

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

JUNE, 1883.

ART. I.—EPISCOPACY IN SCOTLAND; ITS PRESENT
ASPECT AND FUTURE PROSPECTS.

IT is an easy thing to cause a schism in the Church of Christ, but an extremely difficult thing to heal one. That is a lesson taught us by the history of all Churches. A narrow intolerance on the part of the dominant party, or an undue attempt to exercise authority over men's consciences in matters not essential to the faith, first produces resistance, and then separation. This is at first viewed as a necessary evil which the circumstances which caused it could alone justify; and there is a willingness to return if these difficulties are removed. Then men become habituated to a state of separation if their spiritual needs are met by a separate organization; and when the feelings and views of the dominant party become softened and enlarged so that they regret the original action which caused the schism and would willingly remove the difficulties which prevent a reunion, the latter party, inheriting the principles without the feelings and wishes of the originators, become hardened to the state of separation, and what began in a narrow intolerance in the dominant party, or in a difference to be deplored, ends in an intolerance equally narrow in the separated, and in a sect to be maintained in a narrow and sectarian spirit.

There is, in fact, no lesson more difficult to learn than the nature of true Christian tolerance, its legitimate province and its proper limits. It was taught us by our Saviour when He rebuked two of His Apostles who forbade one who was casting out devils in His name, "because he followeth not with us," and warned them against putting a stumbling-block or rock of offence in their brother's way. It was practised in the primitive Church when, probably, a High Churchman and an Evangelical are not more apart in spirit than were St. Jerome and St.

Augustine, and yet both remained in one united Church. It was the failure to recognise this truth in the subsequent history of the Church which has given rise to most of the separations which afterwards took place.

These views are well illustrated in the movement which is now taking place among the Episcopalians in Scotland, the object and meaning of which will, however, be better understood by a short sketch of the previous position of this body.

At the Revolution in 1688, when some of the English Bishops refused to take the oath of allegiance to King William III. and were ejected from their sees, the entire Episcopal Church of Scotland followed the same course and was in consequence disestablished, and the Presbyterian Church established in its place. The former was placed under penal disabilities; but when the Act of Toleration was passed in 1712, which authorized those of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland to meet for divine worship under pastors ordained by a Protestant Bishop, provided they subscribed the oath to Government and prayed for the Queen and Royal Family, various Episcopal congregations were formed who were not in connection with the Scotch Episcopal Church. There were thus at the same time two Episcopal communions in both countries. In England the Established Church and the non-jurors; in Scotland the disestablished non-juring Church and the tolerated English congregations: these latter were in communion with the Established Church of England and Ireland, whose Bishops freely ordained their clergy and exercised episcopal functions among them, while the two non-juring Churches were in close communion with each other.

The English congregations in Scotland, as they may be called, used the English Book of Common Prayer. The non-juring Church had at first no liturgy, but adopted, for the celebration of the Eucharist, the Communion Office in the Service Book of 1637, which had been framed on the model of the Prayer Book of 1604, and was sanctioned by the proclamation of the Privy Council of Scotland dated 20th of December, 1636, enjoining the use of the Service Book which had been compiled "for the use of the National Church of Scotland" by command of Charles I., but the attempt to force the use of which upon the Scotch people led to the abolition of Episcopacy in 1638.

The non-juring Church in Scotland, however, like the English non-jurors, soon became divided into two parties—those who wished to introduce what were called the *usages*, and those who opposed them. The former party had framed a liturgy derived from that of the ancient Greek Church, which contained forms and usages entirely opposed to the modern

