

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1844.

---

No. II.

---

---

ART. I.—*History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles.* By Dr. Augustus Neander, Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin, Consistorial Counsellor, etc. Translated from the third edition of the Original German, by J. E. Ryland. Complete in one volume. Philadelphia: James M. Campbell and Co. 1844. 8vo. pp. 331. *J. M. Alexander*

THE translator of this celebrated work has given us a brief memoir of the author, which is, in substance as follows. John Augustus William Neander, was born at Göttingen, January 16, 1789. His youth was spent chiefly at Hamburg. Having renounced Judaism, he began his academical studies at Halle, in 1806, and completed them at Göttingen, under the venerable Planck. After a short residence at Hamburg, he commenced, in 1811, at Heidelberg, as a theological teacher; and in 1812 became theological professor extraordinary. Here he published his work on the Life and Times of the Emperor Julian. The next year he was called to the University of Berlin. His work on St. Bernard soon followed. In 1818 appeared his history of the Gnostics. His next labour was the interesting and learned Biography of Chrysostom. In 1825, he published his 'Denkwürdigkeiten,' or Memorabilia of early Christianity. All these

We were pleased to learn from the preface of the author, that it was his purpose to issue a third volume, bringing down the narrative to our own day. Whether this concluding volume has appeared, we are as yet uninformed.

---

*Charles Scodge*

ART. IV.—*The Claims of the Free Church of Scotland.*  
By Thomas Smith, D. D. 1844. pp. 146.

THE delegates from the Free Church of Scotland have been cordially received by the evangelical churches of America. If, in some instances, any backwardness has been exhibited as to pecuniary contributions, it is to be attributed not to want of liberality, nor to want of sympathy with our Scottish brethren, nor to want of faith in the principles for which they are contending, but to the want of a due appreciation of the subject. It requires time to get the public mind aroused to the importance of such a movement. There is, in the first instance, an ignorance of the facts of the case; and when the facts are known, their bearing is not soon or easily apprehended. In Scotland this subject has been under discussion for years; the public mind is imbued with it; the people feel that their dearest rights and most precious interests are at stake; the matter has taken hold on their heart and conscience, and they are not likely to let it go. Men coming from a community all on fire with this one subject, must be painfully impressed with the ignorance and consequent apathy of the Christian public in America. This apathy, however, is unavoidable, until the case be fairly understood, and then we doubt not it will give place to an intelligent interest. Let the case be fully apprehended; let it be seen that the authority of Christ is the real point in dispute; let it be known that the standard which the Free Church has unfolded is no sectarian, or national banner, but the common banner of the church, that it is the banner under which we are rallied, and "which floats over the crystal battlements of heaven," and then no man who intelligently believes that "Jesus Christ is Lord," can fail to take an interest in the subject, or can stand an idle spectator of the conflict. "They who are not with me are against me." They who do not take sides with the truth, when it is called in question, oppose

it. They who stand with their arms folded, or with their hands in their pockets, while the friends of Christ are contending with the powers of this world, will have their portion with the world. The only question, therefore with the Christians of America is, whether the cause of the Free Church is indeed the cause of Christ. If it is, there is no danger of their being backward to espouse it. To suppose otherwise would be to suppose they had no zeal for their Lord, and no sympathy with his people. It would be to suppose that it is no longer true of the "body of Christ" that when one member suffers, all the members suffer with it, and that when one member rejoices, all the members rejoice with it.

Is then the cause of the Free Church the cause of Christ?

Andrew Melville announced the radical principle involved in the present controversy, when he took king James by the sleeve and calling him God's silly vessel said, "Sir, as I have divers times before told you, so now again must I tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland; there is Christ Jesus the king of the Church, whose subject king James is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. Those whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over his church and govern his spiritual kingdom, have sufficient power from him to do this both severally and jointly, the which no Christian king should control, but fortify and assist, otherwise they are not faithful members of his Church. We will give 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 even in this world we seek for; and you cannot deprive us of it. Permit us then to meet in the name of Christ, and attend to the interests of that church of which you are the chief member. Sir, when you were in your swaddling clothes, Christ Jesus reigned freely in this land, in spite of all his enemies; his officers assembled freely for the ruling and welfare of his church, which was ever for your welfare, defence and preservation, when these same enemies were seeking your destruction."

Here is the gist of the controversy. The church of Scotland has always held and testified, in prison and at the stake, First, that "there is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ," and that He "as king and head of the church hath therein appointed a government in the hands of church officers distinct from the civil magistrate." Secondly, that the

officers in whom is vested the government of this church, derive their authority not from the civil power, but are members appointed thereto by the word of God;" and that this "power ecclesiastical flows immediately from God and the mediator Jesus Christ." Thirdly, that this power is purely "ministerial, not lordly, and to be exercised in consonance with the laws of Christ, and with the liberties of his people." Consequently that the Bible and not the law of the land, is the statute book of the church; that the Bible and not the civil law must decide who are to be admitted to the church privileges or excluded from them; who are to be ordained to ecclesiastical office or deposed from it; who are to be instituted pastors of particular congregations or separated from them. Fourthly, that "this government of the church, thus appointed by the Lord Jesus, in the hands of church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate, or supreme power of the state, and consequently flowing directly from the head of the church to the office-bearers thereof, to the exclusion of the civil magistrate, comprehends, as the object of it, the preaching of the word, administration of the sacraments, correction of manners, the admission of the office bearers to their offices, their suspension and deprivation therefrom, the infliction and removal of church censurers, and, generally, the whole 'power of the keys.'" Fifthly, that the people have an inalienable right to determine who shall exercise this ecclesiastical government over them, that is, they have a right to elect their own church officers. "It appertaineth to the people," says the First Book of Discipline, "and to every several congregation to elect their minister." The Second Book of Discipline teaches, "ordinary and outward calling has two parts—election and ordination. Election is the choosing out of a person or persons most able for the office that vaikes, by the judgment of the eldership and consent of the congregation." It declares that "none should be intruded upon any congregation, either by the prince, or any inferior person, without lawful election, and the assent of the people over whom the person is placed."

That these principles are true we shall not attempt to prove. It is enough for our present purpose that they are included in the standards of our own church, and substantially in the standards of all the evangelical churches of this country. That there is a government of the church, distinct from that of the state; that Jesus Christ is the only

head of the church ; that all ecclesiastical power is derived from him ; that this power includes the right of discipline and of determining who shall be appointed to office in the church ; and that the people have a right to a voice in deciding who are to be their spiritual teachers and rulers, are principles recognised by all the Protestant churches of America. By common consent, therefore, we must hold that those who contend and suffer for these principles, contend and suffer for the truth.

