church.....	76,233
Free Church.....	91,328
United Presbyterian Church.....	54,324

If we compare this with the Reports on Sunday-schools given respectively to these denominations in 1877, we shall perceive a very remarkable increase in the schools of the Established Church. In that year the number of her Sunday-school scholars was 170,297, whilst in the Free Church the number was 139,926, and in the United Presbyterian Church it was 79,109. The comparative increase since 1851 was, for the Established Church 94,064, for the Free Church 48,598, and for the United Presbyterian Church 24,785. It thus appears that the increase in the Sunday-schools of the Established Church, during twenty-six years, exceeded, by 20,681, the increase of both the other denominations put together.

Her Home Mission scheme presents still more important results. That scheme originated before the disruption, and was then chiefly associated with the name of Dr. Chalmers. He threw himself into it with all the generous energy of his soul. His stirring appeals awakened a great interest in the cause of Church extension; and when the crash came, and he and so many others, who had promoted this important work, left the Church, it seemed to many that the best course would be to abandon that scheme for a time altogether. Wiser counsels, however, prevailed.

The Church of Scotland found a man equal to the occasion in the late Rev. Dr. Robertson. He not only advised the continuance of the Home Mission scheme, but two years after the disruption he originated a scheme for the endowment of the new parishes, and the following figures will show with what results:—

Before the disruption, in 1842, the income of the Home Mission scheme was 5029*l.*; the year following the disruption; it was only 2289*l.* A great effort was made, which raised it in 1844 to 4590*l.*, but it fell again in 1845 to 2782*l.* After that year the crisis of the storm had passed, the ship had righted herself, and began at last to make headway through the troubled waters. In 1873 the income of the Home Mission scheme had reached 9509*l.*, in 1875 11,857*l.*; and so it has steadily increased until 1878, that year of great commercial depression, when its income reached nearly 16,000*l.* Dr. Robertson at first proposed to endow 100 churches which had been built by the Home Mission scheme before the disruption. He and his successors have been enabled to accomplish far more than their most sanguine expectations could anticipate. They have endowed no fewer than 283 new parishes at a cost of 1,031,500*l.*, subscribed by the members and friends of the Church.

We do not wish to weary our readers with figures. We think it sufficient to add the following remarkable statistics showing the amounts contributed for various purposes by members of the Church of Scotland, from the years 1872 to 1877. The number of churches from which these returns have been made is 1286.

The total sums contributed during these six years are as follows: for congregational and charitable purposes, 567,529*l.*; to supplement the stipends of the poorer clergy, &c., 333,124*l.*; for education, 91,124*l.*; for Home Mission work, 148,689*l.*; for Church building and extension, 338,117*l.*; for endowment of new parishes, 287,732*l.*; for Foreign Missions, 165,461*l.*; making a grand total of about 1,931,779*l.*

This does not include the munificent donation by the late Mr. Baird of 500,000*l.*

Another interesting proof of the healthy condition of the Church of Scotland may be gathered from the custom, which of late years has been adopted by the General Assembly, of appointing annually a "Committee on Christian Life and Work." This Committee issues every year a series of questions to every parish minister on a great variety of subjects, social and religious, for the purpose of having a comprehensive view of the social and spiritual condition of their flocks. The following are a few of the questions, taken from the Report of 1872. They

are arranged under the following heads: I. Public worship. II. Interest in religion. III. Baptism. IV. Family life. V. Sabbath observance. VI. Ecclesiastical divisions. VII. Change of residence. VIII. Lay agency. The searching character of these inquiries may be seen from the following from II., III., and IV.:—

What in your opinion is the state of vital godliness among those who usually attend church? Have the ministrations of the Gospel in your experience been recently followed by any perceptible result? Is it your experience that those who do not attend church are now, as a class, more or less accessible to missionary visits than they formerly were? and to what do you attribute the change, if there be any?

III. Baptism.—Are there any unbaptized adults in your parish; and if so, how many? Is it your opinion that parents who are not themselves communicants obtain baptism for their children; and if so, how and through whom?

IV. Family worship.—Is family worship usual, and are servants generally collected for it? Is the Assembly's manual for family devotion, or any other book of prayers, commonly used? What is your opinion of the state of domestic servants and farm labourers, as regards education and religion, and how do they stand affected towards their employers?

Verily, if Episcopacy means *oversight*, there is no lack of Episcopacy in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland! It would startle an English diocese, were the Bishop to issue a long series of such questions as these.

The reports of this Committee show that from many ministers these questions have received carefully considered answers, proving how thoroughly they are interested in the spiritual and social condition of their parishes. And this is the poor, decrepid, moribund Church which Liberationists and Free Churchmen desire to see laid low!

We believe, that had Chalmers, and some of his colleagues who have passed away, been permitted to see the remarkable changes which have taken place in the communion which they left, they would have generously acknowledged that God was blessing it, and they would have condemned the present action of the Free Church in regard to it.

In his evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons, in 1847, Dr. Chalmers most emphatically denied that the Free Church "can have anything like a hostile influence on the established institutions of the country;" and he added, "I confess to you that I should look with a sigh to the demolition of the framework, either of the Scotch or English Establishment." Before the same Committee he said, "I do not think the Free Church would consent to become the Establishment, *except on the condition of the abolition of patronage.*" Patronage is

abolished, but there is no Chalmers now at the helm of the Free Church!

The Church of England has no cause to be ashamed of the sister Establishment across the border. When the hour of its trial comes, and when Free Churchmen and United Presbyterians, combined with English Liberationists, demand its overthrow, we believe that English Churchmen will know how to act. They will have a few questions first to put, which are easier put than answered. They will want to know *the reason why*, if her destruction is decreed, and they will not accept as sufficient mere jealousy because of her increasing popularity. That, as yet, seems to be the only cause which animates her opponents to seek the confiscation of her ancient endowments, and her degradation from her time-honoured position. English Churchmen will further have a right to ask who is to be benefited by her disestablishment and disendowment? Her endowments amount only to 250,000*l.* a year, so it cannot be said that she is burdensome to the country. Her tithes are paid, not by the tenants, as in England, but by the landlords; and they are paid most cheerfully, even though many of these landlords are Episcopalians. The confiscation of her revenues, which were with such difficulty rescued by Knox, at the time of the Reformation, from the rapacity of the nobles, would be the robbing of the poor; for in Scotland, as well as in England, the National Church is the poor man's heritage, and who would be the gainers?

The Church of Scotland has shown the greatest forbearance during recent attacks. She has done what she could to heal the schisms which are the scandal of Presbyterianism. She is willing to induct into her benefices any Presbyterian minister from any other Church, who may be willing to join her and may be elected by any of her congregations. "In quietness and in confidence is her strength," and we have no fear but that she will continue to increase in influence and usefulness, and to retain her important position as one of our most useful national institutions, and one of the strongest bulwarks of Evangelical Protestantism.

WM. SCOTT-MONCRIEFF.