liturgies, and attempted to introduce it into Scotland; but in 1731, when a concordat called "Articles of Agreement amongst the Bishops of the Church of Scotland," was entered into, the first article prescribed that "they should only make use of the Scottish or English Liturgy in the public divine service, and not disturb the Church by introducing the usages." Thus the two Offices were placed on a par; and the Communion Office of 1637 continued in use till the middle of the century, the last edition of it being printed in 1743. The usagers soon after obtained a majority in the Episcopal Synod, and the non-juring Communion Office was introduced in 1755 and finally adopted in 1764. The main distinction between the two offices was that the latter introduced from the early Eastern liturgies a form entirely contrary to that adopted in all the editions of the English Prayer Book, including the first Prayer Book of King Edward VI. This consisted in the Prayer of Consecration being followed by an Oblation in which the consecrated elements were offered to God, and an Invocation praying Him "to bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son." Thus, while the Communion Office of 1637 contained no features which were really objectionable, the other expressed doctrines inconsistent with the formularies of the Church of England. This is the office now known and in use as the Scotch Communion Office, and a more unfortunate step on the part of the Bishops than to supplant the Office of 1637 by it could not be taken, for it was an element of discord at the time it was introduced, it has been an element of discord ever since, and it will be an element of discord as long as its use is permitted. It has no claim whatever to be called the National Office of Scotland. That character more truly belongs to the Office of 1637 authorized by King Charles I. What the precise doctrinal significance of the peculiar features in the Scotch Communion Office really may be is matter of controversy. There is no doubt that in the Eastern Church, from which this form was derived, the invocation is understood to express the doctrine of a material change in the elements, but the supporters of this Office have always maintained that the expression can only mean "become by way of efficacious representation."

In 1792 the penal statutes which affected the Scotch Episcopal Church were repealed on condition that her Bishops subscribed the Articles of the Church of England, which was fulfilled in the year 1804, and then only under reservation that they were to be interpreted in unison with a work which had been published some years before, containing the doctrines of

the non-juring party, a reservation not communicated to the Government or by which their subscription was qualified.

At this time the head of the Scotch Episcopal Church, as *Primus*, was Bishop Skinner, a man of much sagacity and judgment; and the leading layman among the English Episcopalians was the Sir William Forbes of Pitsligo,¹ a man not only of great influence but of enlarged views and much benevolence of character. Under their auspices a union was formed between the two communions, under Articles of Union by which the exclusive use of the liturgy of the Church of England was reserved to the clergymen of the English congregations, "as well in the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as in all the other offices of the Church." The English congregations all joined, with the exception of those at Aberdeen, Perth, and Montrose; the two former, however, ultimately joining.

The exclusive use of the English Communion Office was confirmed to these congregations by the Code of Canons enacted in 1811, "in order to promote an union among all those who profess to be of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland, while the Scotch Communion Office was to be used in all consecrations of Bishops, and every Bishop when consecrated was to give his full assent to it, as being sound in itself and of primary authority in Scotland." This was a qualified recognition of it as a standard of doctrine which did not affect the English congregations, and there being at this time no Evangelical congregation among them, it escaped much notice. The first, strictly speaking, Evangelical congregation was that of St. James's in Edinburgh, formed in 1822; and its principles soon spread to most of the other English congregations. As might be expected, it excited some opposition among the Bishops, who then belonged either to the old non-juring party or to the High Church party in the Church of England. But when they met in 1826 to consider how these congregations should be dealt with, they came unanimously to the resolution that "the time was past when they could with safety refuse to tolerate anything that was tolerated in the English Church." This was a wise resolution, and it would have been well for the unity of the Church if it had been adhered to.

From this time all was peace and harmony in the Scotch Episcopal Church till the Tractarian movement began in 1833 in the English Church. These views were largely adopted in the former Church, and its spirit soon manifested itself in a revision of the Canons, which took place in 1838. The term

¹ The grandfather of the present writer.

“Protestant” was carefully eliminated from them. The Scotch Communion Office was declared to be not only an authorized service, but also of primary authority—that is, it was elevated into a standard of doctrine for the Church, and a clause was added to one of the Canons for the purpose of suppressing the prayer-meetings commonly used by Evangelical congregations. Soon after it pleased the then Bishops in an evil hour to undo the work which had been accomplished in 1804 and subsequent years, and to force the Evangelical clergy out of the Church.

An Evangelical chapel had been established in Edinburgh, called Trinity Church, and the Rev. D. T. K. Drummond, who had been previously officiating in a small chapel in the Old Town of Edinburgh, was appointed joint incumbent with the Rev. Andrew Coventry. Mr. Drummond was the recognised head of the Evangelical party in the Scotch Episcopal Church; and he established a weekly prayer-meeting, which was largely attended and highly appreciated by his congregation. This meeting the Bishop of Edinburgh was urged by his High Church clergy to suppress, and unfortunately; yielding to their importunity, he in 1842 enforced against Mr. Drummond the Canon which prohibited a clergyman from officiating without using the Liturgy, which had hitherto been a dead letter. Mr. Drummond offered every concession which could be reasonably asked from him, but in vain, and he was placed in the position of having either to abandon all practical Evangelical work, or to leave the Church. He chose the latter alternative, and a separate congregation of English Episcopalians was formed of those who adhered to him, which became St. Thomas’s English Episcopal Church.