That these are the principles of the church of Scotland will not be denied. Most of them are expressed above in the language borrowed from her standards, and they are all included in her "claim of rights." We have no doubt also that these rights not only belonged to that church as a church, but that they were recognised and guaranteed by acts of parliament and solemn treaties. Such has been the repeated judgment of the highest civil courts in Scotland ; and such is still the judgment of her most distinguished judges and lawyers. The Confession containing the principles above recited was formally and repeatedly ratified, at different periods, by the Scottish parliament, and especially in the first parliament under William and Mary. The opposite doctrine, viz. that the king, the supreme power in the state, was judge "in all matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, as well as in things temporal," was "finally and expressly repudiated and cast out of the constitution of Scotland, as inconsistent with the Presbyterian church government." This was the very point of contention between the church and James VI. In 1612 when prelacy was established, the doctrine of the king's supremacy was established with it ; and when in consequence of that attempt on the liberty of the people, the throne of Charles I. was overthrown, that doctrine fell with it. When prelacy was a second time established under Charles II. the same doctrine was inserted in the "Test Oath," for refusing which so many of God's people were put to death. And when after twenty-eight years of persecution, the church and country, were delivered from the tyranny of the Stuarts, an act was immediately passed repealing all the laws asserting the supremacy of the crown in ecclesiastical matters, and all oaths requiring such acknowledgment were done away. "By which enactments, any claim on the part of the sovereigns of Scotland to be supreme rulers in spiritual and ecclesiastical matters, as well as in temporal

and civil, or to any power, by themselves or their judges holding commission from them, to exercise jurisdiction in matters or causes spiritual and ecclesiastical, was repudiated and excluded from the constitution as inconsistent with the Presbyterian church government then established, and still subsisting under the statutes then and subsequently passed, for its security and maintenance, ‘without any alteration to the people of this land in all succeeding generations.’ ”\*

This denial on the one hand of the right of the civil magistrate to judge in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, and the assertion that all such power belonged to the church, was legally ratified and confirmed at the time of the union of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland. At that time the parliament of Scotland passed an act, commonly called the Act of Security, confirming the previous acts establishing the Presbyterian church, and expressly providing and declaring, “That the aforesaid true Protestant religion, contained in the above mentioned Confession of Faith, with the form and purity of worship presently in use within this church, and its Presbyterian church government and discipline—that is to say, the government of the church by kirk sessions, presbyteries, provincial synods and general assemblies, all established by the aforesaid acts of parliament, pursuant to the claim of right, shall remain and continue unalterable.” It was further enacted that all succeeding sovereigns should swear and subscribe “That they shall inviolably maintain and preserve the foresaid settlement of the true Protestant religion, with the government, worship, discipline, right, and privileges of this church, as above established by the laws of this kingdom, in prosecution of the claim of right.”

It was further enacted, “That the said act of security, with the establishment therein contained, should be held and observed in all time coming as a fundamental and essential condition of any treaty of union to be concluded betwixt the two kingdoms, without any alteration thereof, or derogation thereto, in any sort forever.” This act, and the settlements therein contained, were accordingly incorporated in the treaty of union, and subsequently in the separate acts of the Scottish and English parliaments ratifying the union.

\* Claim of Rights.

With regard to the right of the people to a voice in the choice of their pastors, the facts of the case are substantially these. As has been already shown, the principle that no minister should be settled over a congregation contrary to the will of the people, was explicitly stated in the Confessions adopted by the church in 1560 and 1581.

The government, however, under James and Charles I., succeeded in enforcing patronage and partially in establishing prelacy. In 1638, at the time of the Second Reformation, the General Assembly resolved, "That there be respect had to the congregation, and that no person be intruded in any office of the kirk, contrary to the will of the congregation to which they are appointed." Eleven years afterwards the Parliament of Scotland passed an act to the effect: "That patronage and presentations to kirks is an evil and bondage, under which the Lord's people and ministers of this land have long groaned; that it hath 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 the time of ignorance and superstition." The act proceeds to abolish all patronage, and to recommend to the next General Assembly to determine on some "standing way" for filling up vacant parishes. The Assembly accordingly directed: 1. That when a congregation became vacant, the presbytery should send some minister to preach to the people, to exhort them to fervent prayer to the Lord to send them a pastor after his own heart, and to inform them that the presbytery would send men to preach on trial, and if they desired to hear any particular minister they would endeavour to secure his services. 2. That at a suitable time after, another minister should be sent to preach, and inform the people that the election was about to take place. The session then met, and under the presidency of the preacher, made the election, "and if the people, upon intimation of the person agreed upon by the session, acquiesced and consented to the said person," the matter was reported to the presbytery, who took the necessary steps for his ordination. 3. If the majority of the people objected to the choice of the session, the matter was to be reported to the presbytery, and if that body did not find that the objections "were grounded on causeless prejudices," they were to appoint a new election.

Charles II., on his restoration in 1660, abolished all the laws made during the establishment of presbytery; turned

out about four hundred ministers from their parishes; set up episcopacy; and not only intruded new ministers on the churches; but forbade, on pain of fine, imprisonment or death, any man to leave his own parish church.

■ When this tyranny ended in the expulsion of the Stuarts, and the calling of William, the prince of Orange, to the throne, an address was presented by the people of Scotland, to that prince, praying, among other things: "That laical patronages be discharged, as was done in the parliament of 1649, and the people restored to the right and privilege of election, according to the warrant of God's word."

The church wished and endeavoured to obtain the restoration of the act of 1649. This, however, William opposed, and the Church, worn out by a long persecution, submitted to a compromise, agreeably to which the parliament abolished patronage, and enacted that "In case of the vacancy of any particular church, and for supplying the same with a minister, the heritors (being Protestants) and the elders are to name and propose the person to the whole congregation to be either approved or disapproved by them; and if they disapprove, that the disapprovers give their reasons to the effect that the affair be cognosed upon by the Presbytery of the bounds, at whose judgment and by whose determination, the calling and entry of a particular minister is to be ordered and concluded." In accordance with this act, the call to the minister was substantially in the following form, "We heritors and elders of the parish of — being assured of the ministerial qualifications of you, Mr. — have agreed *with the advice and consent of the parishioners of the parish aforesaid, to invite and call, &c.*" This act, though not all the church desired, is represented as having worked well. There could be no presentation without the consent of the elders, who were the representatives of the church, and all calls were made out in the presence of the congregation and in almost all cases with their consent. During the twenty-two years this act was in force, only fourteen cases of disputed settlements occurred, out of the estimated number of six hundred and sixty.

This was the position in which the matter stood at the time of the union. The act of 1690 by which patronage was abolished, was one of those established and confirmed by the act of Security, and the Treaty of Union, and declared to be unalterable in all time coming. Notwithstanding this solemn stipulation, in 1712 an act was introduced abrogating

the act of 1690 and restoring the rights of patrons. By this act the presbyteries were required to "receive and admit in the same manner such qualified person or persons, minister or ministers, as shall be presented by the respective patrons, as the persons or ministers presented before the making of this act ought to have been admitted."\*

This act was so obviously in violation of the Treaty of Union, that it is necessary to inquire how it came to be passed, and how it came to be submitted to. It is well known that Queen Anne, towards the close of her reign, lent herself to the machinations of the enemies of the revolution, by which the protestant succession to the crown was secured. Her ministry, with Bolingbroke at its head, were in correspondence with the Pretender, and directed all their efforts to secure his accession to the throne. One of their objects in furtherance of this design, was to weaken and overthrow the Scottish church, and to disgust the Scottish people with the Union. The restoration of patronage was the first step towards the attainment of the object in view. The evidence of the correctness of this representation is abundant. In a letter preserved in the Wodrow MSS. written by one who had been a bishop, to another episcopalian, the writer, after saying that the restoration of prelacy was the great end at which they should aim, adds, "The matter must first be sounded at a distance, and a just computation of our strength made, and some previous settlements made, such as restoring patronage and the granting indulgence, with liberty to possess churches and benefices, and this will undoubtedly make way for an entire re-establishment of the ancient apostolic order of bishops; for our Queen, having right, as patron to a great many churches, she will still prefer those of our persuasion to others; and the rest of laical patrons, partly through inclination and partly through interest to please her majesty, will follow her example."†

Lockhart of Carnwath, the leader of the party in the House of Commons, at that time, says; "As my chief, my only design, in engaging in public affairs was to serve the king (i. e. Pretender) so far as I was capable I had that

\* For the facts above stated see, Collection of Acts of Parliament and Assembly concerning patronage; and Begg's History of the Act of Queen Anne.