In forming this separate Church, its founders announced that if the interference with the weekly prayer-meeting were the sole ground of secession, “Mr. Drummond and the congregation connected with him would suspend communion with the Scotch Episcopal Church until their Christian privileges are secured to them, and when this is done they will return;” but “a new and more serious ground of difference was brought under the notice of Mr. Drummond by an English clergyman. A Communion Office exists in the Scottish Episcopal Church—little known in the South of Scotland (where the use of an English Communion Office is permitted)—which contains doctrines repugnant to Scripture and closely allied to superstition.”

Mr. Drummond held that this Office clearly expressed the doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice in the Eucharist, and a doctrine of transubstantiation; though it is fair to add that the

justice of this view has been uniformly denied by its supporters.¹

This ground of separation, however, was soon to show its reality, for the action taken by the Bishop of Edinburgh against the Evangelical clergy was followed by the Bishop of Aberdeen, who endeavoured to compel Sir William Dunbar, the Incumbent of St. Paul's, Aberdeen, one of those English chapels which had joined the Scotch Episcopal Church, to join in the celebration of the Scotch Communion Office. This was a direct breach of the Articles of Union, and he and his congregation again dissolved their union. They were followed by Mr. Miles, the Incumbent of St. Jude's, Glasgow, who was assailed by his Bishop for sympathizing with Sir William Dunbar. The church of St. Peter's, Montrose, had never joined the Scotch Episcopal Church, and other new Evangelical congregations were formed in connection with them, the principal of which were St. Vincent, Edinburgh; St. Silas's, Glasgow; and St. John's, Dundee. And thus the congregations of English Episcopalians again formed a separate communion not in connection with the Scotch Episcopal Church; the grounds of separation being first, the refusal of the Evangelical congregations in Scotland of those Christian privileges enjoyed by their brethren in England; and second, the recognition of the Scotch Communion Office as a standard of doctrine which they could not accept.

The alienation between the two Episcopal Communion was further increased when the judgment of the Privy Council in the Gorham case, in 1850, drew forth from the High Church party in England numerous protests against it, in which the then Scotch Bishops unanimously joined, and declared it not to be binding on their Church.

This was the last step taken in this direction by the rulers of that Church, and soon after a better spirit began to prevail. It was felt that the Bishops had been led to adopt a very mistaken course in alienating the Evangelical congregations, and there was a very general regret that it had led to a schism in the Church. It was not long before they were startled by the Primary Charge of the late Bishop of Brechin, which was delivered in 1857 and published. In this Charge the Bishop maintained that there was a material presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements, and that therefore they ought to be adored. His views, however, were not sanctioned by the rest of the Bishops. They severally protested against them; and finally, in 1858, issued in

¹ The present writer, who was a member of the Evangelical congregation of St. James's, which did not secede, thought it his duty to support Mr. Drummond, and was one of the original members of St. Thomas's.

Synod a Pastoral letter in which they were repudiated, and a moderate view of Eucharistic doctrine, in accordance with that generally held in the Church of England, was maintained to be the doctrine of the Church.¹

It was soon seen that the position of the Scotch Communion Office in the Canons, as of primary authority and as a standard of doctrine, was inconsistent with this declaration, and a petition was presented to them by a large body in the Church, urging its abolition. It was therefore resolved to summon a general Synod of the Church, for the purpose of revising the Canons. This issued in the revised Canons of 1863, in which a great change was made in the standards of the Church, and in the position of the two Communion Offices. In the introduction to the Canons the Church is described as "being in full communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, and adopting as a standard of her faith the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion *as received in that Church.*" The Church thus explicitly receives them as they are interpreted by the Church of England, and accepts them without qualification. The Canon declaring the Scotch Communion Office to be of primary authority, and thus a standard of doctrine, is repealed. The relative position of the two Offices as services is simply inverted. The Book of Common Prayer is now declared to be the service book of the Church for all the purposes to which it is applicable, and no clergyman is to be at liberty to depart from it in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments. In all new congregations, and at all consecrations, ordinations, and Synods, the Communion Office of the Book of Common Prayer is to be exclusively used, while the use of the Scotch Communion Office is now only permitted to those congregations which have hitherto used it, and to new congregations where the incumbent and a majority of the congregation apply for it, but the Bishop may refuse the application if it appears to him that undue influence has been used. The change, therefore, with regard to the position of the Scotch Office is very great. Its position in 1842, when the separation commenced, was this :

¹ The following passage will show this ; " You will remember that, as our Church has repudiated the doctrine of Transubstantiation, so she has given us no authority whereby we can require it to be believed that the substance of Christ's Body and Blood, still less his entire person as God and Man, now glorified in the heavens, is made to exist *with, in, or under* the material substances of Bread and Wine. You will continue to teach that this Sacrifice of the Altar is to be regarded no otherwise than as the means whereby we represent, commemorate, and plead, with praise and thanksgiving before God, the unspeakable merits of the precious death of Christ, and whereby He communicates and applies to our souls all the benefits of that one full and all-sufficient Sacrifice once made upon the Cross."

1. The Scotch Communion Office was used in the old non-juring congregations in the North.
2. It was declared to be of primary authority.
3. Every Presbyter must acknowledge this.
4. The use of the English Office in the other congregations was merely permitted.
5. The Scotch Office must be used not only at the consecration of Bishops, but at the opening of every general Synod, and every Presbyter was thus liable to take part in it.

Of these facts, which abundantly justified the separation, not one was left in existence after the revision of the Canons in 1863 except the first, and the Scottish Communion Office was in all the rest replaced by the Common Prayer Book. The Canon which restricted the freedom of service, and might be enforced to prohibit prayer-meetings, was unfortunately retained.

This great change was differently viewed by the English Episcopalians, so far as the Scotch Communion Office was concerned. By some the obstacle created by it was considered to be substantially removed; but Mr. Drummond himself held that it was still incumbent upon the English Episcopalians to continue apart as a standing protest against the use of it to any extent whatever, and the great weight of his personal character and influence swayed the greater part of the body. Both parties, however, were agreed that the retention of the Canon restricting the freedom of the services still presented an obstacle to union, unless the same liberty in this respect was guaranteed to them as is enjoyed by Evangelical congregations in England. Mr. Drummond, however, showed his willingness to terminate the schism if this were done, and if the Scotch Communion Office were replaced by the Communion Office in the Service Book of 1637, which he offered to accept.

During the next ten years the Scotch Episcopal Church drew gradually nearer to the Church of England, and assimilated herself more and more to it in her doctrinal aspect and comprehensive spirit. There was more spiritual life and less narrow formalism in her teaching and services, the communion with the Church of England became closer, and she was more fully recognised by the latter as her true representative in Scotland. The Scotch Bishops were invited to the Pan-Anglican Synod, and took part in many of the Conferences, and English Bishops freely officiated in the Scotch Episcopal Churches; at length in 1875 a series of Mission Services took place in the Edinburgh churches, which were conducted by the Rev. W. D. Maclagan, now Bishop of Lichfield, and the Rev. Mr. Pigou, now Vicar of Halifax. These services attracted to them many

of the English Episcopalians, and their effect was to leave behind them an enlarged spirit of Christian love and charity, and greater breadth in her practical work and services, so that the same prayer-meetings were then and since generally held which had been suppressed in 1842.