† Dr. Welsh's evidence before the House of Commons. See History of the Act of Queen Anne 1711, by the Rev. James Begg, p. 36.

always in view. . . . And in order to prepare those who I knew would not assist the king, out of a principle of loyalty, (I mean the west country Presbyterians,) for receiving impressions that might prevail with them on other topics, I had in concert with Dr. Abercromby been at a good deal of pains to publish and disperse amongst these people papers which gave them from time to time, full accounts of what were likely to be the consequences of the Union, and showed how impossible it was for the Scots to subsist under it. And I pressed the toleration and patronage acts more earnestly, that I thought the Presbyterian clergy would be from thence convinced that the establishment of their kirk would, in time, be overturned, as it was obvious that the security thereof was not so thoroughly established by the union as they imagined.”\* We have here the distinct avowal by one of the principal agents in passing the act for the restoration of patronage, that it was designed to subvert the Church of Scotland, and that it was known to be a violation of the treaty of union by those who passed it. Bishop Burnet, a contemporary historian says, the measure was framed “on design to weaken and undermine the Presbyterian establishment,” since “it was set up by the Presbyterians from the first beginning as a principle that parishes had, from warrants of scripture, a right to choose their own ministers.” As a farther evidence of the animus with which this act was passed, it may be stated that the delegate of the church at that time in London, found other bills prepared to be laid before Parliament, one for abolishing all General Assemblies; and another for compelling presbyteries, “under certain penalties to settle any licentiate, who received a presentation without further form or trial, and especially without any form of consulting the parishioners.”†

Professor Hutchinson in his *Treatise on Patronage*, 1735, says, “Matters continued in a very easy manner till the year 1711, when the late Queen’s ministry, intending to defeat the Hanover succession, took all methods to harass such as were firmly attached to it, which the Presbyterian clergy and gentry ever were, both from principle and interest. An act, therefore, was obtained restoring patrons to their power,

\* Lockhart Papers, vol. i. p. 417. Every one knows what James II. intended by his “Toleration Act,” and the Jacobites under Queen Anne had the same object in view by what they called their act of Indulgence.

† See Begg, p. 39.

though in the most direct opposition to the articles of the union, and the public faith of the nation then given in that sacred treaty upon which is founded his majesty's title to the crown of Scotland, and the very parliament of Great Britain itself."

It is essential to a proper understanding of the present controversy in Scotland to understand the real nature and design of this act. The testimony adduced above is sufficient to prove that it was known and recognised as a violation of the treaty of Union; and that it was intended as an incipient measure for the overthrow of the Presbyterian church. It is also important to know how it was then regarded by the church itself, as a proof of its true intent, and also to show that the portion of the church which now defend patronage and this act on which the right rests, are not the true representatives of the Church of Scotland. As soon as the bill was introduced into parliament, a commission of three ministers was deputed by the church, to repair to London to remonstrate against its passage. They were heard by counsel before the House of Lords and in their address to the Queen they declare the act to "be contrary to our church constitution, so well secured by the treaty of Union." This address the General Assembly *unanimously* approved and embodied in an act, thereby giving it the sanction of the whole church. And Wodrow states that at the meeting of the Commission of the Assembly, "It was owned by all, that patronages were a very great grievance, and sinful in the imposers, and a breach of the security of the Presbyterian constitution by the union."\* The Commission complained of the special injustice of this act, inasmuch as the act of 1690 which abolished patronage, gave the patrons as a compensation a right to the tithes, which did not belong to them, upon condition of their paying a certain portion of them to the incumbent. "Notwithstanding which advantageous concession to the patrons, this bill," say the Commission, "takes back from the church the power of presentation of ministers, without restoring the tithes which formerly belonged to her, by which the patrons come to enjoy both the purchase and the price."

As soon as George I. came to the crown, the Assembly sent up a strong remonstrance against the act restoring pat-

\* Hetherington's *History of the Church of Scotland*. New York edition, p. 331.

ronage ; and that remonstrance was repeated annually from 1712 to 1782. Nothing can more clearly prove that what is now regarded, by those in authority, and by the moderate party in the church, as consistent with the original compact between the state and the church, was in fact a violation of that compact and was universally so considered at the time of its perpetration and for two generations afterwards. The state of feeling on this subject is clearly stated by Prof. Hutchinson in 1735, "The direct pleading for patronages in Scotland was so odious to all men of piety, that not one of the clergy, not a king's chaplain, a politician-clergyman among them dared to open his mouth in favour of them in their assemblies and synods. . . . All honest men among the clergy abhor them."

Thus this unjust encroachment was made on the liberty and rights of the church. If it is asked how it came to be submitted to ? The answer is to be found in various causes. The men who decided the course of the church at that time were not men of the nerve and power of Knox, Melville, or Henderson. The church had not long before emerged from a period of bloody and harassing persecution of nearly thirty years continuance, and was indisposed to renew the contest. It was confidently hoped that remonstrance would in the end be effectual for the removal of the grievance. Important interests were from the first enlisted in support of the abuse, and the zeal and fidelity of the church soon began to decline under the operation of the act itself. There are two other reasons which deserve to be specified. The first is, that the act was not at first enforced with any kind of rigour. Patronage, says Mr. Begg, is like the thumb-screw, easy at first, but with every turn of the screw it becomes tighter and tighter until it gets to be insupportable. "Patrons often stood aside and allowed the people to choose ; no presentee received a presentation unconditionally till twenty years after the act of Queen Anne was passed." It was therefore brought slowly and cautiously into operation. Another reason of the submission of the people to this unconstitutional and unjust act was that it never received the harsh interpretation which has recently been put upon it. The courts have of late decided that the presbytery is bound, under pain of fine or imprisonment, to induct any qualified presentee the patron might choose to name. But the act of Anne purported to repeal the act of 1690 "in so far as the same relates to the presentation of

ministers by heritors and others therein mentioned," and to vest the right of presentation in the patrons, and the presbytery was obliged to induct such presentee in the same manner as before the passage of the act. The whole effect of the act, therefore, as to this point, was to take the presentation from the heritors and elders and vest it in the patron. But the right as vested in the heritors and elders was subject to the consent of the people and the judgment of the presbytery, and, therefore, when transferred to the patron, it was subject to the same limitations. Accordingly, in 1735 and 1749 the Court of Sessions decided, that they had no right to interdict a presbytery from inducting as minister of a parish another person than the presentee of the patron; that they could only decide who was legally entitled to the stipend.\* The actual operation of the act was therefore in general this. The patron nominated to the presbytery a minister to the vacant church; the presbytery sent the candidate to preach to the people; they, if satisfied, sent him a call to the effect "We the heritors, elders and parishioners of the parish of —— do hereby call and invite you to take charge and oversight of this parish, and to come and labour among us in the gospel ministry." This call was laid before the presbytery and if found in order, i. e. to come, in fact, from the persons in whose names it was presented, the presbytery proceeded to the examination, and if satisfied, to the ordination and induction of the minister.

Now it is evident that if these steps were faithfully adhered to, patronage, though liable to great abuse, as experience abundantly shows, was not of necessity, a serious practical grievance. The patron had not the right of appointment, but merely that of nomination, subject to the approbation of the people, and the consent of the presbytery. In most cases the practical abuse arose from the presbyteries themselves, who wickedly held that a call was regular if signed by a single parishioner; and in many cases insisted on ordaining and inducting the presentee, in despite of the opposition of the people. If the presbytery found the call in order, the civil courts gave effect to their decision; but no case ever occurred, until the recent controversy, in which, when the presbytery refused to recognise the call, the civil courts interfered to compel them.

\* See Memorial to Sir Robert Peel, by the Convention of Ministers and Elders. 1842.