In the end of this year Mr. Drummond resigned his position as Incumbent of St. Thomas's, after a ministry of upwards of thirty years, which had been characterized by great faithfulness and had been largely blessed to his people, his health rendering absolute rest and quiet essential to him, and soon after his retirement an unexpected difficulty arose to the English Episcopalians. The confirmation of the children of the English congregations had hitherto been provided for by sending them at first to Carlisle, where they were confirmed by the late Bishop of Carlisle (Waldegrave), and after his death to Berwick, where the same good office was rendered to them by the late good and excellent Bishop of Durham (Baring). This Bishop had, however, for some time, as the result of mature consideration, come to the conclusion that the Scotch Canons of 1863 conceded quite as much as the English Episcopalians required, and only resolved, out of consideration for Mr. Drummond, to accept candidates for confirmation at Berwick as long as he was minister of St. Thomas's, but upon his voidance of the charge he meant no longer to do so.¹ Accordingly, when an application was made to him in August, 1876, to confirm the children of one of the English congregations as usual, he replied in the following terms: "I am very sorry that I must decline receiving candidates for confirmation from Edinburgh. The resignation of Mr. Drummond seemed to me an admirable opportunity for arranging a Concordat between the so-called English Episcopal congregations and Bishop Coterill. Mr. Drummond had consistently fought a most important battle with reference to the Communion Service, and to all intent had gained the victory. It is, I believe, entirely due to him that the Canons, with reference to the Scotch Communion Service, were altered. It could be hardly expected that after all he had undergone for the cause of the truth he should be willing to accept the authority in any way of a Scotch Bishop. But on his resignation an opportunity has occurred, in my judgment, which ought not to be lost, of a satisfactory arrangement." Mr. Drummond's influence, however, was too much felt for this excellent advice to be followed, while the restrictive

¹ Communicated by the clergyman to whom he made the statement, and whom he told that whenever his advice had been sought by Evangelical clergymen about taking charges offered them in the Scotch Episcopal Church, he always told them that there was nothing whatever to prevent Evangelical clergymen from accepting such preferment.

Canon, with regard to the services, still presented in their minds an obstacle.

In order to meet the difficulty, an association was formed in March, 1877, of English Episcopalians in Scotland for the object of promoting their interests generally, and specially to secure the continuance of the services of a Bishop of the Church of England to exercise Episcopal functions among these congregations. Mr. Drummond was a member of this association, and the chapels represented were St. Thomas's and St. Vincent, Edinburgh; St. Silas's and St. Jude's, Glasgow; St. Peter's, Montrose; St. John's, Dundee; St. James's, Aberdeen; those at Nairn, Cally, Wemyss Bay and Dunoon.

The sudden death of Mr. Drummond on the 9th of June, 1877, soon after deprived the party of their able and excellent leader, by whom they were held together, not only by the force of his Christian and Evangelical character, but by the bond of strong personal attachment, a feeling in which the present writer fully joined.

Bishop Beckles, an ex-colonial Bishop settled in London, undertook the duty of exercising Episcopal functions among them, and in the following year proceeded to Scotland and confirmed the children in the English chapels. There was nothing absolutely contrary to ecclesiastical law or usage in this, for the Scotch Bishops did not possess territorial jurisdiction in the same sense as belonged to the Diocesan Bishops of the Church of England. By the Statute of 1840 (3 & 4 Vict., c. 33), a Scotch Bishop is defined as "any Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland residing and exercising Episcopal functions within any district or place in Scotland," in contradistinction to the English Bishop, who is referred to as "the Bishop of any Diocese in England and Ireland;" and Bishop Beckles was merely to exercise Episcopal functions without any right of superintendence or jurisdiction being conferred upon him. But notwithstanding there being no technical objection to his exercising these functions in Scotland, it soon became apparent to many of the English Episcopalians that this had been an ill-advised step; and so far from strengthening their position materially weakened it. At the first meeting of the Convocations of Canterbury and York which followed, this step was condemned by both Convocations, in consequence of which the Incumbent of St. James's Chapel, Aberdeen, refused to allow Bishop Beckles to confirm their children, and formally joined the Scotch Episcopal Church, and there was no doubt that it was almost universally viewed with disapprobation in England. They could not, too, but recognise the altered aspect of the Scotch Episcopal Church—that the use of the Scotch Office was in the main confined

to congregations in the north, who had inherited a relish for it from the old non-juring Church; that one half, if not a majority, of the existing Bishops, and the great body of the Clergy in the southern dioceses, had no greater liking for it than had the English Episcopalians, and that its use among them was extremely rare; that among them perfect freedom of service and a close approximation to the Church of England now existed. There actually were in the Diocese of Edinburgh two Evangelical congregations—those of Trinity Church and St. Andrew's Church; and they could not but feel that a united Evangelical party within the Church would be more powerful for good than when they were divided—part within the Church, and part in an isolated position without it—that, as the ties between the Scotch Episcopal Church and the Church of England were drawn closer, their position, as the grounds of separation became narrower, would be less tenable, and they would meet with less support and sympathy from their brethren in England. They felt, too, that with the changed spirit of the Scotch Episcopal Church there would be every disposition to remove the difficulties which impeded union; and it appeared to them that the time had now come when it would be desirable, if it could be done without sacrifice of principles, to terminate the separation.