During the declension of religion and the reign of "moderation," as it is called, in the latter half of the last century, it often happened, as just stated, that the presbyteries found the call, which was an essential step in the settlement of a minister, in order, when it was no call at all; and if the presbytery was too conscientious to be guilty of the outrage, the General Assembly forced them to do it, and even in some cases actually deposed from the ministry those who refused thus to violate their conscience. In 1834 the party in the church, headed by Dr. Chalmers, who had always opposed these forced settlements, gained the ascendancy in the General Assembly, and immediately passed an act, obliging the presbyteries to give the call of the congregation its due weight; that is, not to consider that a call which was no call; in other words, not to proceed to the settlement of a minister, unless the people were at least quiescent and abstained from actual opposition. This was the whole intent and force of the Veto Act. It simply forbade the presbyteries from proceeding until one essential step in the process had been taken. The law forbade them to proceed without the nomination of the patron, unless that nomination was delayed more than six months; the constitution of the church forbade their proceeding without the call of the people, or without the examination of the candidate. The first step was the nomination; the second, the call; the third, the examination by the presbytery into the learning, orthodoxy and character of the presentee. These steps were always taken; though in practice, the second was often a mockery. The Assembly enjoined that it should be a reality; that unless that step was taken the process was to be arrested.

Was this act of the Assembly right? and if right was it legal? That it was right is clear, because, by the law of God and the nature of the case, a Christian people should have a voice in deciding who is to be their religious guide. This is one of the necessary adjuncts of the right of private judgment; of liberty of conscience, of the right to worship God according to our own understanding of his will, and of ministering to our own spiritual growth, and to the religious education of our children. To say that a man whom I disapprove of shall be my spiritual instructor and the educator of my household, is to deny to me one of the most obvious and important of the rights of religious liberty, of that liberty which God has given his people, and

which no man, without sin, can take from them. The Assembly, therefore, did but say, that neither they nor their presbyteries, should be parties to the crime of violating this divine right of the people to a voice in the election of their pastor.

It is no less evident that the act in question was in accordance with the constitution of the Scottish church. This is plain, not only from the repeated recognition of the principle of the act in all the standards of the church, by the unanimous and long continued opposition to the act of Queen Anne, by which that principle was endangered; but also, and pre-eminently, from the existence and form of the call. What is that call? "We, the elders, heritors, and parishioners of the parish of —, being satisfied with your qualifications, do cordially invite and call you to become our minister." What does this mean? What does it imply? Does it not recognise in the clearest terms that the people have a right to call, nay, that they must call in order to open the way to the induction of the minister? The existence of this usage supercedes the necessity of any other arguments or evidence that the principle of non-intrusion, or of the right of election, is a principle of the church of Scotland.

If any man wishes to feel the full force of this argument, if he would see not merely the propriety but the moral necessity of the Veto Act, let him read any account, shocking from its profanation of sacred things, of the intrusion of a minister on "a reclaiming congregation." Let him take the recent Marnoch case. The pastor of the parish of Marnoch, being infirm, employed as an assistant a Mr. Edwards, who, in the course of three years, rendered himself so obnoxious to the people that the aged minister was obliged to remove him. On the death of the incumbent, this Mr. Edwards was presented by the trustees of the Earl of Fife, the patron, as minister of the parish. When the call was offered for signature, it was signed by one of the heads of families on the roll of the communicants; at the same time dissents were recorded by the six elders composing the session, and by two hundred and fifty-four heads of families. This call the presbytery ultimately declared to be in order; that is, they declared a call signed by one man, resident in the parish, to be the call of "the elders, heritors, and parishioners." Mr. Edwards, in answer to the usual constitutional questions, declared that he had used no undue

methods, either by himself or others, to obtain the call of the people, though he had no such call; and that zeal for the honour of God, love to Jesus Christ, and desire to save souls were his great and chief inducements in entering the holy ministry. He was thereupon ordained, and settled, "a minister without a parishioner, a man without a friend." No person of correct moral feeling can hesitate to pronounce this whole transaction an outrage; a grievous sin in the sight of God, which no law of man could justify or palliate. The General Assembly, in forbidding presbyteries to settle men under such circumstances, did but say they ought not and must not sin against God, against his people, and their own souls. That the veto act therefore was a righteous act, an act which fidelity to God required the church to pass and to uphold, is as plain a case as was ever submitted to the moral judgment of men.

Whether it was a legal act, an act within the legal competency of the Assembly to pass, that is, whether the laws of the land allowed the people to have an effective voice in the choice of their pastor, is a different question, and is doubtless a point about which honest men differ. That it was legal even according to the statutes of the civil law, we think may be fairly inferred from the following facts. First, all the law officers of the crown pronounced it legal at the time of its passage. Secondly, those judges of the Court of Session most distinguished for talents and learning, concurred in that decision and still adhere to it. Thirdly, those who decided against the legality of the act, rested their decision on the unconstitutional act of Queen Anne, above referred to, and upon an interpretation of that act, in opposition to all the previous judgments of the civil courts; it having always been held that the right of patronage was restored by that act, subject to the limitation of the consent of the people, or the judgment of the presbytery that such consent was withheld on the ground of "causeless prejudices." And, fourthly, the British parliament has within a year passed a declaratory act, asserting the law to be in substance what the Free Church maintained it to be, viz., that the presbytery was not bound to induct a qualified presentee, but had a discretion in the case.\*

\* It is well known that the law Lords in the House of Lords, by whose votes the Auchterarder case was decided against the Free Church, especially Lords Brougham, Cottenham and Campbell, entered a protest against Lord Aberdeen's church bill, declaring that if the averments of that Bill were true,

The question as to the legality of the act, however, though important is still subordinate to the moral question. Whether legal or illegal, whether the law of the land required or forbade the forcible intrusion of a minister upon a congregation, it is plain that the thing ought not to be done, and that the church was bound to refuse to do it, whatever might be the consequence. She accordingly did refuse. The civil courts then began a course of coercion and usurpation, novel even in the history of Scotland. They imposed heavy fines on presbyteries which refused to ordain and instal men whom the people refused to call. They declared the sentence of suspension and deposition passed by the church courts to be null and void, and reinstated ministers regularly deposed, into their offices; they interdicted ministers, sent for that purpose, preaching in congregations declared to be vacant; they declared that the church courts had no right to erect new ecclesiastical parishes. It was not of course maintained that the church could divide parishes considered as civil divisions of the country, or throw any new burden upon them. But where a parish contained from ten to sixty thousand people, the church by voluntary contributions, erected and endowed new places of worship, organized new congregations, and ordained ministers over them. In this way, in the course of ten years, about two hundred new congregations had been created at an expense of a million and a half of dollars. By the constitution of the church, the pastors and elders of these congregations had the same right to sit and vote in church courts, as any other ministers or elders. The civil courts denied them that right, and quashed the proceedings of the bodies in which they were allowed to vote. In these, and various other ways the liberties of the church were openly infringed.

The question then is, could the Scotch church, consistently with obedience to God, submit to be thus controlled by the civil courts? Could she consent to be forced by the law of the land to do what the law of Christ forbade? Could she, consistently with her fundamental principle that Christ, and not the civil magistrate, is the head of the church, admit that the state should prescribe the rules of

their judgment rendered in the Scottish Church case, was erroneous and contrary to law. Thus the House of Lords in their judicial capacity pronounced the law to be one thing, and in their legislative capacity declared it to be another thing!

her procedure in ordaining or deposing ministers, and at its own pleasure force her to ordain, or interdict her from deposing? It is clear that this was a case in which the church had to choose between obeying God or man; between duty and interest; between the honour, influence and emoluments of establishment, and the contempt, the weakness and poverty of dissent.