The keynote was struck in a pamphlet published in 1882, under the title of "A Plea for Union among Episcopalians in Scotland, by a Member of the Church of England;" it was followed by "A further Plea for Union among Episcopalians in Scotland, by a Presbyterian of the Church of England."¹ In the former pamphlet the difficulties which impeded the union were plainly stated and discussed. The view taken with regard to the Scotch Communion Office is as follows. After stating that the revised Canon of 1863 remained, so far as its position was concerned, unaltered in the last revision of the Canon in 1876, and that this is now the law of the Church, the author proceeds:

The question of the position of the Scotch Communion Office in the Church has, therefore, ceased to be a question of doctrine, and has now become one merely of toleration; and it is a matter of serious consideration for the English Episcopalians whether, in the face of this explicit declaration of doctrine, and adoption of the English Communion Office as the Service Book of the Church, and the only one that these congregations would be called upon to use or sanction, while the Scotch Communion Office is obviously merely permitted to certain congregations as an article of peace, and to avoid disunion, they are now justified in remaining separate on a ground as narrow as this, should all other obstacles to union be removed. Such a view would make it equally impossible for them to consider themselves connected with the Church of England. In that

¹ It is no secret now that the present writer was the author of the former, and the Rev. E. C. Dawson, of St. Thomas's, of the latter.

Church there are forms and ceremonies adopted by extreme High Churchmen in the administration of the Sacrament, which symbolize a doctrine not very diverse from that expressed by the Scotch Communion Office; and yet the Evangelical party have no thought of leaving the Church on that account. They take the true view that they are of more service to the cause of Christ by maintaining their position within it, and preserving within its fold a party bearing witness to Evangelic truth. As there are diversities in the human mind and tendencies, so there must be differences in their mode of viewing the doctrines of the Church they all accept, and in each of her forms as they find most conducive to their advancement in spiritual life. Toleration of such differences does not necessarily imply their sanction or approval, and without it there can be no comprehension in any Church. Such is the character of the Church of England, which unites within her fold parties who attach different meanings to her formularies, and are quite as apart from each other as the supporters of the Scotch Communion Office are from the Evangelical congregation. In no other sense could the English congregations, if they again united themselves with the Scotch Episcopal Church, be held to sanction the Scotch Communion Office.

The "further Plea" takes very much the same view:

"Let us then endeavour to state clearly what it is that the Evangelical congregations should seek to obtain. In the first place, with regard to the Scotch Communion Office, if they are wise they will not fail to recognise the difficulty with which the Church in Scotland has to contend. They will perceive that it may be impossible to remove from the Church's services an Office which has so long been used, and which expresses the opinions of an influential section, without causing serious disturbance or even widespread defection. They will not, therefore, ask for what it is impossible should be granted, but they will consider whether there are not terms which may be safely and honourably offered by the one and accepted by the other, without a compromise of doctrine on either side.

With regard to the other difficulties connected with the restrictions imposed by the Canons upon the services, which would unfairly hamper the position and practical work of an Evangelical clergyman, both pamphlets urge that these should be at once removed. The former pamphlet thus concludes:

Such then being in the main the obstacles which apparently prevent the union of the English Episcopalians with the Scotch Episcopal Church, if they can be removed, ought it not to be done? Would not the gain to both parties by reunion be incomparably greater than it would be to the former to remain in a position of isolation, hardly recognised by the Church of England as belonging to her, and to the latter to maintain narrow rules, adopted at a time when a narrower spirit prevailed than is the case at present? Let the Scotch Episcopal Church quietly remove or invalidate those narrow features that impede reunion. Let the English congregations be satisfied with obtaining freedom for Evangelical teaching and Evangelical practices, without seeking to impose their views on others who differ from them: and let both parties join in one Christian brotherhood, and go forward into the warfare against evil, and unite as Christian brothers in one common effort to win souls to Christ.

The same tone is taken in the conclusion of the second pamphlet:

The English Episcopal Churches, too, will, if they are filled with the spirit of wisdom, let bygones be bygones; they will lay aside all feelings of prejudice, and regard such concessions as may be offered them from the broad standpoint of Christian charity. And if both parties meet as brethren, earnestly and sincerely desirous to find a method by which both may work hand in hand for their common Master, it will be hard indeed if such a way cannot be found.

The views expressed in these pamphlets were at once cordially responded to by the Scotch Episcopal Church. A meeting of the whole Clergy of the Diocese of Edinburgh, under the presidency of their Bishop, was held, when a resolution was unanimously adopted in favour of removing all obstacles to a union of the two Communion, and not long after the Bishops met and agreed to issue a Declaration obviating the difficulties connected with the points of difference.

At a meeting of the Representative Council of the Scottish Episcopal Church, held at Glasgow on the 10th October, 1882, the present Bishop of Durham preached before them a sermon, in which he urged the union between the two Communion in the following terms:

Episcopal communities in Scotland outside the organization of the Scottish Episcopal Church—this is a spectacle which no one, I imagine, would view with satisfaction in itself, and which only a very urgent necessity could justify. Can such a necessity be pleaded? “One body” as well as “one Spirit;” this is the Apostolic rule. No natural interpretation can be put on these words which does not recognise the obligation of external corporate union. Circumstances may prevent the realization of the Apostle’s conception, but the ideal must be ever present to our aspirations and our prayers. I have reason to believe that this matter lies very near to the hearts of all Scottish Episcopalians. May God grant you a speedy accomplishment of your desire! You have the same doctrinal formularies; you acknowledge the same Episcopal polity; you respect the same liturgical forms. “Sirs, ye are brethren.” Do not strain the conditions of reunion too tightly. I cannot say, for I do not know, what faults or what misunderstandings there may have been on either side in the past. If there have been any faults, forget them. If there exist misunderstandings, clear them up. “Let the dead past bury its dead.” The darkest chapters in the history of the Church are the records of schisms—hopeless schisms which centuries have done nothing to heal—arising out of the over-scrupulous accentuation of minute differences on the one hand, and the over-rigorous enforcement of an absolute uniformity on the other—sad tragedies of spiritual frailty and disorder, over which angels have wept as they beheld the Son of God crucified afresh. God forbid that another such painful chapter should be added to these dark records of the past. Learn to bear and to forbear. Meet one another in a spirit of mutual truthfulness and brotherly love.

Rest not day or night till this union be effected. Do this, and the crown of crowns shall rest upon your brows. "Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God."

The Declaration, which was adjusted at this and a subsequent meeting, was issued on the 28th November, 1882, and communicated by the *Primus* to the Association of English Episcopalians, along with an address presented to the Bishop of Edinburgh by the Clergy of his diocese. It is unnecessary to quote this Declaration at length. Suffice it to say that so far as concerns doctrine, the Bishops explicitly declare that "the standards of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and of the Church of England are now the same," and the English Book of Common Prayer "the service book of the Church, not only for the performance of morning and evening service, but for the Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church." That the use of the Scotch Communion Office is permitted, because it "has been in use in certain congregations for upwards of a century," and "that it would be at variance with those principles of comprehension and toleration which ought to regulate the government of every Christian Church, and are essential to the preservation of unity, to deprive the foresaid congregations of the liberty granted to them," but "that there is obviously no possibility of this Office being imposed on any congregation contrary to their wishes;" and they declare "that those who by their subscription promise obedience to the Canons do not thereby commit themselves either to an approval of the distinctive features of the said Communion Office, or to any acceptance of doctrine which can be supposed to be inconsistent with the Book of Common Prayer." With regard to discipline, it states that the purpose of the Canon is, in their judgment, "on the one hand, to secure regularity in the stated and ordinary worship of the Church, and, on the other, to prevent the introduction of ritual and doctrine inconsistent with the Church's formularies and standards; but that the Bishops would not use the power given them under that Canon to interfere with other services for devotion and instruction by any of the Clergy, such as are now of frequent occurrence amongst us, over and above the stated services both on Sundays and other days." This Declaration is signed by all the Bishops; and the address signed by the Dean and all the Clergy of the Diocese of Edinburgh, which was adopted by them, and communicated with it, explicitly declares "that the liberty of worship now possessed in England by those of the Clergy commonly designated 'Evangelical,' has, as a matter of fact, been enjoyed to the full in our own Communion without hindrance and without reproach."