The principles then involved in this controversy are in the highest degree important. Christ has established a church and has given it a government distinct from that of the state, and its officers, in the administration of that government, must follow his directions and not the directions of men. The truth on which this doctrine rests, is essential not merely to the prosperity of the church, but to the vitality of religion. The soul must be brought under the conviction of its allegiance to Him that died and rose again that He might be the Lord of the dead and of the living. We must as individuals as well as a church, feel that Christ has a right to reign in us, and to rule over us; and that his will must be the rule of our conduct. It is this truth which the Free Church has so asserted as to bring it in living contact with millions of minds; and in so doing has conferred an inappreciable blessing on the world. We doubt not that the clear exhibition of this truth among our churches, by the Scottish delegates, will be a means of spiritual good, for which all our contributions will be a most inadequate compensation. Nay, were we to increase those contributions an hundred fold, we should still be their debtors, if they only make us feel more than we have hitherto done, that Jesus Christ is indeed our Lord. It is this more than anything else, that has interested us in their mission. We have felt under some of their addresses as we never felt before; we have had clearer views of the intimate connection between the practical recognition of Christ's kingly office and the life of God in the soul; and we think we see one of the principal sources of that strength of character, elevation of mind, and constancy in trials, which Scottish Christians have so often exhibited. Let any man with this principle before his mind, read the history of Scotland, and he will have the solution of the mystery of servant girls and labourers dying on the gibbet or at the stake, for a question of church government. Let him contrast the bearing of Knox, Melville, or Henderson when they stood before kings,—we will not say with the slavish adulation of the

unworthy bishops of king James, but with the spirit of such good men as Crammer, and they will see the difference between believing that Christ is king, and believing that the king is the head of the church.

This therefore, is far from being an abstract principle, it is a truth of vital, practical importance; which enters into the religious experience and moulds the religious character of men. This immediate and constant contact between the soul and Christ, not only as its priest but as its sovereign, restrains and elevates it. To serve God and to serve man are extremes separated by an infinite distance; and it is only when the service of men is considered as part of the service of God that it ceases to be degrading and withering; and when a case occurs in which the service of God conflicts with the service of men, then, if a man perceives the contrariety and yet chooses the latter, he is guilty of rebellion against God; and if he does not perceive it, when it actually exists, this wrong moral judgment is itself a sin, and its influence is evil and only evil on his own spiritual state. When our obedience terminates on men; when we violate the scriptural rule which requires us to do service as to the Lord and not to men, then we sin against our souls, we withdraw ourselves from the elevating presence and service of God, to bow at the feet of man the lowest of his rational creatures. If this is true even in reference to the external service due to magistrates and superiors, it is pre-eminently true when such superiors pass beyond the limits of their legitimate authority. There is nothing more degrading, nothing more hurtful to the religious feelings, than to yield obedience to men in those things which God has reserved to himself, that is, matters of faith, of conscience, of worship, of church order and discipline. This has long been one of the most fruitful sources of heresy and irreligion in the church. As a living principle, therefore, as a source of inward spiritual life, as a necessary element of all true elevation and independence of character, and as a divinely appointed means of securing a real and practical adherence to the scriptures as our rule of faith and practice, the distinctive truth for which the Scottish Church is contending, and which by her testimony has been brought to bear with increased force on so many minds, is of the utmost practical value and importance.

If this truth is important to the individual Christian it surely is to the church, which is but the community of

Christians. And it is important to the church, not only as a means of elevating the piety of her members, but to direct her action as a society. Unless she practically recognises the principle that Christ is her head, that her authority is derived from him, and must be exercised in obedience to his word, she sinks from a divine institution into an engine of the state; from being the family of God, to being one form of the world, governed by worldly men and worldly principles. As soon as it is admitted that the world, that is, the mass of society in its organized capacity as the state, and through its constituted authorities, may decide what the church must teach, what must be its terms of ministerial or Christian communion, whom it must admit and whom exclude from ordinances and office, in a word, when it is admitted that the statute-book, and not the Bible, is to be the rule of the teaching, government and discipline of the church, then the great distinction between the church and the world is done away, and the divinely appointed security for purity of doctrine and discipline is destroyed.

When Henry VIII. chose to renounce the authority of the Pope, the whole nation did the same; when he commanded them to believe and teach the doctrines of Rome, they obeyed; when Edward VI. proclaimed the protestant faith, people and ministers made haste to profess it. When Mary ascended the throne they became Romanists, and when Elizabeth succeeded her, they became Protestants. In all these changes, there were many who remained steadfast, but the mass of the people and clergy changed as the court changed. This right of the state in its representative authority to decide what the church must believe and teach, the Stuarts attempted to enforce in Scotland, and there the battle for the independence of the church, that is, for its right to regulate its faith and practice by the word of God, was fought, and has again been asserted. This is a right essential to the church's accomplishing her vocation, a right which she is not at liberty to surrender. Though we may think that this is a matter about which we are secure, it is not the less our duty and privilege to aid those who suffer for its assertion. And it is by no means certain that we shall not be called upon ourselves to contend for this same principle. However that may be, it is certain, on the one hand, that our Scottish brethren are now suffering for that truth, and on the other, that it is a truth essential to the purity and prosperity of religion, and consequently their cause is the cause of Christ.

We have also felt more deeply than ever before, the connexion of this doctrine of the headship of Christ, of the direct allegiance of the soul to him as the person on whom our obedience should terminate, with all true and secure liberty, civil as well as religious. What is commonly called the spirit of liberty in the world, is rarely anything more than a compound of pride and malignity. He only is a freeman who serves God rather than man, and who obeys men as doing service to the Lord, and the only true spirit of liberty is the determination to be in that sense freemen. All history, and especially the history of Europe, teaches us that when the spirit of liberty is disconnected from religion, when it does not arise from a sense of our relation to God and a determination to obey him rather than men, it becomes little better than a proud estimate of ourselves, and a malignant hatred of all our superiors; a spirit which strives to pull down what is above, and keep down what is below us. There is no liberty either secure or blessed which God does not give, which does not flow from a purpose to call no man master but Christ. To bring the great truth of Christ's authority over men, clearly before the public mind, and to impress it upon the heart of Christians, is, therefore a signal service, even in relation to civil liberty and the permanency and well-being of our civil institutions. If the people could only be brought to feel that they are bound to obey all lawful enactments of men out of a regard to Christ, and bound, as part of their allegiance to him, to disregard all human enactments which conflict with his revealed will, we should then have a firm foundation laid for all our liberties. This practical recognition of the kingly office of Christ has very much declined among us. We receive the doctrine but we do not live by it. It is not his will, but expediency, or right, or usage which is commonly consulted. If the truth, which we admit as an article of our creed, can be turned into a principle of life, we shall be unspeakably the gainers. And we firmly believe that this is an effect which the addresses and sermons of our Scottish brethren are eminently suited to produce. We doubt not, therefore, their visit will be a blessing to the country.

Our first and great reason then for believing that the cause of the Free Church of Scotland is the cause of Christ, and therefore entitled to the sympathy and support of all Christ's people, is that they are simply asserting Christ's right to

reign; they are maintaining the obligation of Christians and Christian churches to make his revealed will the rule of their conduct; they are enforcing and exemplifying the duty of obeying him rather than men, and in despite of the commands of men to the contrary. We wish to have a part in this testimony; we wish to be on their side; to share in their struggles; to participate in their reproach and bear their burden; we wish to acknowledge their Lord as our Lord. When men are contending for so great a truth and at so great a sacrifice, we cannot but think it to the last degree narrow and contracted, to quarrel with their saying *sibboleth*, instead of *shibboleth*, on the abstract question of the duty of the state to sustain Christianity. Every man who holds that religion should be taught in our public schools, goes the whole length with the Free Church, as far as the principle involved in the question is concerned. That constriction of the throat which makes men strain at gnats is apt to be a fatal disease.

We have spoken of the great truth of Christ's right to reign over his own people, and to rule in his own church, as one that exerts an effective influence in the formation of religious character. We see its power in every part of Scottish history, and its efficacy is now again exhibited in the character and conduct of the Free Church. We very much doubt whether the world has seen for two centuries such a revival of genuine religion as is now, and has been for some years in progress in Scotland; and we should be greatly at a loss to point to any church on earth, which is now exhibiting such an amount of Christian energy and excellence. Where is the church of which it can be said that all its ministers and all its members are submitting to daily self-denial for the support of the truth and the extension of the gospel?

When it became apparent that they could not, with a good conscience, remain in the establishment, four hundred and seventy ministers, about two hundred licentiates, perhaps two thousand elders,\* and about one million of the people, at once seceded. The sacrifice involved in this step, we are not prepared to appreciate. We cannot enter into the feelings of these brethren in regard to the church of their birth, of their fathers and their country. Ties were

\* The number of adhering elders reported in October last, from very imperfect returns, was 1680.

there sundered which have never here existed. In this country also the social position of a man depends almost entirely upon his personal qualities; in Europe more depends upon the accidents of birth and station. In England the difference between a minister of the established church, and a dissenting minister, is as great as between a captain in the army and a militia captain. We may affect to think this of little consequence; but the influence of such considerations is greater than we are willing to acknowledge. The men who are superior to them are great men.

The pecuniary sacrifice made by the ministers is more tangible. Many of them had salaries from two to four thousand dollars, the average was perhaps about a thousand dollars. Thus an annual aggregate income, punctual and certain, of five hundred thousand dollars, was given up, for one far less in amount and in a great measure precarious. This sacrifice occasioned a general and instantaneous change in the mode of living in the great body of the clergy. The relinquishment also of their manse and glebes, where many of them had lived in peace for years, to seek a new and uncertain home, must have cost many a severe pang. The sacrifice on the part of the people has been quite as great. They have given up the churches in which they were accustomed to worship and around which their fathers lie buried; and they relinquished the right to have a ministry supported for them. Such a sacrifice for principle made by five hundred ministers and a million of people, is one of those events which happen but once in many generations. It is a blessing to live in an age in which such a proof of the power of religious conviction is given to the world.

These determined men, in leaving the establishment, assumed at once the task of building churches for all their congregations, of sustaining their own ministers, of carrying on all the missionary and other benevolent operations formerly pertaining to the united body; and of providing the means of education, professional, academical and elementary, for the whole church. They have addressed themselves to this Herculean task, with a wisdom, an unanimity and energy for which we know no parallel.

As to the building of churches, the thing to be accomplished was to erect, within the year, seven hundred places of worship, each capable of seating six hundred people, and costing on an average five hundred pounds. The sum

required for this purpose was, of course, three hundred and fifty thousand pounds. To this must be added the cost of the sites, which in towns is a serious item, so that the whole amount necessary for the object, is over two millions of dollars. In five months more than one million was actually raised. When it is recollected that Scotland is a poor country, and that very few of the aristocracy or of the wealthier classes have joined the secession, this must be regarded as an unexampled effort. To accomplish this great object, it was necessary to make common cause. It would not do to let the wealthier congregations build their own churches, while the poorer parishes remain unsupplied. It was therefore agreed that no expensive church should be erected by the rich, until all the congregations were furnished with a suitable place of worship. This was a novel species of self-denial. It was also determined that while each locality did what it could towards the erection of its own church, a general fund should be created, which should be apportioned to the weaker congregations according to their necessities. This great burden of building so many churches, has come upon them suddenly, the work must be done at once, and it must be done in addition to all the ordinary duties of a church. It is this sudden, indispensable demand for an expenditure immensely beyond the ordinary capabilities of Christian enterprise, that forms the ground of the just appeal of the Free Church to the aid of their fellow Christians. It is not for assistance in sustaining her ministers, in educating her people, or in sending the gospel to the destitute, but in meeting a sudden and great emergency, that she looks for the aid of other churches. Her people, in many places, are unsheltered, worshipping in barns, under tents, or on the highways; and she asks those living in ceiled houses, to assist in sheltering them. It is unspeakably more important to us than it is to them, that we should answer this appeal aright. We ought to bring this case home to ourselves. In ordinary times, it is easy for each family to provide its own residence, but if a sudden calamity renders a whole community houseless, how is it then? It is not always easy, even in ordinary times, for every congregation to build its own church; but suppose that in a single year every presbyterian, or every episcopal church in the land was to be re-erected; would not that be an emergency in which we should feel that we had all the right that Christian brother-

hood or human fellowship can give, to look around for help ?

We have seen that the Free Church determined to make common cause, to create a common fund, to meet the demand for new churches, and that the amount raised has already exceeded all expectation. Let us see what plan was adopted for the support of the gospel. At the time of the Reformation, the Church of Scotland was possessed of large landed estates, and was entitled to a tenth of the produce of the soil of the whole kingdom. The estates were seized by the crown and the nobles ; and the tithes in many cases abolished, or given to laymen. What remained of them, was given to the landowners, when patronage was abolished, upon condition of their paying a part as a stipend to the minister ; and when patronage was restored they retained the possession of the tithes subject to the same condition. This plan of supporting the church by tithes, introduced throughout Europe, was designed to throw open the means of religious instruction, free of all charge, to the whole community. The clergy were supported not by the rich, not by the landowners, not by the tenants, but by a portion of the common property belonging neither to landlord nor tenant, but to the whole community. It is not our purpose to descant on the merits or demerits of this system, but to state it. The advantage which is patent to every one, and which recommended it to the judgment of so many good and great men in all ages of the church ; is, that it designed to make the gospel accessible to all, and to take it and sustain it even among those who were not willing to receive it. It was this end that the Free Church desired also to accomplish. It was easy to have churches built and supported in populous and rich places, but to sustain the ministry among the poor and even the irreligious, was a more difficult task. The ministers determined as to this point also to make common cause, to raise a general fund, out of which every preacher of the gospel should receive a sum adequate to his comfortable support. But as the same sum would be in one place an adequate, and in another a very inadequate salary, it was determined that while all received a common sum from the common stock, each congregation should supplement, as it is called, i. e. add to the salary of its pastor, according to its own ability and choice. To secure the money necessary for the general fund, eight hundred associations were soon formed in

all parts of the church, which make weekly or monthly collections. This fund is appropriated: "1. To defray the expenses of administration and agency. 2. To pay whatever salaries may be charged upon it, and the allowances to preachers and ordained missionaries employed by the church. 3. To appropriate the residue to provide an equal dividend to each ordained and officiating pastor of a congregation, and to such ministers, as, having been pastors of congregations, shall have been otherwise employed under the authority of the church, or declared *emeriti*. 4. This dividend shall not exceed £—— per annum, any surplus beyond that being applicable to the extension of the church, or the maintenance of schools."\* It is intended to make the dividend to each pastor, five hundred, and if possible seven hundred and fifty dollars, a year.

To supplement the salaries, that is, to add to the sum received from the common fund, dependence is placed on the collections made every sabbath at the church door. The pews or seats are to be free, or let at a very low rate, designed merely to meet the incidental expenses of the congregation, for fuel, lights, &c. The plan of entirely free seats, is the one which seems likely to be generally adopted.