The present writer is permitted to state that the terms of the Declaration were submitted by him to the Archbishop of York, and that his Grace expressed a decided opinion that it ought to be accepted by the English Episcopalians as satisfactory, and strongly advised that the separation between the two Communion should now be brought to an end.

When these documents were formally communicated, the result was that the Vestry of St. Vincent Church and the Incumbent, Mr. Talon, were unanimously of opinion that "This Declaration substantially removes the causes of the separation of the English Episcopal Chapels;" and the Incumbent, with the full concurrence of the congregation, subscribed the Canons.

The Vestry of St. Thomas's came to the same conclusion; but there were circumstances connected with that congregation which rendered it difficult for them to take the same course, and they adopted the plan suggested by the late Bishop of Durham of a Concordat. An arrangement has therefore been made by which the Bishop of Edinburgh executes Episcopal functions in the congregation, sanctions Mr. Dawson, the Incumbent, officiating in the diocese, and an exchange of pulpits with the Clergy of the Scotch Episcopal Church.

Since then the Bishop has preached in both churches, and performed the rite of Confirmation. The constitution of the Church of Montrose prevents their coming to a resolution till the lapse of six months. The two Glasgow congregations have peremptorily refused to join their brethren in either uniting themselves to the Church or in entering into a similar Concordat. Their grounds of objection are stated in a published letter addressed by a leading layman to the secretary of the Association of English Episcopalians. Space prevents us quoting it at length, but they may be stated shortly that: 1st. The Church "not only recognises and sanctions, but will continue to recognise and sanction, the use of our Office which expressly teaches and proclaims the erroneous and pernicious Papal doctrine of transubstantiation;" 2nd. The power conferred upon its Bishops of preventing a clergyman from conducting "in any unlicensed place any religious service." It is obvious that such objections derive their force solely from regarding the Scotch Episcopal Church in the aspect she presented prior to the revision of the Canons in 1863, and practically ignoring the change affecting them and its results in the altered spirit of the Church. That the first objection is now untenable, we have the weighty authority of the late Evangelical Bishop of Durham; and it is enough to assure them of the groundlessness of their fear as to the second, that the Bishop of Glasgow (Dr. Wilson) signs the Declaration.

It is probably due to this being apparent to themselves that two other grounds have since been urged; viz., that the Scotch Episcopal Church protested against the Gorham judgment in 1850, and that the Declaration is merely the opinion of individual Bishops, and has no authoritative or permanent character. But these, too, are equally untenable, for the first was before the revision of the Canons in 1863, and the Bishops now explicitly declare that their standards are the same with those of the Church of England; while the address which declares that the liberty accorded to the Evangelical Clergy in England is enjoyed to the full in the Scotch Episcopal Church is signed, among others, by two Evangelical clergymen. As to the second objection, they have the remedy in their own hands, for they can give to the Declaration the force of contract by making it a condition of the Concordat or an article in the Constitution of the Church, to be approved by the Bishop in terms of the Canons, as has been done in the case of St. Vincent Church.

It is obvious that if each party in a Church insisted upon enforcing their views upon other parties, and refused to tolerate any deviation in doctrine or ritual in the others, to which they were not required themselves to submit, a united and comprehensive Church would be impossible, and it would become a mere group of separate sects, viewing each other with dislike and suspicion, and refusing to co-operate in the great contest with evil. This is the position which the Glasgow congregations of English Episcopalians must inevitably assume if they continue to maintain a separation not only from the Scotch Episcopal Church, but from their Evangelical brethren, upon grounds too narrow and ill-founded to bear examination. Our Saviour's exhortation to His disciples to love one another is best interpreted in our days by a large-hearted and generous mutual toleration in matters of difference in the same Church, which do not involve a real sacrifice of principle on either side.

It is to be hoped that when time has mitigated the angry feelings which accompany controversy, and calm reflection has shown the superiority of union and co-operation over division and isolation, and the relative unimportance of the points of difference when viewed in a candid spirit, the result may be a united and comprehensive Episcopal Church in Scotland, in which the Evangelical element may have its legitimate freedom and influence, and every obstacle to the union of all those who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity and truth, in one combined effort against evil, be once and for ever removed.

WILLIAM F. SKENE.