This is a beautiful scheme. It is founded on the brotherhood of the church. It assumes that all the ministers being engaged in the same work, have the same right to a competent support. At the same time it makes provision for the inequality, as to the expense of living in different places. Provided a congregation makes a fair contribution to the general fund, it may give, uncensured, what it pleases to its own pastor. It serves also, greatly to enlarge the views and feelings of the people. If a poor woman, as one of the delegates remarked in our hearing, is asked to give six pence a week to support her pastor, she may hesitate, but if you tell her it is for Scotland, for all Scotland, to support all the ministers of the church, her heart is enlarged; her prayers and blessing go with her mite, and she feels elevated and blessed in giving. Its tendency to increase the liberality of the people, which is to them a great good, is therefore obvious. A congregation cannot but feel inclined to give more freely to a great national object, than one which makes no such demands on their conscience and

\* Proceedings of the General Assembly in October.

feelings. We have heard it said that Dr. Gordon's church in Edinburgh has subscribed twenty-five thousand dollars a year to the sustentation fund, while it supports its own pastor, or at least raises the dividend which he receives from the common fund, to an adequate salary. The committee of distribution sent Dr. Chalmers a check for three hundred pounds as his salary as professor, but as his fees had equalled his emoluments from his chair in the established church, he returned it all to the fund. Besides its healthful action on the church, this plan accomplishes the important object of sustaining the gospel in the poorest parishes in the country, and of sustaining it well, so that the necessity of resorting to teaching or farming, as a means of support, is not imposed on the pastors. By making the seats free, the church is thrown open to the poor, the invidious distinctions of wealth are not obtruded into the sanctuary and the freest access is given to the preaching of the gospel. In a letter addressed to the session of one of the new churches, a gentleman after detailing the plan above stated, says "You see from the above that nothing is to be done in the way of exaction. The gospel is to be freely preached to all who choose to avail themselves of the offer. None are to be excluded on account of their poverty. . . . He that giveth much shall not be preferred; he that has little to give shall not be slighted; he that has nothing to give shall not be despised. In so far as the congregation provides directly for the support and comfort of its minister, the "collecting plate, while it receives, will conceal also the contribution of each."

As to the success of this whole scheme we can only state that Dr. Chalmers reported to the Assembly in October last, that enough had been contributed to the sustentation fund, to authorize a dividend at the rate of one hundred and fifty pounds (about seven hundred and fifty dollars) a year to each minister. But the exigency of the church for the building fund, was so great that a large part of the contribution for the support of the clergy, had been diverted to that object. A dividend, therefore, at the rate of only four hundred dollars a year was declared for the first six months. This is certainly, most encouraging; and there is every prospect that the plan will be completely successful. Whether a similar plan can be introduced into our church, is worthy of serious consideration. Our great dispersion, and the immense extent of our country, renders combined action

much more difficult with us, than in such a limited sphere as Scotland. Still, if some Chalmers should arise, to organize the plan; and with the eloquence of benevolence urge it on the church, we should not despair of its success even in America.

It has ever been the glory and blessing of Scotland, that education has gone hand in hand with religion. The school house has always stood near the church. The system of doctrines contained in the Shorter Catechism has there, more thoroughly than elsewhere, been the real pabulum of the people. And to this fact, is, in a great measure to be attributed, whatever of mental or moral superiority distinguishes their national character. This is the great source of that discrimination of intellect, that firmness of purpose, that logical adherence to principle, that independence of character, which appear so conspicuously in Scottish history. True to the noble principles of their fathers, the Free Church has at once directed her energy to the thorough religious education of the people. If she has her building committee, her sustentation committee, she has as early and as vigorous her education committee. Here as well as in other matters, her schemes are wise, large, and practical. The committee state in their report to the Assembly in October, that they must discriminate between what is essential and what is desirable, between what is indispensable at the present moment and what they must aim to accomplish. The whole scheme embraces the founding of theological seminaries, of a college or university, of grammar, elementary and normal schools; requiring an outlay of a million of dollars.

For the present one theological seminary is deemed sufficient, and it has already gone into operation, with Drs. Chalmers, Welsh, Duncan and Cunningham as its professors. We learn, that Dr. Chalmers has been lecturing, through the winter, to a class of two hundred and nine theological students.

The speedy establishment of an university, seems to be contemplated with confidence. We have seen a letter from Sir David Brewster, urging the necessity of the enterprise, though it is for the present postponed for more pressing demands.

The principal object for the present, is to secure a sufficient number of elementary schools. These schools are always placed under the supervision of the session of the church, and the especial charge of the pastor. The presby-

tery has the general directions of all the schools within its bounds, and is expected to visit or inspect them twice a year. The teachers are appointed, and in a measure sustained by the church, and religious instruction, on the basis of the Westminster Catechism, is made, not the work of any one day, but of a portion of every day in the week.

It is stated in the report to the Assembly, in October, from the imperfect returns at that time received, that three hundred and sixty school-masters, having the estimated number of twenty thousand pupils, had already adhered to the Free Church. The important normal school at Edinburgh, with its intelligent principal and all its teachers and pupils, passed over to the new body, leaving behind them the valuable library and other appurtenances of the institution. We learn from the last "Missionary Record" that the school in question is in a very flourishing state, the total number of pupils is about six hundred, of whom thirty are preparing to be teachers. This is an increase of two hundred pupils, since the disruption. The children of this school have subscribed fifty pounds to the scheme for building school-houses, and their teachers have raised the subscription to £110 8s. 4d. The infection of benevolence and zeal has, therefore, taken hold even on children.

As in leaving the Establishment, the Free Church had to abandon their places of worship, so also they lost their schools and the whole apparatus of instruction. There is the same demand, therefore, for new schools as for new churches. To meet this demand, the Rev. Robert McDonald, of Blairgowrie, devised a scheme for raising two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and has devoted himself to carrying it into effect. From the success which every where attends his efforts, it is probable the whole sum is by this time secured. The February number of the Missionary Record of the Free Church, says Mr. "McDonald is more successful than he ever anticipated, however sanguine his hopes were. There is no doubt, whatever, of the whole sum of £50,000 being realized, and that too, within a very short time. He visited Perth, Greenock, Glasgow and Edinburgh; and in each of the two last named places about £8000 were subscribed. In no village or glen has he propounded his scheme, without meeting a ready response to his call, and he has never held a meeting at which less than £100 have been collected. In the village of New Haven £274 were subscribed." This last named place is

described as a small fishing village. All this is doing while the building, sustentation and missionary schemes are pressed with equal zeal and success. It is very evident that something has touched the soul of Scotland and she is herself again.\*

The Rev. Mr. Lewis of Dundee, who is now in this country, states in one of his Tracts, the following facts, which we here mention as illustrative of the efficacy of this scheme of parochial school instruction in connexion with the church. In 1745, at the close of the last rebellion, there were about 500,000 highlanders, speaking the Gaelic language. The great majority of them were papists, and little better than savages, requiring a standing army to keep them in subjection. The Church of Scotland planted among them two hundred churches and two hundred schools, all furnished with ministers and teachers speaking Gaelic. These people now constitute the most thoroughly presbyterian, pious and peaceable portion of the population of Scotland. The great body of them, as might be expected, have gone with the Free Church. In the county of Sutherland with a population of twenty-four thousand, not four hundred remain in the establishment. In Ireland at the same period, 1745, there were about two millions of people speaking the Celtic, and in the same condition of ignorance and barbarity as the Scottish highlanders of that day. They have increased to something like three millions, and are as ignorant and barbarous as they were a hundred years ago. This difference between the two countries, and it is a difference which, as to its results in this world and the next, is beyond computation or conception, is, under God, to be referred to the fact that the Church of Scotland planted a minister and school-master, speaking the language of the people, in every parish of her Celtic population; and that the established Church in

\* The success of any scheme of benevolence depends mainly on the energy with which it is prosecuted, and the state of the people to whom it is presented. Still it may interest our readers to know what Mr. McDonald's plan is. He proposes to raise £50,000 for 500 schools by getting:

500 persons to give one shilling to each of the schools, yielding in all,	£12,500
1000 giving six pence to each	12,500
2000 giving three pence	12,500
6000 giving one penny	12,500

---

9500 giving at the above rates yields, £50,000

The subscriptions are payable as the building of the schools proceeds.

Ireland did not. We have here an example and a warning. If we plant a church and school, side by side, in every community in this country, we shall have a population equal to the best part of the population of Scotland; if we do not, they will be like the worst part of the population of Ireland.

Difficulties are so rapidly clustering around the system of public schools generally adopted in this country, Romanists and infidels are so strenuously striving to banish the Bible and religion from all such institutions, that it surely becomes all evangelical churches to consider what is their duty in the premises. Wherever there is a church there may be a school; and the same people who organize the one should organize the other. If assistance is necessary to sustain the teacher, it may be afforded just as in hundreds of cases it is afforded by our missionary societies to sustain the pastor. The plan proposed in Scotland, is, to furnish from a central fund, a salary of seventy-five or a hundred dollars to every school-master, to be "supplemented" by the community in which he labours. Here is a field worthy of the highest talent and greatest energy of the church.

If half the ability and time which are spent on unimportant or injurious contentions, were devoted to devising and executing a scheme by which a sessional school should be established in connexion with every presbyterian church in our country, future generations would rise up and call us blessed. Why should not our General Assembly appoint a board or committee for elementary schools? Would not such a board have as wide and as important a field of labour, as that which belongs to any institution of the church? Of all the incidental blessings which we anticipate to attend the mission of our Scottish brethren, it will be the greatest and most permanent, if they are the means of awakening the zeal of our evangelical churches to this important subject.

In addition to building churches, sustaining the ministry, and providing the means of professional and elementary instruction, we stated that the Free Church assumed the responsibility of conducting all the benevolent operations, carried on before the disruption. They had to renounce their missionary funds and property, but they wrote to their missionaries, that they were willing to receive and sustain them all. And it is one of the highest testimonies to the

goodness of their cause, and one of the clearest manifestations of the divine favour, that the whole corps of missionaries, as well those to the Jews as to the heathen, have left the Establishment and adhered to the Free Church.

The mode by which these benevolent operations are carried on, is very similar to our own. The church has what are called the "Five Schemes:" 1. The scheme for the conversion of the Jews. 2. For education. 3. For foreign missions. 4. For domestic missions. 5. For Colonial churches. For each of these objects a large committee is appointed, and under it a smaller executive committee, with its convener or chairman, who has the principal management of its concerns. By delegation from these several committees, a joint committee called the general Board of Missions and Education is formed, "for attending to and regulating certain matters common to them all; such as organizing and keeping in operation a system for maintaining and increasing the contributions to the Schemes, publishing the Monthly Record, &c."\*

The annual amount contributed by the whole church to these schemes was about 120,000 dollars. The year before the disruption it was 26,000 pounds. The contributions by the Free Church alone bid fair to equal if they do not exceed that sum. Last year, as stated by Mr. Dunlop to the Assembly, the contributions to the scheme for the conversion of the Jews, after deducting legacies, was £3,863, this year more than four thousand pounds have already been reported. The Indian mission embracing thirteen missionaries, was taken on hand when there was but £372 in the treasury, "we have now to rejoice," says the Record, "in very little short of six thousand pounds contributed for the mission." All the other schemes seem to be equally well sustained. Most of the work committed to the Home Missionary committee having been transferred to the building and sustentation schemes, less will appear under that head, though immensely more has been done for the objects embraced under it. When we remember that two hundred ministers, who formerly voted and acted with the evangelical party, remain in the establishment, the fact that the seceding portion of the church has fully sustained the benevolent operations formerly resting on the united body, and that this has been done in the midst of unexampled demands for the

\* Proceedings of the General Assembly, May 1843.

building, school, and sustentation funds, it certainly exhibits extraordinary devotedness and zeal.

We have written this article with two objects mainly in view. The first is a selfish one; we wish our own churches to know what the Free Church is and is doing; we wish them to understand their principles, and their modes of operation, because we have much to learn from them. The truths which the Free Church is now holding up to the world, for which she is bearing testimony by suffering, are truths essential to the vigour of spiritual life in the church and its members. They are truths which we all admit, but which we have let slip. We have not felt as we ought that Jesus Christ is our Lord; that he must reign in us and over us, as individuals and as a community; his priestly, more than his kingly office, has filled our minds and hearts. We should take both, and live by both; we must live by faith not only in his atonement and intercession, but also in his authority and protection. He is our master and we must have no other. Feeling personally our short-comings in this matter, we have thought it might be useful to call the attention of our readers to the truths which this Scottish movement has brought so prominently to view. The plans also adopted by the Free Church for the support of the ministry, and especially for the support of schools and the promotion of religious education, are worthy of the serious consideration of the churches in this country. We have a similar work, and on a larger scale to perform; and it is well to ask, whether we cannot learn something from them, as to the best way of doing it. Our second object was of course to minister what little we could to aid the cause of the Scottish delegation to this country. This, however, is a very subordinate matter. With such principles at work, and with such men engaged in her service, we have no doubt of the success of the Free Church. Her cause is the cause of Christ, and must succeed. Its success cannot be materially promoted or retarded, by the few thousand dollars more or less, which American Christians may see fit to give. But it is of immense importance how we feel on this subject. To be hostile or to be indifferent, would be a sore calamity. "We have heard," said the eloquent delegate from Wales to the Scottish Assembly, "that Christ is suffering in this country, and we have come to look upon the bush that burns and is not consumed." If Christ is there suffering in his church, we must all admit that it would be for us a

grievous evil, not to believe it, and not to feel and manifest our sympathy. If we make a mistake on this subject, and through that mistake, remain indifferent, we shall suffer loss.

We have only one thing more to say. The testimony of the Free Church "is not a Presbyterian, it is a Protestant testimony. The great Reformation was a recovery of the truth. The truth made men free. The believer stood in his essential dignity—having Christ for his master, and owning and tolerating no other. He claimed the right of private judgment. He repudiated, as an invasion of his birth-right, all lordship over the conscience. He insisted on dealing direct with God—no man coming between. He demanded that the conscience should depend on, and hold of the Lord alone. Church rulers are no keepers of the people's conscience. They have no warrant to lord it over the heritage. The people must be left free to obey Christ, and Christ alone. Thus the testimony borne now to the honour of Jesus, is the very testimony borne by Luther and Melancthon, and the other worthies of the great Reformation. The question lies deeper than the particular controversy which has raised it. It is at the root of all civil and religious liberty. It is—let it be reiterated again and again, in the ears of all men—the question of PROTESTANTISM. It is the question of the right of private judgment; the right of each Christian man to depend on Christ alone, and therefore independent of all authority, civil or ecclesiastical, in the discharge of his duty to Christ."\*

The appeal then of the Scottish Church is made to Protestants and not to Presbyterians. It has been cordially responded to by Wesleyans and Independents. Of the hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars received from England, the greater portion was from the Wesleyans, and the work there is but just begun. In this country the appeal is not yet generally understood. When it comes to be apprehended, we cannot doubt that it will reach every heart that wishes Jesus Christ to reign.

\* We have gathered these sentences from the introduction to the proceedings of the Scottish Assembly held in May, 1843, as reported in the *Edinburgh Presbyterian Review*.